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The following is the agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **June 10, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.** in the Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org).
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1. **CALL TO ORDER** ________________________________________________________ Chair
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _________________________________________ Chair
   
   Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda?
   
   If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that
   they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____________________________________________________ Chair
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** ________________________________________________ Chair
   
   5.1. *May 13, 2015* ________________________________________________________ Chair
6. **ACTION ITEMS** __________________________________________________________
   
   6.1. *Resolution 15-06: A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Officer to sign a Memorandum of
       Agreement with NMDOT Transit and Rail Division* __________________________ MPO Staff
6.2. Resolution 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement
       Program ________________________________________________________________ MPO Staff
6.3. Resolution 15-08: A Resolution Adopting the 2015-2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
       (Transport 2040) ______________________________________________________ MPO Staff
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____________________________________________________
   
   7.1. NMDOT Long Range Transportation Plan ______________________________________ NMDOT Staff
7.2. NMDOT update ___________________________________________________________ NMDOT Staff
7.3. Committee Training _______________________________________________________ MPO Staff
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____________________________________ Chair
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____________________________________________________ Chair
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _________________________________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held May 13, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)  
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC) arrived 1:15  
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)  
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla) arrived 1:27  
Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC) departed 1:32  
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)  
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC) departed 1:32  
Councillor Nathan Small (CLC) departed 1:53

MEMBERS ABSENT:  
Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)

STAFF PRESENT:  
Tom Murphy (MPO staff)  
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)  
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)  
Sharon Nebbia (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT:  
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
Harold Love (NMDOT) arrived 1:36  
Hilary Binnegar  
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:20 p.m.)

Sorg: As the Vice-Chair of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee I call the meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

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

Sorg: Any conflict of interest?

NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST INDICATED.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Public comment?

Murphy: None.

Sorg: Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: We’ll go to the Consent Agenda.

Garrett: Mr. Chair I move approval of the Consent Agenda.

Hancock: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Commissioner, Commissioner Little, Commissioner ...

Garrett: Garrett.

Sorg: Billy Garrett. And second by who was it?

Hancock: Hancock.

Sorg: Hancock. Action Items. First Action Item is 6.1, Resolution 15-04, motion to approve.

Murphy: Excuse me mister, we want to take a, take a vote.

Sorg: Oh yeah. We need a vote.

Murphy: A vote on the Consent Agenda.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: All, all those in favor signify.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Murphy: Any opposed? No. Okay so it passes unanimously.

Sorg: Okay. Unanimous.
5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *April 8, 2015 – Minutes approved under the Consent Agenda vote.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution 15-04: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program


Hancock: Motion to approve.

Sorg: Is there a second?

Garrett: Second.

Sorg: A motion, moved by Hancock, second, second by Garrett. Any discussion?

Wray: I’m here to provide information but I won’t give a presentation in view of the time constraints.

Sorg: Any questions or, or discussion?

Small: Mr. Vice Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Small: Very briefly, this can be amended after today should things come up, correct?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Small. I’m not sure what you mean.

Small: That is if there’s additional projects or other amendments. I saw Commissioner Hancock shaking his head yes. If there’s things that reach that level of being appropriate for amendment after today with the, yeah.

Wray: Oh, yes the TIP can be amended.


Sorg: Okay. Any other discussion?

Hancock: Question.
Sorg: Or questions?

Hancock: Mr. Chair. Call the question.

Sorg: Questions called. Would the, Andrew call the roll.

Wray: Councilor Small.

Small: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Motion passes – vote 8 – 0 (1 member absent).

6.2 A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Chair to sign a letter of support for the Dona Ana County TIGER grant

Sorg: Next item on the agenda is the 6.2, A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Chair to sign a letter of support for the Dona Ana County TIGER grant.
Hancock: Motion to approve.

Garrett: Second.

Sorg: Motion to approve by Hancock and second by Garrett. Is there any discussion or questions?

Garrett: Mr. Vice Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Garrett: I’ve read the letter. I think it covers the topic well and will serve us well.

Sorg: Thank you. Thank you. Any other comments? Mr. Murphy, would you call the roll.

Murphy: Councilor Small.

Small: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: District Engineer Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.
Sorg: Yes.

Motion passes – vote 8 – 0 (1 member absent)

6.3 Appointment to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee

Sorg: Next item on the Action Items is 6.3, Appointing, Appointment of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee and that is an appointment of, let me get the name right. Oh, that’s TIGER grant.

Murphy: The, the gentleman’s name is Duane Bentley. He was invited to be here but we weren’t able to ascertain whether he was able to, you know job constraints and everything. He is replacing Leslie Kryder on the, on the Committee who submitted her letter of resignation a few months ago. We advertised and this was the only applicant that we had received for it and his letter was included in the packet.

Sorg: Okay. Is there a motion to approve?

Hancock: So moved.

Small: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Hancock, second by Small. Any further discussion or questions? Mr. Murphy call the roll.

Murphy: Councilor Small.

Small: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: District Engineer Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes. Okay.

Motion passes – vote 8 – 0 (1 member absent).

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 NMDOT Update

Sorg: Okay we go to Discussion Items, NMDOT update.

Doolittle: You’ll see on the, on the agenda there’s a few projects there. I’ll just give a quick update. That 11610 is the I-10 mill and inlay from the 146 to the 164. That’s a project that we actually moved up, only because another district had some, had some funding they couldn’t spend so we’re going to move that project up. We’re looking at a September production, November bid. So you’re probably looking at spring that we’ll start on that project. What that is, is that’s the section, that’s the six-lane section between the I-10/I-25 interchange and the Texas state line. Basically it’s to fix the lanes that we didn’t do anything with when we did the six-lane widening. Again it’s just a simple mill and inlay project.

The next one on there is the I-10/Union bridge replacement. I do need to clarify a little bit. I guess there was some, some discussion or, or incomplete information provided at the last meeting. I did talk to Commissioner Garrett a little bit before the meeting but ultimately what that project is going to do is replace the bridges at Union, the two bridges that go over Union, we’ll replace those two bridges. The ramp from Whataburger, you know which is basically an extension of Valley Drive we’ll extend that ramp and I did find out, Commissioner Garrett that we’re actually going to replace the decks on those bridges so it’d just be replacing the riding surface. The Union bridge we’re going to do replacement of the pier caps, the abutments, a lot more extensive work but because we’re already in the area we’re going to replace the deck at those two bridges where the ramp goes under I-10. That project is currently, we actually have a pre-con next week. It does have a 60-day
ramp up time so I would expect that we won’t start any work on that project until probably the end of July and then we’ll get in and you know it’s, it’s a pretty extensive project. I think we have ten months on that project.

The next one is the I-25/Missouri bridge replacement project and that project, for those of you that have been out there is moving very quickly. They’re actually hoping to be finished by December which is about three months ahead of schedule so it’s, it’s good to see those guys getting out there and working so, working so hard to get them finished.

The next one on here is the, the second section of I-10. This is basically from the Corralitos interchange to the I-10/I-25 interchange. Again, again it’s just a mill and inlay project. That one is scheduled for a June production which is an August letting. We may see some work late in the fall but depending on temperatures that one may be suspended until the spring, it just kind of depends on what the weather does for us, again just a simple mill and inlay project.

They have one here, the NM188 which is the Valley Drive reconstruction project. We’re currently in project development on that one and will continue to work with Molzen Corbin and the City to develop that project but we’re in the very beginning stages, working on the Phase A-B study on that one.

The other two are just railroad crossing projects. I don’t currently have an update as that’s a different section but if we need an update on those I can certainly provide staff with that information for distribution.

The other one that’s not on here that I just want to touch, touch bases on real quick is the North Main project. It seems like we’re finally out of the sub grade which means getting away from a lot of the utility conflicts which has really hampered the progress of that project so we’ll start to see some progress at the top. They’ve moved over to the west side of the roadway. Currently the expected completion date of that project is the end of July. And I think that’s all the projects that we have in the area unless anybody has any specific questions.

Sorg: Any questions by the Committee? There is one question but before you start Mayor Barraza, I would like to turn the meeting over to our Chairperson Linda Flores.

Flores: Yes and I apologize for being late. I don’t know what happened. I just lost track of time. Okay so seeing no questions ...

Benavidez: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Benavidez: I just, Trent I just have a question or a comment. Someone brought to my attention, I can’t remember if it was at a Council meeting or at another
meeting that when they’re getting off the ramps there on Avenida de Mesilla where they’re, you’re coming from the, is it south and west or however, when they exit the ramps there’s not a sign indicating which way is Las Cruces and which way is Mesilla. So, and I think it was probably at one of our meetings and one of the businesses said that some of their customers said they had gone to Las Cruces instead of coming into Mesilla to visit for the day, so I don’t know if it’s something that you can address or not.

Doolittle: Mayor do, do you recall which, do you know if it’s the eastbound or the westbound ramps, or both?

Benavidez: Both.

Doolittle: Both, okay. Absolutely. I’ll, I’ll send somebody out there to take a look at that.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you.

Flores: And did we have a comment from some, question, no, yes? Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yeah. Thank you. One other question and that has to do with the interchange where, the intersection between Stern and the Mesquite exit whether there’s been any examination of that particular configuration.

Doolittle: Not that I’m aware of. The proposed ...

Garrett: I, I brought that up at the last meeting, that, that would, became apparent to people because of the construction and there were concerns about visibility to the north as you go west but it’s also that the road drops off and curves so it’s, it’s hard for people to see the traffic and there was just a question about how that interchange might be handled, that intersection might be handled to make it safer.

Doolittle: I, I don’t recall Commissioner Garrett. Which intersection are we talking, on the frontage road or an actual interchange?

Garrett: It’s, it’s, it’s not an, the interchange, it’s when you come off the interchange and you ...

Doolittle: Oh. Yes. I, I, I do remember that. I did talk very briefly with our traffic section to do a, a sight triangle study. Honestly, I failed to follow up after I asked them that question. I’ll, I’ll make that a priority and I’ll, I’ll give you an update. I, I didn’t ...
Garrett: Thanks. I, I, just know that that’s an issue that’s going to come back up in some of my district meetings.

Flores: Anyone else? All right.

7.2 Transport 2040 Update

Flores: Then we’ll move along to Transport 2040 update.

Murphy: Okay, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. I don’t have a presentation. Before I get, we included some, a couple of letters into your packet but before I discuss those, something, we held a, held three public meetings and there’s you know, our, the plan we had one downtown Las Cruces, one Mesilla Community Center, and one in the Del Cerro Community Center down in the south valley. Turnout was, was rather light. I think we had six or seven at the, at the downtown and at the, at the Del Cerro one. We had one attendee at the Town of Mesilla. Trustee Flores and I did a, did have the pleasure to, to be on KRWG where we announced the updating of plan but it didn’t generate the interest that I felt it would.

In addition to that we sent out requests to various organizations, did get a, I did meet with the Government Affairs Community, Committee for the Chamber of Commerce, presented to them on the plan, got that, got, got some feedback from them. I believe we are holding, or we’re taking comments through the end of this month of which, well actually I, I think the comment period officially closes Monday but comments can always that, that’s for inclusion into the draft. We plan on asking the BPAC next Tuesday for a recommendation, the TAC on their June meeting, and then back again at this Committee for your June meeting for approval of that. Now absent any, any game-changing comments. In the, the letters in the packet that we submitted we got I guess some concerns or interest in what, what’s proposed for future Sonoma Ranch Boulevard south of Dripping Springs. Although it’s not listed on the proposed transportation priorities plan it is on the right-of-way preservation plan and it’s been, come a, a, a point of contention I believe at, at the Extraterritorial P&Z as there’s a zone change in the vicinity of that. We’ve had some citizens that are asking us to downgrade it and/or move it to the west and then we’ve got a letter from the University stating that it’s vital for, for their long-range plans. At this point I’d like to kind of open it up for discussion, kind of see where the Committee members, what the Committee members feel on this and then staff can amend the maps accordingly.

Flores: Anyone have any discussion? I see Commissioner Garrett going towards the mic.
Garrett: Thank you. I’ve been aware of the issue about the designation of this, this section of road probably from the beginning of the, my tenure as a County Commissioner and I think that, that an elegant solution if it’s possible would be to have an indication in the plan that the designation and specific alignment of that road needs to be something that should be worked out through area planning in that location. I, I can appreciate the point of view about the University and they’re going through negotiations now, all 25 years ago or so. A lot has changed and I think that in order to consider all of the different values that there needs to be a, an area plan developed that would be done in conjunction with the University. The University is not the only property owner in that area and they’re not the only ones who are going to be affected by both the road configuration, the amount of traffic that we’re intending to send through those areas, as well as what happens with, with the properties themselves. So I, I think it’s, it’s, personally I think it’s premature to either change it or to simply ignore it and, and just say, “No this is, this is fine.” I think that this is something that we need to recognize as a potential area of additional work and just as we have made some, put some language into the plan that addressed the, the issues that have to do with the, the roads going around, the ring roads, I think this might be a good way to simply recognize that there is an issue there and at some point we’re going to have to get into it but it needs to be done in more detail. I would also say that an important part of that has to do with what kind of public input we have in that process. I don’t know what the public process was at the time that the City was going through negotiations with the City and BLM, or the University was and so that’s another question just in terms of due process and hearing the public.

Flores: Councilor Small, do you have a comment you wanted to make?

Small: Thank you Chairwoman Flores. Mr. Murphy, was there any feedback regarding multiuse trails along the laterals within the city because that’s something as we, as we hold neighborhood meetings frequently comes up where folks greatly value the La Llorona Trail, certainly the Triviz and other, the outfall channel and there’s a growing interest in the internal networks within the city along the water conveyance systems.

Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. There’s not been any specific discussion of using the laterals during this, this update of the plan. We do however have the, the trail priorities plan in place which does make use of, of most if, most of the EBID laterals. To my knowledge there’s really not been any specific request for it. The MPO has worked in the past, we had helped get some legislation through up in Santa Fe that …

Small: Right.
Murphy: That allowed ... 

Small: Right. 

Murphy: Either the City, the County, or the Town to enter into agreements with EBID so that we, you know and that's, hey, we got an agreement in place that... 

Small: Right. 

Murphy: Allowed the outfall channel so we got the, the mechanisms in place. 

Small: Sure. 

Murphy: Additionally we're, we're studying West University and one of the proposals currently that's, that the consultant is looking for is to utilize some of those, some of those laterals as part of the trail system and we'll, we'll work on advancing that concept and, and a little more as we move through the process. As for any other, any other specific segments I think we need to have them probably either you know recommended through to us that we can go to the appropriate government board and say that you know, “We've heard this request and we would like, you know they would like you to develop the, this portion.” It would have to go through a, the special use permit through EBID and, and then develop some kind of a, you know develop a project to implement it but the mechanisms are really all in place to, to achieve you know any of that. 

Small: That's excellent and thank you for the summary. 

Flores: And Commissioner Hancock. 

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Would it be appropriate for the South Central Regional Transportation District to be including a TIP for some of these purposes in the rural sections of the county before it gets into the El Paso MPO, for example in the Viva Dona Ana plan there are the, there's the, the trails proposal and, and I've been in the process of talking with a growth, with Growth Management at the County about how the upcoming transit district stops could be oriented to those trails in order to advocate for bike trails and walking trails from some, for some of the little areas that are off of the main transit route. Since we obviously don't have the resources to get our transit into those routes, it makes good sense to utilize those trails so that people can walk to or take bikes to the, and put in, and then we could put in transit stops at those points but identifying those. So what, would, would this be the appropriate process for achieving that?
Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hancock. I think the, the process you'd want to do and, and the TIP is really once we have funding identified to, to make a particular improvement and then if it's a trail segment that depends on geographically whether it’s located within our area or the El Paso MPO area. As for, as for general system overall approval that would probably have to go into both TIPs, but to get back to the specific of, of recommending certain trail I, trail segments to be improved I think that that would probably be a priority recommendation through the MTP so I think if the district had, had some specific, specific laterals in mind that they wanted to see advanced, you know they could comment that to a process and then you know that would just, just be something that we could put in as, as part of the prioritization process as far as advancing projects.

Hancock: Very good. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: The only thing that I would add to that is just I am concerned about the reliance that the University has put on the planning and that they already thought that they had an agreement and I can see how that would be upsetting so, all right. So shall we move on to Committee Training: Transportation Funding, 7.3?

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Oh, I'm sorry.

Doolittle: No, that's okay.

Flores: You had asked, you wanted to make a comment and I (inaudible).

Doolittle: I, I don’t have any comment specifically to the two letters that were in here but I do have a few tied to the plan itself if you don’t mind. Tom, Jolene’s going to submit all of the comments from the department just in general but I do have a few that I just want to touch on real quickly that I think is important just because it’s been discussed with some of the, the Policy Board Members. If you would turn to page 65, in that first column under the, the truck traffic and loop roads, the first paragraph the very last sentence and this is something I’ve talked to Councilor Sorg about says “based on public input MPO staff is also proposing a redesignation of US-70 on Main and Picacho to a local roadway and to not permit hazardous cargo.” You know that’s something that we have talked about but at this point, honestly is not realistic so I would hate to mislead the public by saying that we’re going to eliminate or restrict traffic on US-70 so my proposal would be to eliminate that, that sentence completely just because I don’t want to mislead somebody with statements in here that you know at this point is, is just not realistic.
Flores: Does anybody have another, a comment to add to that or a problem? No?
Okay. Just want to check.

Doolittle: All right. My next one just real quickly on page 71 in the second column, the last paragraph on that page starts talking about the City of Las Cruces Pavement Preservation Program and it continues on and starts listing the pavement and asphalt treatment schedule with costs. I think we need to be real clear that that's specific to the City of Las Cruces.

Flores: Las Cruces, yeah.

Doolittle: Only because the department's costs are substantially different and we don't have a 50-year schedule and I don't know what Mesilla's or the County's are but maybe what you can do is separate that out with a different header or something along the line that makes that very clear that's the City's.

Flores: Yes.

Doolittle: Kind of reads that way but ...

Flores: Yeah.

Doolittle: For someone who wouldn't, wouldn't understand the process it may be also a little bit confusing. And then the last, in that same section on page 73 you, you put on here “figure 6-4 above shows the range of pavement conditions throughout the MPO.” That is only within the City of Las Cruces. That map only references the City's map. And then the, the last comment that I've got on the very last page, page 78 you know staff read through this and one of the comments was it reads kind of negative. I think the language can be, can be written a little bit differently, specifically the very last paragraph. It says, “While this MPO can do little to influence State or National decisions, it's able to decide which projects are built in this region.” Our feeling is eliminate that sentence and then start immediately with, “this MPO is committed to projects that supports the livability principles.” I think that's more of a positive comment tied to what our goals and, and objectives are of the department rather than saying the MPO can decide which projects we're going to build. You know something along the lines of, "work cooperatively with the MPO entities to provide a transportation infrastructure.” It just, that, that last paragraph it, it to us it also kind of summarizes the entire plan not just the financial plan, so I don't know if the intent was to summarize the entire plan in, in, in general. You know I don't know what any of the other Board Members think but it just, it just read a little bit ...
Flores: What do you think about changing from “while” to “although” like “although we can’t” direct them? Would that make it better or you still think that’s too negative?

Doolittle: I think if you just start by saying that, “We as an MPO are committed to the projects that support the principles,” you know that kind of starts off on what our, what our objectives are as an MPO. And, you know it further states you know that we’re going to support that and we’re committed to it so. It, it, and I think we still have some comments and I don’t know what your public comments will show to that if any but you know those, that was something that I think we as an MPO ought to consider is, is really writing that more as a positive statement as opposed to seems, seems pretty direct. And then I do have, I do have a few small ones that I just need to clarify with you but we can do that after the meeting.

Flores: Okay. Anyone else? All right. So ...

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I concur. I think that those are good recommendations by Mr. Doolittle. I don’t know that we actually ended up providing direction relative to the Sonoma Ranch Road question and my proposal just to be clear about that is not to try to address that in this version of the update for the, the Transportation Plan but to recognize that it is an issue. And I understand, you know I’ve read the, the letter from President Carruthers too. What I’m concerned with is that there were decisions that might’ve been made 25 years ago that didn’t take into consideration all of the kinds of things that have happened around that area. Centennial High School was not even thought about in, in terms of location at that particular place. The amount of development that’s out on the east side of A Mountain and, and I, I think that this is an area that would be really worth a, a more detailed examination in terms of both transportation but also land use and I think that that needs to be done in conjunction with the University. This isn’t about saying that what they’re doing is right or wrong but there are many other interests that are at play in that larger area and I think that by doing planning for that location, probably in conjunction with the County in other words not, don’t do this just in terms of the Transportation Plan but actually look at it as a larger area plan that, especially after completion of the Comp Plan for the County. This would be a good area to actually sit down and take as a test case in terms of how do some of these new principles apply. So I’m looking for inclusion of, of some language that simply recognizes this as a, an area of interest to multiple entities that needs to be more closely examined as we move forward and, and just something to that effect so we have a place in the plan to hang a TIP...
project, for example to do some additional planning just as we've looked at. You know, how do we actually deal with University in where we get to Zia you know and that, that kind of thing. There’s some real difficult areas that we need to have planning worked in in terms of how do you actually get this done, so ...

Flores: I see Councilor Small.

Small: Oh, Madam Chair. I just, I apologize. I have to head out now.

Flores: Okay.

Small: But, and I’ll circle back with folks after. Thank you. Thank you.

1:53 NO QUORUM - ALL MEMBERS OF THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES HAD DEPARTED THE MEETING.

Garrett: So Madam Chair. I guess my question again is closure. Is that the, I think that Mr. Murphy’s looking for direction and we don’t, we’re not doing a motion or anything like that but I don’t have a sense that how, where the rest of the Board is in terms of this as an approach to including some language and, and I’m talking way too much by myself.

Flores: No, no I don’t have an objection to saying we’re purposely leaving this open because this needs more work, just stating that you have issues on both sides and that we need to look at where, when use has, where growth has affected the area and maybe get some more coordination on that and planning.

Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett. I, I think we can, we can accommodate what is the, the, what’s being requested. I, Sonoma Ranch is, that, that segment of proposed Sonoma Ranch has been in contention since, since I came to the MPO back in, back in ’03 and every time we do the Transportation Update it, it gets discussed and people, people grab their opposite sides of the rope and starts tugging it. So I really like the idea of formally declaring, you know declaring it a study area, put it as a priority that in the next five years we find funding to conduct such a study that does get all of the players, all of the interests to the, to the table to the process to discuss that so that we can come up with, with something that is, you know least agreeable or least objectionable to all parties in, involved and I, so I, I think that’s one of the things we can, as far as this, this update to the plan we just amend that, that this study area is a priority for the MPO that we go and we find funds to conduct such a study so that we can, you know we could have it out then.

Flores: Okay. So...
Hancock: Madam Chair.

Garrett: Madam Chair. That would meet my, my concerns.

Flores: Okay. And Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: I would, I, I think where it could be particularly appropriate would be to include the cultural and heritage significance of the, of the area. To, to only be considering the commercial value of a place leaves out too many parts and too many groups and so I would think that they, the cultural and heritage significance should be closely monitored and given particular significance. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: So assuming that you will include that as part of the concerns when you write about ...

Murphy: Yes.

Flores: The need for the study area.

Murphy: Yes Madam, Madam Chair, Commissioner Hancock. In fact those, you know the, those, those cultural, historic, environmental resources you know stem from the livability principles that we based on, they’re are also re-echoed in the transportation principles that, that we’ve adopted through this process that specifically talks to those points so I would, I would, I would say that any study that we, we conduct would have to take, take that into account or we’d be in violation of our own documents.

Flores: Okay. And ...

Doolittle: Madam Chair, Tom. The only, the only thing I heard you say is we would seek funding for this study within five years. I would be very hesitant about putting a timeline in there just because we don’t have any idea what the funding source is going to be and then we as a Board determine what kind of priority it is but I, we put a timeline in there we’re going to be held to it.

Murphy: Madam Chair, District Engineer Doolittle. I, I, I think probably what I really meant to say was we, we would commit to study it whether we got funding to, to bring on a, a consultant or if we utilized internal resources and handled it as a UPWP item but to, to make further study of this issue a priority.

Flores: We’ll move on to Committee Training and Transportation Funding, 7.3.

McAdams: Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen. We were talking about funding and I think that’s the appropriate thing to sort of talk about funding in general. As you know that transportation has been around for a long time and here’s an example of an engineering feat in the Andes Mountains. (Inaudible) done, they’re going without, you think without really tools, only Bronze Age tools. They did cliff you know paths etc. so really what I’m saying is maintenance and construction is not a new thing. It’s been around for many, many years and it’s an issue of connecting people together and activities. If you look at transportation it’s the glue for communities. It enables us to go to work, shopping, medical, social trips, and at every, they rely on quality, rely on quality and reliable transportation. I think if you look at two, there’s two questions at the core of urban transportation planning: What are the various alternative options to adequately address the transportation needs of a planning area in the short and long term? And then the second thing is: How will they be implemented given the financial constraints at all levels of government? I think that’s what we’re really talking about. Do we have the money to do what we want to do? If not we have to look at alternatives. And here’s where we talk about the facts in general not in the, overall we’re spending more on expansion than repair. If you look at this figure, $20.4 billion are spent on expansion as opposed to $16.5 so again, in other words we’re going to build but how do we maintain it.

Annually the needs, repair needs are far exceeding what’s being spent. If you look at repair the needs are $45.2 billion as opposed to $16.5 billion on current spending. The deficits is, is incredible. In New Mexico we have also, not as bad as other states you would think but still significant differences: 23% of all major locally and state maintained urban roads are in poor condition; 41% are in mediocre or fair condition. So that’s approximately 60%, no 50, 50% of all roads are in bad condition over and one, one in six bridges are of locally and state maintained bridges so significant deterioration or do not meet current design standards. So this, we in New Mexico we have a, a condition where really we should concentrate on repair and on, and maintenance. If you look at this, this graph: Percent difference of actual and, of annual actual needs and spending by state. So I mean, we’re going to, New Mexico if you look in red is not that bad but not that good, right. Other places like Texas have a lot more they need to spend on, right. So we’re not doing too bad but still improvement. If you look at this figure, this other, the, the figure we’re, we’re doing pretty well about, approximately 70% of our budget in New Mexico is spent on repair as opposed to expansion so we’re doing pretty good. We’re up in that top tier, can almost see the divisions of steps of those in groups. We’re not doing too bad. Doesn’t mean we can
lay back though. The question is, the ultimate question is how do we pay for transportation improvements? We pay either from federal and state fuel taxes, property taxes, sale taxes, gross receipts tax, gross receipts tax, bonds, special district tax, user fee, tolls but they're not authorized in New Mexico, and other sources, so really a variety of different sources.

What is a big myth and that roads pay for themself. They don't. A lot of people think, "Oh, well I ride the roads. I pay the, I'm paying taxes, my fuel tax." That's just not true. In fact if you look at this figure, in urban areas 50-200 thousand, only 55%, well 55% of all roads don't pay for themselves. That's between vehicle miles, gas taxes as opposed to the, how much it cost to construct them. Overall it's 48% pay for themselves, 13% break even. So more or less 50, 60% or really not over 50% don't pay themselves. And we've been doing this for a while, right that, that we've been supplementing federal gas taxes with other funds, general property tax, general tax from other areas too. If you look by state New Mexico is not, the federal taxes, or the federal fuel, federal and state fuel taxes are not really making a, a good dent in this. So we're, so that means what, we're, we are supplementing our transportation budget with other sources which we know. This is nothing new. This is not, if you look at the trend for fuel taxes take less, paying for less, this trend's been going on for quite a while but you can see there's different levels. You see that in the '50s we're all driving around in cars, we're spending gas all over the place and we were not fuel efficient so a lot of this, then fuel, the fuel taxes were paying for a large amount of the roads. But then when cars got more fuel efficient, we, we actually are driving less, that's a new phenomena, you see it drops about '79. That's the, the oil embargo, a tremendous drop, pretty much steady and then recently we found an alarming trend and I'm not sure, you can attribute this to many things but now we've crossed that barrier. We're paying, we're having to pay to supplement that fuel tax with, with other funds and I think that's, so if you look it's the annual base for this, this turnover year, you can see right here bond revenue is only 10%, user revenue 48%, that means fuel taxes etc. and non-user revenue, that's property tax etc. bonds, who are only 40, or 42% so almost, close to 50% are being paid out by other sources, all right. So if anybody tells you as a transportation, transportation person that either fuel taxes pay for the roads, "I'm paying for the roads," you can say, "No, they don't. We're having to supplement," you know.

I like to call this challenges instead of conclusions. I think that in a sustainable transportation system both maintenance and new construction has to be addressed, right. Many of the states we see are not in a sustainable situation, place and they're going to find in the future that they're going to have to repair the roads. New Mexico's not so bad, all right but we're going to, eventually we'll have to pay for them too in taxes, all right. We're going to make up the difference because we're a, a federal system not a state system. The maintenance needs far exceed what is being spent. There's a great need for repair for roads and bridges that are
exceeding the present projected revenue. This must be a priority for the MPO and it is for our MPO. While future, while, while fuel taxes generate a significant amount of the revenue, they are not reliable, right. They’re going up and down. We know that people are traveling less, fuel tax are even less and not sufficient for future transportation needs and this is absolutely true.

So how do we, how do we deal with this? I think that we, the way we deal with it is this: Fuel taxes should be considered not as a user tax but another source of revenue like property tax etc. So we have to, we sort of refocus our idea about financing. General revenues generated from a variety source have, we know that on a local, state, and national level we have had to come up with a difference to have a transportation budget. One of the things that supplemented the fuel tax in the, in the past or recently has been some of the recovery acts done recently to give more assistance but that came by general funds not fuel taxes, right. So we know that, so we have to, pretty much we have to abandon it and it’ll be necessary to make up the difference for revenue for funding transportation projects. In other words if you build it you have to maintain it or you can just abandon it or you can have in some situation, like in Minneapolis their bridges collapse and we know that’s true. There’s many bridges are deficient, roads are deficient that we’re going to have to decide something. Are we going to spend all our money and really enforce it and you look at the DOT is now recommending, there’s a, there’s a, a study right now to try to force the hands of state DOTs to do more repair and I think, I think you can see the message quite clear. And the real question, the overall question: Can we continue on the same paradigm? And I think that’s a, that’s a philosophical question but I, I think we can say, “No. We can’t.” We have to go a different direction and this, in the plan, our, our plan update is definitely saying this. We have to go in a different direction. We can’t expand any more without having a, a, a sustainable financial source. Any questions or comments, comments too?

Flores: *(inaudible)* or actually Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Nice presentation. Thank you. Interesting, interesting facts. What seems to be the trend with moving towards more efficient vehicles? Obviously, the fuel revenue is going to continue to go down.

McAdams: Exactly.

Hancock: So we have to move to, and I assume that that will be at a federal level, moving more towards a, a vehicle tax rather than a consumption tax, something that, that corresponds across the, the spectrum. What, what seems to be the trends in that area?
McAdams: I think that, I think that it is. We’re talking about it could either be like vehicle miles traveled, it could be a straight vehicle tax, it could be just maybe apportioning a financial, or a sustainable or regular funding out of the general fund, federal and the state. I think it’s real at this point, I think it’s really a problem and I think there’s many groups who are looking at this and they’re asking the federal government, “What are we going to do? We can’t keep on going year to year refunding and stuff, we can’t, we can’t keep on complaining about the highway tax fund,” and actually it’s been, that’s been used to offset the deficit too. That’s really sort of a false figure, but I think you’re right. We have to look at some kind of steady funding. The vehicle tax is maybe the way but obviously I can’t answer. I think it’s a really complex question but one that, it’s been waffling but it has to be addressed. You know in that, that aspect so I think it’d be a good idea but I think not the only idea, you know that has to be concerned.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: We, we had somebody come and speak to us when we went to Albuquerque for the MPO, do you remember Mr. Murphy? And I don’t remember his name but he was assigned with the State of New Mexico with a group of investigating ways to raise money and I know one of them was possibly doing car inspections and using that money to fund ...

Murphy: Right.

Flores: There were issues with rural people complaining about basically paying for roads in the city, and what was the solution for that? I don’t ...

Murphy: I, I don’t, Madam Chair I don’t think they came up with a solution there.

Flores: No, those were just ideas that he was saying they had talked about and ...

Murphy: Right. Yes. Several, several years ago through direction from the legislature all the MPOs in the state worked with the State DOT and, and they did a study and they basically was, like they told, it was House Memorial 35 that came, came forward with many recommendations on, on funding sources and I think that each of those are various, various levels of either being kept, pushed along or, or, or, or as in the case of tolling, you know, you know sometimes ignored. I think it’s going to be something that we continually debate and discuss and hopefully, hopefully we’ll get, get some, you know get some steps in the right direction to make, make our situations better.

Garrett: Thank you Madam Chair. Are there sources of information that break down the usage of roads by commercial, residential, public?

McAdams: You mean overall, I mean by every road segment or for road, different types of roads in general?

Garrett: I think different types of roads in general.

McAdams: There is, the best source for this, in fact the source for all the, the, that I said today was the Federal Highway Statistics and every year they compose a huge book on statistics and I'm sure that that can be delineated if, anyway there's the Bureau of Transportation Statistics also, so either through the BTS or through FHW Highway Statistics there should be an answer about usage, you know. If not that's to be something we'd research but I, I'm fairly familiar with the FHWA Statistics and I think that's one of the uses of different, different types of road facilities is there, yeah.

Garrett: Thank you. I, I think as we look at different ways to finance, we need to be considering why the roads need to be either upgraded or newly developed. Yeah, I agree with you that once they're in place they have to be maintained.

McAdams: Right.

Garrett: But there are different things that are driving why roads need to be expanded or newly constructed and part of that is population growth, part of it is economic growth and I keep going back to what's happening in the south county in particular and just, how do we address and how do we think about those roads cause there's a lot of, that's a complex network of, of roads that need to be developed, need to be improved, that need to be maintained but if we didn't have a port and we didn't have a multimodal yard there we wouldn't have to worry about that. So, unless we struck oil in, in Santa Teresa. Let's get that out as a rumor but ...

McAdams: But I think, I think you, I, I have a comment on this because I didn't add something but you have to look at what's the actual cost both if, financial and environmental, social and what are the benefits, right. And I think a lot of times transportation projects are not looked at in that way and they also when they're done they're not looking that way as well. And so I would say that if you looked at what are the benefits of developing roads in Santa Teresa I would say very much for economic benefit, right. But in combination if you look at what kind of things can we do to ameliorate air pollution, mobility things, you have to look at a whole package of, of public transportation, walking, and you know pedestrian, pedestrian, all kinds of modes to look at it comprehensively, you know. I think so saying, "Oh, well we're going to build it, it will pay for itself in fuel taxes," is not enough.
I think what are the, the good sides of the road and what are the bad sides
the road and I think, you look in all the reports we’re looking at that’s what
they’re saying. We’re ignoring all the complicated and multimodal and
multifocal type of aspect too so it’s, it’s not simple and I think that you as
Commissioners and us as technicians have to struggle with some of the
same things so there’s not a good answer and I think we all muddle
through to a certain degree.

Flores: Anyone else? All right thank you very much for the presentation.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Flores: We’ll move on to Committee and Staff Comments. Mr. Wray.

Wray: Thank you. Thank you Madam Chair. All of you should have received
except for Madam Chair who wasn’t here at the time, the copies of the
current drafts of the 2016-2021 Airport and Surface Transportation
Improvement Program.

Flores: Okay.

Wray: We are now within the public comment period for the adoption of the next
TIP. It started at the TAPP, or at the TAC meeting, excuse me of last
week. Not going to do any presentation on it, just providing it ...

Flores: Okay.

Wray: For your information so that you can look over it over the course of the
next several weeks and provide us with any comments that you have
regarding the upcoming TIP and this will be an Action Item at the June
Policy Committee meeting.

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Just as a point of clarification the Airport Transportation Improvement
Program is, is the City’s airport?

Wray: That’s correct.

Garrett: And do we know if there’s a similar TIP that’s being put together for the jet
port? The Dona Ana County International Jet Port and I’m assuming that
that would then be part of consideration by the El Paso MPO?
Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett. The, the airport projects are something that this MPO has, has traditionally ...

Flores: Missed.

Murphy: Or adopted and, and concluded and put out for public information. It’s, it was a, I guess done at the request of the City and the desire of this Board to put out as much information to the public as, as we could. That being said having an airport TIP is not a requirement so I do not believe that the El Paso MPO constructs one for, for projects in their area.

Garrett: Does, does the TIP as such have to go through an MPO? Is that only an instrument of the MPO?

Murphy: The TIP is an MPO document, yes.

Garrett: So the County couldn’t do something for transportation related improvement projects for the Jet Port?

Murphy: I think you could probably choose to highlight it on your ICIP.

Garrett: But it just wouldn’t be hooked in with the state’s transportation planning, is that correct?

Murphy: If, if I’m right I, I believe we just publish it and it ends here. I don’t think that the state even accepts it from us.

Wray: Mr. Murphy’s correct. The state does not accept it from us. It’s, the, the airport projects are all funded by the FAA and they have a completely different process. They don’t know what a TIP is so it’s, it, it, we’re, we do this because it’s the will of the, of our Policy Committee that we, that we include it in for public information but it stops here. The state doesn’t want it, the federal highways doesn’t want it. It, they specifically direct us not to provide them with the information, in fact.

Garrett: And it’s this Committee that has asked to do this even though it doesn’t go anywhere?

Wray: That’s correct.

Murphy: It, it goes onto our website and its information available to the public.

Garrett: But couldn’t that just as well be done by the City of Las Cruces since that’s the primary entity that would be benefiting from this?
Murphy: It could be and if, I guess if, if this Committee does, you know decides for us not to, not to continue that I think that’s something that, that could be done but with it, yeah, it’s...

Garrett: It, yeah let me just make it clear where I’m coming from. I am not in any sense indicating a lack of support for these projects. I don’t want there to be a public assumption that the MPO has any role to play in this particular effort and it seems to me that if it’s appropriate for this to be part of the City’s ICIP process that having it highlighted there is great. It may be that what we could consider as a Committee is simply to say that there are places to go for airport transportation projects, both the City and the County to look at information about those but I think it’s misleading. I’m, I’ve always been confused with this because I look at this and I say, “Well it’s a, it’s, looks like the same thing as our Surface Transportation Improvement Program,” in terms of the way it’s laid out and everything so I’m not sure what the point is of having you all do that staff work. We got plenty of things that need to be done so that might be something for further discussion at some future time.

Flores: Okay. Does anybody else have a comment about that (inaudible) cause I don’t have a problem cutting it or just, I, but I think we state on there that it’s just listed because as a, maybe we can state for, this is just listed as a courtesy and MPO doesn’t have any, but I don’t mind cutting it either if it helps with staff time. Did you have a comment Commissioner Hancock?

Hancock: I, I tend to agree with you. If it’s not necessary then it’ll be confusing.

Flores: All right.

Hancock: Thank you.

Flores: So any Committee comments? Okay. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Is staff complete?

Wray: I believe so, yes.

Hancock: Thank you. On behalf of the County and South Central Regional Transportation District we thank the Board for, and MPO for the positive vote on the support of the TIGER grant. That’s really appreciated. As a matter of information the NMDOT this week has notified me that the, they have approved the South Central Regional Transportation District Five-Year Plan and Budget. So that’s good news. We finally got that out of the way. In addition to that I received notification today that, from NMDOT, that I have a notice of obligation so the full $440,000 legislative appropriation for buses is totally consumed and we will be buying five new
buses at South Central Regional Transportation District and moving forward with the Five-Year plan and we're looking forward to trying to provide the appropriate transportation for rural communities in Dona Ana and Sierra County. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? No? Okay. We'll then, we'll move on to, and no more from staff.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: We'll move on to Public Comment. Does anybody from the public like to make a comment? No? Okay.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:24 p.m.)

Flores: So then we'll move on to adjournment. We're adjourned.

_____________________________________
Chairperson
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AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Resolution No. 15-06: A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Officer to sign a Memorandum of Agreement between the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO) for Transit purposes.

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 15-06

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
1. Copy of Resolution 15-06
2. Copy of draft MOA

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is for the management of the Federal Transit Administration Section 5303 grant from NMDOT to MVMPO programmed in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for Federal Fiscal Years 2015-2018. The MOA is the basic contractual agreement between NMDOT and the MPO that delineates the responsibilities of each organization.

The UPWP is a required core MPO document which outlines the transportation planning activities to be conducted by MPO Staff as well as processes that MPO Staff will participate in, but not necessarily oversee. The UPWP must contain a budget of both funding and staff time and must be in compliance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. As per the NMDOT Planning Procedures Manual, the UPWP must be renewed every two years. The current UPWP was adopted by the Policy Committee on June 11, 2014.
RESOLUTION NO. 15-06

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 10th day of June, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

motion By: ____________________
Second By: ____________________

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

ATTEST: ______________________
APPROVED AS TO FORM: ______________________

Recording Secretary City Attorney
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

THE NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

AND

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

This Agreement is between the STATE OF NEW MEXICO, acting through its DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Transit and Rail Division, (Department), and the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO). This Agreement is effective as of the date of the last party to sign it on the signature page below

RECITALS

Whereas, 49 U.S.C. Section 5303, authorizes federal assistance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for multimodal transportation planning in metropolitan areas that is cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive, resulting in long-range transportation plans and short-range programs of transportation investment priority (Program); and,

Whereas, the Governor of New Mexico has designated the Department to receive and administer the federal funds under this program; and,

Whereas, the Department and the MPO have long worked together in transportation planning that involved Section 5303 funds and they want to continue; and,

Now, therefore, pursuant to Section 67-3-69 NMSA 1978, the parties agree as follows:

1. **Program.**
The MPO shall develop and implement an annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to identify specific tasks, with detailed scopes of work and funding estimates, related to transportation planning and programs. The UPWP is subject to the approval of the Department and the FTA. A copy of the UPWP is on file with the Department and the MPO.

The MPO shall comply with all applicable provisions of 49 USC Section 5303, specifically sections (i) through (j), which requires development and implementation of additional transportation plans and identifies the planning process, a performance-based approach to plan development as well as requirements for public notification and involvement. A copy of each additional plan is on file with the Department and the MPO.

Additional requirements are highlighted in the attached Exhibit A, Program Requirements.

2. **Funding.**
Funding is determined annually by the FTA, the Department and the MPO, which has a 20% funding match requirement. The Department upon consultation with the MPO will select specific tasks from the UPWP to fund and identify the amount for each task. Prior to the start of funding period, the Department will mail to the MPO a Work Authorization that identifies the tasks to be performed, the funding for each task and the local match requirement.

Funding is provided by FTA, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number 20.505. State funds will not be earmarked or disbursed to fund the Tasks. The Department shall not be responsible for any other costs incurred by the MPO. The MPO shall take all actions necessary to fund its share of the Program.
3. **Method of Payment.**
With federal funds, the Department shall reimburse the MPO for 80% of the eligible expenses. Invoices shall be submitted quarterly, to the Department’s Transit and Rail Division by the 25th day of the quarter following the close of the invoice period. Invoices shall be certified by the MPO that they accurately reflect work completed, amount due and include the Work Authorization number, remaining work authorization balance, control and/or contract number. All expenses must be actual rather than estimated and must be listed on the invoices as charged. Only those expenses properly documented with sufficient documentation as determined and/or approved by the Department, indicating that expenses have been paid, will be reimbursed.

4. **Eligible Costs.**
Eligible Costs are those costs attributable to and allowed under the Program and the provisions of 2 CFR 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirement for Federal Awards. Costs incurred by the MPO prior to the effective date of this Agreement or subsequent to the termination date shall not be eligible for reimbursement as Program costs.

5. **State General Appropriation Funds Not Obligated.**
Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as obligating state general appropriation funds for payment of any debt or liability arising under this Agreement. The parties expressly acknowledge that all payments made under this Agreement are from federal funds appropriated for these purposes.

6. **Term.**
This Agreement becomes effective upon the signature of all parties. The effective date is the date the last party signed the Agreement on the signature page below. All costs incurred under this agreement from July 1, 2015 to September 30, 2018 may be reimbursed. This Agreement shall expire September 30, 2018.

7. **Termination for Cause.**
The Department has the option to terminate this Agreement if the MPO fails to comply with any provision. A written notice of termination shall be given at least thirty (30) days prior to the intended date of termination and shall identify all of the MPO breaches on which the termination is based.

The Department may provide the MPO a reasonable opportunity to correct the breach. If within ten (10) days after receipt of a written notice of termination, the MPO has not corrected the breach or, in the case of a breach which cannot be corrected in ten (10) days, the MPO has not begun and proceeded in good faith to correct the breach, the Department may declare the MPO in default and terminate the Agreement. The Department shall retain any and all other remedies available to it under the law.

8. **Appropriations.**
The terms of this Agreement are contingent upon sufficient appropriations and authorizations being made by the Congress of the United States. If sufficient appropriations and authorizations are not made, this Agreement shall terminate upon written notice from the Department to the MPO. The Department’s decision as to whether sufficient appropriations are available shall be accepted by the MPO and shall be final.

9. **Termination Management, Allowable Costs.**
In the event of termination, neither party may nullify obligations already incurred for performance or failure to perform. The MPO shall be paid for all the allowable costs incurred prior to the date of termination, subject to audit verification by the Department or its duly authorized representative.

The MPO shall not be paid for any costs incurred that are inconsistent with, or contrary to, the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

10. **Breach and Dispute Resolution.**
Disputes which cannot be resolved informally by the parties shall be decided in writing by a representative of the Department’s Transit and Rail Division. The MPO has ten (10) days from receipt of the decision to file a written appeal with the Transit and Rail Division. Upon appeal, the MPO will be afforded an opportunity to be heard and to offer evidence in support of its position. The decision of the Transit and Rail Division on appeal shall be binding.
11. New Mexico Tort Claims Act.
As between the Department and the MPO, neither party shall be responsible for liability incurred as a result of the other party’s acts or omissions in connection with this agreement. Any liability incurred in connection with this Agreement is subject to the immunities and limitations of the New Mexico Tort Claims Act, Section 41-4-1, et seq., NMSA 1978. This paragraph is intended only to define the liabilities between the parties and it is not intended to modify, in any way, the parties’ liabilities as governed by the common law of the New Mexico Tort Claims Act.

12. Retention of Records.
The MPO shall maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records, reports and other evidence pertaining to costs incurred in the Program for three (3) years after the date of termination or expiration of this Agreement.

The MPO shall grant authorized representatives of the Department, the state and the federal government access to books, documents, papers, reports, and records of the MPO or its subcontractors, which are directly pertinent to this Agreement, for the purpose of making audits, examination excerpts, and transcriptions. The MPO agrees to permit any of the foregoing parties to reproduce by any means whatsoever or to copy excerpts and transcriptions as reasonably needed. The MPO shall reimburse the Department for any expenditure for which it received payment or reimbursement, as applicable, which is disallowed by an audit exception by the Department, the state or federal government

The MPO shall ensure that an annual audit of the Program based on the MPO’s fiscal year shall be conducted pursuant to 2 CFR 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirement for Federal Awards. The MPO, prior to initiation of the audit, shall seek written approval from the Department of the auditing firm. The MPO agrees to provide the Department with a copy of the audit report concerning any portion of the Agreement period as soon as it is released, but in no case later than six months following the close of the local fiscal year. Audit costs are an eligible administrative expense. Should the MPO fail to produce the annual audit, the Department may, at its option, commission such an audit payable out of Program funds.

15. Audit Exceptions.
If federal or state audit exceptions are made, the MPO shall reimburse all costs incurred by the State and the Department associated with defending against the exceptions, which includes but is not limited to costs of performing a new audit or a follow-up audit, court costs, attorneys’ fees, travel costs, penalty assessments.

Immediately upon notification from the Department, the MPO shall reimburse the amount of the audit exception and any other related costs directly to the Department. In the notification, the Department may inform the MPO of the Department’s election to withhold an amount equal to the payment owed under this Section from any future distribution owed to MPO under this Agreement.

16. Third Party Beneficiaries.
It is not intended by any of the provisions of any part of this Agreement to create in the public or any member thereof a third party beneficiary or to authorize anyone not a party to the Agreement to maintain a suit(s) for wrongful death(s), bodily and/or personal injury(ies) to person(s), damage(s) to property(ies), and/or any other claim(s) whatsoever pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.

17. Contracting and Assignment.
The MPO shall not contract any portion of this Agreement without prior written approval of the Department. No such contracting shall relieve the MPO from its obligations and liabilities under this Agreement, nor shall any subcontracting obligate payment from the Department.

Except to a successor in kind, the MPO shall not assign or transfer any interest in this Agreement or assign any claim for money due or to become due under this Agreement without the prior written approval of the Department.

Should subcontract(s) or an assignment be authorized by the Department, the subcontractor(s) and assignor(s) shall be subject to all provisions of this Agreement. It shall be the MPO’s responsibility to duly inform the
subcontractor(s) and assignor(s) by means of a contract or other legally binding document stipulating responsibility to this Agreement.

Subcontractors and Assignors of FTA funds must meet applicable Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program requirements when funds are used in whole or in part to finance procurements for applicable products and services. To that end, Subcontractors with contracting opportunities must sign and submit a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Race-Neutral Implementation Agreement for Federal Transit Administration Subgrantee, which is attached as Certification 1.

18. No Federal Government Obligation to Third Parties.

A. The Department and MPO acknowledge and agree that, notwithstanding any concurrence by the federal government in or approval of the solicitation or award of the underlying contract, absent the express written consent by the federal government, the federal government is not a party to this contract and shall not be subject to any obligations or liabilities to the Department, MPO, or any other party (whether or not a party to that contract) pertaining to any matter resulting from the underlying contract.

B. The MPO agrees to include the above clause in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by FTA. It further agrees that the clause shall not be modified, except to identify the subcontractor who will be subject to its provisions.


The MPO shall comply with all federal, state and local laws and ordinances applicable to the work called for under this Agreement.

A. Nondiscrimination - In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, Section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, 42 U.S.C. § 6102, Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12132, and Federal transit law at 49 U.S.C. § 5332, the MPO shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, or disability. The MPO shall comply with applicable Federal implementing regulations and such other implementing requirements FTA may issue.

B. Equal Employment Opportunity - The following equal employment opportunity requirements apply to this Agreement:

1. Race, Color, Creed, National Origin, Sex - In accordance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, and Federal transit laws at 49 U.S.C. § 5332, the MPO agrees to comply with all applicable equal employment opportunity requirements of U.S. Department of Labor (U.S. DOL) regulations, "Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Equal Employment Opportunity, Department of Labor," 41 C.F.R. Parts 60 et seq., (which implement Executive Order No. 11246, "Equal Employment Opportunity," as amended by Executive Order No. 11375, "Amending Executive Order 11246 Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity," 42 U.S.C. § 2000e note), and with any applicable federal statutes, executive orders, regulations, and federal policies that may in the future affect construction activities undertaken in the course of the project. The MPO agrees to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or placement advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. In addition, the awarded contractor shall comply with any implementing requirements FTA may issue.

2. Age - In accordance with Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, 29 U.S.C. §§ 623 and Federal transit law at 49 U.S.C. § 5332, the MPO agrees to refrain from discrimination against present and prospective employees for reason of age. In addition, the MPO shall comply with any implementing requirements FTA may issue.
3. Disabilities - In accordance with Section 102 of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12112, the MPO agrees that it will comply with the requirements of U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, "Regulations to Implement the Equal Employment Provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act," 29 C.F.R. Part 1630, pertaining to employment of persons with disabilities. In addition, the awarded contractor shall comply with any implementing requirements FTA may issue.

C. The MPO shall include these requirements in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by FTA, modified only if necessary to identify the affected parties.

D. For assistance with a contract clause incorporating the requirements of the new DBE rule in 49 CFR Part 26, contact FTA HelpLine at www.ftahelpline.com.

E. The MPO also agrees to include these requirements in each contract financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by FTA, modified only if necessary to identify the affected parties.


A. This Agreement is subject to the requirements of 49 CFR Part 26, Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Department of Transportation Financial Assistance Programs. The Department’s proposed overall goal for FTA participation for the 2016 fiscal year is 1.22%, through race-neutral means.

B. The MPO shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the performance of the Agreement. The MPO shall carry out applicable requirements of 49 CFR Part 26 in the administration of the Program. Failure by the MPO to carry out these requirements is a material breach of the Agreement, which may result in the termination or other such remedy as the Department deems appropriate. Each contract the MPO signs with a contractor must include the assurance in this paragraph (see 49 CFR 26.13(b)).

C. The MPO agrees to ensure that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises as defined in 49 CFR Part 26 have the maximum opportunity to participate in the performance of Contracts and subcontracts financed in whole or in part with Federal funds. In this regard, all recipients or contractors shall take all necessary and reasonable steps in accordance with 49 CFR Part 26 to ensure that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises have the maximum opportunity to compete for and perform contracts. Recipients and their contractors shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the award and performance of U.S. DOT assisted contracts. The MPO will be required to report its DBE participation obtained through race-neutral means throughout the period of performance.

D. The MPO is required to pay its contractors performing work related to this contract for satisfactory performance of that work no later than 30 days after the awarded contractor’s receipt of payment for that work from the Department.

E. The MPO must promptly notify the Department, whenever a DBE contractor is terminated or fails to complete its work, and must make good faith efforts to engage another DBE contractor to perform at least the same amount of work. The MPO may not terminate any DBE subcontractor and perform that work through its own forces or those of an affiliate without prior written consent of the Department.

A MPO of FTA funds must meet applicable DBE requirements when funds are used in whole or in part to finance procurements of and contracts for applicable products and services. A MPO with contracting opportunities must sign and submit a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Race-Neutral Implementation Agreement for Federal Transit Administration Subgrantees, which is attached as Certification 1.

21. ADA Access.
The MPO shall comply with 49 U.S.C. § 5301(d), which states the Federal policy that elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities have the same right as other individuals to use public transportation services and
facilities, and that special efforts shall be made in planning and designing those services and facilities to implement transportation accessibility rights for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. The MPO also agrees to comply with all applicable provisions of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, with 29 U.S.C. § 794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability; with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq., which requires that accessible facilities and services be made available to individuals with disabilities; and with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4151 et seq., which requires that buildings and public accommodations be accessible to individuals with disabilities.

22. Program Fraud and False or Fraudulent Statements or Related Acts.

A. The MPO acknowledges that the provisions of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, 31 U.S.C. §3801 et seq. and U.S. DOT regulations, "Program Fraud Civil Remedies," 49 C.F.R. Part 31, apply to its actions pertaining to this program. The MPO certifies or affirms the truthfulness and accuracy of any statement it makes pertaining to the resultant contract or FTA assisted program for which this work is being performed. The MPO further acknowledges that if it makes, or causes to be made, a false, fictitious or fraudulent claim, statement, submission or certification, the federal government reserves the right to impose the penalties of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 on MPO to the extent the federal government deems appropriate.

B. The MPO also acknowledges that if it makes, or causes to be made, a false, fictitious or fraudulent claim, statement, submission or certification to the federal government under a contract connected with a program that is financed in whole or in part with federal assistance originally awarded by FTA under the authority of 49 U.S.C. §5307, the federal government reserves the right to impose the penalties of 18 U.S.C. §1001 and 49 U.S.C. §5307(n)(1) on the MPO, to the extent the federal government deems appropriate.

C. The MPO certifies to abide by these clauses and include the clauses in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with Federal Transit Administration funds. MPO further agrees that these clauses shall not be modified, except to identify the subcontractor subject to its provisions.

D. All claims for compensation reimbursement and payment of any amounts due pursuant to this Agreement are governed by the Fraud Against Taxpayers Act, §§ 44-9-1 through 44-9-14 NMSA 1978.

23. Lobbying.
An MPO receiving $100,000 or more of 49 U.S.C. §5303 funds shall file the Lobbying Certification required by 49 C.F.R. Part 20, “New Restrictions on Lobbying.” The Lobbying Certification is attached as Certification 2. The MPO must certify that it has not used federal appropriated funds to pay any person or organization for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a member of Congress in connection with obtaining any federal contract, grant or any other award covered by 31 U.S.C. §1352.

If the MPO hires a contractor, the contractor must provide the Lobbying Certification to the MPO. Each tier below the contractor shall also provide a Lobbying Certification. Such disclosures are forwarded from tier to tier up to the MPO.

24. Officials Not to Benefit.
Neither any member of the New Mexico Legislature nor any member of or delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this Agreement or to any benefit that may arise therefrom. The provisions of this clause shall be extended to all public employees, officers, or tribal council members.

The MPO agrees to comply with mandatory standards and policies relating to energy efficiency, which are contained in the state energy conservation plan issued in compliance with the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

A. The MPO agrees to comply with all applicable standards, orders or regulations issued pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§1251 et seq., and the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq. The MPO agrees to report each violation to the Department and understands and agrees that the Department will, in turn, report each violation as required to assure notification to FTA and the appropriate United States Environmental Protection Agency Regional Office.

B. The MPO agrees to include these requirements in each subcontract exceeding $100,000.00 and financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by FTA.

27. Debarment and Suspension.

Executive Order 12549, as implemented by 49 C.F.R. Part 29, prohibits the MPO from contracting for goods and services from organizations that have been suspended or debarred from receiving federally-assisted contracts. MPO shall include the certification and instruction language contained at 29 C.F.R. Part 29, Appendix B, in all Invitations for Bids and Requests for Proposals (for inclusion by contractors in their bids or proposals) for all contracts expected to equal or exceed $25,000.00, regardless of the type of contract to be awarded.

The MPO is required to verify that none of the MPO’s principals, as defined at 49 C.F.R. Part 29.995, or affiliates, as defined at 49 C.F.R. Part 29.905, are excluded or disqualified as defined at 49 C.F.R. Parts 29.940 and 29.945. By signing and submitting this Agreement, the MPO certifies as follows:

The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact relied upon by the Department. If it is later determined that the bidder/MPO or proposer/MPO knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to remedies available to the Department, the federal government may pursue available remedies, including but not limited to suspension and/or debarment. The bidder/MPO or proposer/MPO agrees to comply with the requirements of 49 C.F.R. Part 29, Subpart C while this offer is valid and throughout the period of any contract that may arise from this offer. The bidder/MPO or proposer/MPO further agrees to include a provision requiring such compliance in its lower tier covered transactions.

28. Central Contractor Registration Requirements.

Prior to payment of invoices, MPO must register and maintain current registration in the Central Contractor Registration website, http://www.sam.gov. Registration requires having a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Number (DUNS), see http://www.dnb.com. The Department will not provide vehicles, or make payments, until the MPO demonstrates that it is registered with the System for Award Management (SAM) website.

29. Federal Grant Reporting Requirements.

Under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act, the Department is required to report on projects or activities, which are awarded federal grants of $25,000 or more. This information will be made available to the public on www.USAspending.gov.

The type of information the Department is required to report includes:

- Name of MPO receiving the award
- Amount of Award
- Funding Agency
- NAICS code for contracts or the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance program number for grants
- Program source
- Award title descriptive of the purpose of the funding action
- Location of the MPO, which includes the Congressional District
- Place of performance of the program or activity, which includes the Congressional District
- Unique identifier—DUNS—of the MPO and its parent organization, if one exists
- Total compensation and names of the top five executives of the MPO. This information is required, if the MPO in the preceding year received eighty (80) percent or more of its annual gross revenues in federal
awards, which exceeds $25 million annually, and the public has no access to this information under the Securities Exchange Act or the Internal Revenue Code.

30. Severability.
In the event that any portion of this Agreement is determined to be void, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

31. Scope of Agreement.
This Agreement incorporates all of the agreements, covenants, and understandings between the parties concerning the subject matter. All such covenants, agreements, and understandings have been merged into this written Agreement. No prior agreements or understandings, verbal or otherwise, of the parties or their agents shall become valid or enforceable unless embodied in this Agreement.

32. Applicable Law and Venue; Federal Changes.
The MPO shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules, warranties, assurances, and regulations applicable to the performance of this Agreement. This includes all applicable FTA regulations, policies, procedures and directives, including without limitation those listed directly or by reference in the current Master Agreement by FTA. The MPO shall make as part of this Agreement between the Department and the MPO the assurances and warranties which were signed as part of the grant award. Venue shall be proper only in a New Mexico court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with NMSA 1978, Section 38-3-1(G).

33. Incorporation of FTA Terms.
Provisions of this Agreement include, in part, certain Standard Terms and Conditions required by the U.S. DOT. All contractual provisions required by the U.S. DOT, as set forth in FTA Circulars 4220.1F, and 9040.1F, are incorporated by reference. Anything to the contrary herein notwithstanding, all FTA mandated terms shall be deemed to control in the event of a conflict with other provisions contained in this Agreement. The MPO shall not perform any act, fail to perform any act, or refuse to comply with any Department request, which would cause the Department to be in violation of FTA terms and conditions, as referenced in the current Federal Transit Administration Master Agreement shall prevail and be the instrument governing the receipt of Federal assistance from the Federal Transit Administration. The Master Agreement can be viewed on the web at http://www.fta.dot.gov/grants/15072.html.

34. Amendment.
The terms of this Agreement may be altered, modified or amended by an instrument in writing executed by the parties. Section 1. Program, details how such changes are to be approved and documented.
In witness whereof, each party is signing this Agreement on the date stated below that party’s signature.

**New Mexico Department of Transportation**

Loren D. Hatch, Deputy Secretary

**Las Curces Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Signature

Name/Title (please print)

Date

Date

Approved as to Form and Legal Sufficiency by the Department’s Office of General Counsel.

Cynthia A. Christ, Assistant General Counsel

Date
EXHIBIT A
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the requirements identified in Section 1, above, and 49 USC Section 5303 and 2 CFR 200, the MPO shall:

1. Act in the capacity as the designated lead agency for each Task identified in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and designate a point of contact.

2. Assure the development of the annual UPWP and each Task.

3. Submit quarterly reports to the Department describing progress on each of the Tasks. Quarterly performance of each Task will be reported relative to the annual requirements as specified in each individual Task.

3. Abide by the annual resolution passed by the MPO Policy Committee approving the annual UPWP in support of each transit planning Task for the Metropolitan Planning Area.

4. Coordinate activities and the planning processes, as appropriate, with local governments and their bureaus overseeing land use, environmental, economic and transportation planning; RTDs, RTPOs and other MPOs; and the Department’s Transit and Rail Division and District Offices.

5. Assure all data collected under this MOA is made available to the Department upon request by the Department.

6. Comply with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act, NMSA 1978, §10-15-1, et. seq. Notification to the Department’s Transit and Rail Division shall be transmitted by E-Mail. Provide for distribution of regular MPO meeting agendas and packets to member entities and to the designated Department Transit and Rail Division liaison not later than seven days prior to each meeting.

7. Develop and implement a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the Department, evaluate and report to the Department on the effectiveness of the PIP in contributing to transportation investment and policy decisions on an annual basis and refine as needed.

8. Designate a point of contact, develop and implement a plan and policies to assure Title VI compliance, maintain required documentation.

9. Develop and assure consistency between the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), the UPWP and annual Performance and Expenditure (P&E) Reports.

10. The MPO shall take action on all written requests to the MPO for all Department changes affecting the TIP.

11. Assure that local entities submit detailed and accurate Project Information Forms, updated as needed to maintain consistency with the current TIP and Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) to the Department to facilitate the timely preparation and execution of Local Government Agreements.
AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 Resolution No. 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 15-07

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2016-2021 Surface Transportation Improvement Program
2016-2021 Airport Transportation Improvement Program

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

At their May meeting, the Policy Committee held some discussion of discontinuing the Airport TIP as this is not a required work product but has been done solely at the request of previous Policy Committees.
The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federal and/or state-funded transportation related projects within the MPO’s Urbanized Area for the specified fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program is a bi-annual requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT); and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s policy is to prepare its Transportation Improvement Program on a biennial basis; and

WHEREAS, the Fiscal Year 2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program has been prepared as a cooperative planning effort, working with NMDOT, local governments, members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory, Technical Advisory and Policy Committees of the MPO, the public, and staff; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program has been advertised for public comment and review; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended adoption of the FY 2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program at their May 19, 2015 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended adoption of the FY 2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program at their June 4, 2015 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 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Program, 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 this 10th day of June, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________  
Chair

Motion By:  
Second By:  

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

ATTEST:  

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________  
Recording Secretary  

__________________________  
City Attorney
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: 1100620</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 70</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: 1100620</td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1</td>
<td>Length: 18 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: I00010</td>
<td>Proj I-10 Mill and Inlay</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $9,000,000</td>
<td>Est. Letting: 1/21/2016</td>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending? □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: 146</td>
<td>To: 164.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Mill and Inlay

**Category:** Hwy & Brg Pres

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

**Work Zone:** Routine

**Remarks:** New TIP Funding Sources

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$1,994,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,994,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>$8,287,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,287,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-L</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-S (old)</td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, May 28, 2015
**Reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Road**

**Category:** Hwy & Brg Pres

**Project Desc.:** Preliminary Engineering funds for reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Rd.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLHP-Pub Lands Hwy Disc</td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Information

**MVMPO - Rec Num:** 75  
**Fed ID:** LC00110  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**County:** Dona Ana  
**Municipality:** Unincorporated Dona Ana Co  
**Lead Agency:** County of Dona Ana  
**Est. Letting:**  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $517,265  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $517,265  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Category:** Safety  
**Remarks:** Added to the TIP; New TIP Funding Sources; Admin Adjust: 10-25-12; Admin Adjust 08-21-13; has $42,750 obligated in FFY 2013; admin mod 03-30-15

### Project Description

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

### Project Phases

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

### Work Zone

- Routine

### TIP Informational Years

- TIP Amendment Pending?

### Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$34,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (HSIP)</td>
<td>$3,242</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (HSIP)</td>
<td>$436,352</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$436,352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$471,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$474,519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</td>
<td>TIP Informational Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND SOURCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Yr. TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>2021</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$793,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$793,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>$4,656,480</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,656,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00140</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 99</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LC00140</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: US0070</td>
<td>Proj</td>
<td>US 70 Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: Intersection with 17th Street</td>
<td>To: Intersection with 17th Street</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 0.2 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category:**

**Project Desc.:** New traffic signal and intersection improvements

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

**Work Zone:** Signif.

**Remarks:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$116,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, May 28, 2015
**Project Description:**
CP-91, Valley Drive reconstruction from Ave de Mesilla to Picacho including intersections. Admin mod (02-21-14) added a section of NM 28 to the project.

**Remarks:**
Administrative Modification adding a secondary route to the project on 02/21/2014, admin mod done 04/13/15

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$1,601,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,601,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>$6,408,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,408,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Sm Urb</td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00230</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 103</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LC00230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.: Signal Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,480</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$509,520</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$509,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: Admin Mod done on 12-17-14, admin mod done 04-03-15

Work Zone: Exempt

Thursday, May 28, 2015
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00240</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 102</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: Unincorporated Dona Ana Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LC00240</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 8 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $4,362,000</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category:** Safety

**Project Desc.:** Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Replacement, Drainage Structure Extensions, CWB Replacement

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$436,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,610,800</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,610,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$4,012,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,362,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

□ TIP Amendment Pending? 

**Work Zone:** Signif.
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: LC00250  MVMPO - Rec Num: 106  NMDOT Dist.: 1  County: Dona Ana  Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID: LC00250  Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1

RT: I00025  Proj: University Interchange  Fr: I-25 MP 1  To: I-25 MP 2

Category: Hwy & Brg Pres

Project Desc.: Bridge Replacement, Ramp modifications/reconstruction, roadway reconstruction, and extension of multi-use path


Remarks: PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,038,400</td>
<td>$1,456,000</td>
<td>$3,494,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,116,800</td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td>$8,228,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$854,400</td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td>$3,844,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-S (old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td>$8,544,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Amendment Pending? □

Work Zone: Signif.

Thursday, May 28, 2015
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: TL00010</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 18</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: TL00010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td>Proj RoadRUNNER Transit Operations</td>
<td>Fr: To:</td>
<td>Project Desc.: Operating Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending? □</td>
<td>Work Zone: Exempt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Remarks:** Admin mod 5/28/14.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>$4,802,580</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Oper)</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1,200,645</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$4,802,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
<td>$9,605,160</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
<td>$2,401,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Information

**CN:** TL00011  
**Fed ID:** TL00011  
**MVMPO - Rec Num:** 20  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**County:** Dona Ana  
**Municipality:** City of Las Cruces  
**Lead Agency:** City of Las Cruces  
**Est. Letting:**  
**Proj:** RoadRUNNER Transit  
**Fr:**  
**To:**  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Category:** Transit  
**Remarks:** PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

### Programmed Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$884,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus/Facil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,316,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Funds for purchasing busses and transit capital purchases

**TIP Informational Years**

- Exempt

**TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐
## Project Information

**CN:** TL00013  
**Rec Num:** 21  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**County:**  
**Municipality:**  
**Fed ID:** TL00013  
**Lead Agency:** City of Las Cruces  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $0  
**Est. Letting:**  

### Project Details

**Category:** Transit  
**Project Desc.:** Support Equipment and Rolling Stock  

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$508,084</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Cap)</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,879,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Oper)</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$3,387,244</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$3,387,244</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$508,084</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
<td>$127,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Cap)</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$719,790</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,879,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Oper)</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$3,387,244</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$3,387,244</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
<td>$846,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: TL00014</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 22</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: TL00014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RT:**
- Proj: RoadRUNNER Transit Maintenance and Operations Center Design
- Fr: To: 

**Category:** Transit

**Project Desc.:** Maintenance and Operations Center

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

**Remarks:**
- PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category
- TIP Informational Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus/Facil)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, May 28, 2015**
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: LCA0017  MVMPO - Rec Num: 82  NMDOT Dist.: 1  County:  Municipality:  
Fed ID: LCA0027  Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport  
Est. Letting: Proj  Maintenance Grant  
Fr: To:  
Est. Proj. Cost: $0  
TIP Amendment Pending? ☐  

Category: Maintenance

Remarks:


Work Zone:

Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

TIP Informational Years

Friday, May 01, 2015

59
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**  

---

**CN:** LCA0026  
**MVMPO - Rec Num:** 81  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**County:**  
**Municipality:**  
**Fed ID:** LCA0026  
**Lead Agency:**  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $120,000

**RT:** Proj Apron Sealing  
**Fr:**  
**To:**  
**Category:** Maintenance

**Project Desc.:**

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

**Work Zone:**

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TIP Informational Years**

**TIP Amendment Pending?** □

---

*Friday, May 01, 2015*
**CN:** LCA0028  **MVMPO - Rec Num:** 83  **NMDOT Dist.:** 1  **County:**  
**Municipality:**  
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport  
**Est. Letting:**  
**Proj:** Seal Taxiway A  
**Fr:**  
**To:**  
**Category:** Maintenance

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $370,000  
**Fed ID:** LCA0028  
**Construction** □  
**Right-of-way** □  
**Prel. Engr.** □  
**Design** □  
**Environ. Document** □  
**Other** □  
**State Match**  
**Local Match**  
**FAA** $333,000  
**Totals** $370,000  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LCA0029</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 84</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LCA0029</td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj Airfield Electrical Improvements</td>
<td>Fr: To:</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.: Vault, PAPI 12-30 &amp; 8-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND SOURCE</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday, May 01, 2015
## Terminal Apron Rehabilitation - Design

**Project Desc.:**

- **Category:** Maintenance

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

**Remarks:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95</td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- 2016: $20,000
- 2017: $20,000
- 2018: $360,000
- 2019: $400,000
- 4 Yr. TOTALS: $400,000
- 2020: $400,000
- 2021: $400,000
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LCA0032</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 87</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LCA0032</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj Install Wildlife Perimeter Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.: Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</td>
<td>TIP Informational Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND SOURCE</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday, May 01, 2015
**CN:** LCA0033  **MVMPO - Rec Num:** 88  **NMDOT Dist.:** 1  **County:**  **Municipality:**  
**Fed ID:** LCA0033  **Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport  **Length:** 0 Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RT: Proj</th>
<th>Security Fence Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Fr:</th>
<th>To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Category:** Maintenance  
**Project Desc.:** Gates

**Remarks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND SOURCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

**TIP Informational Years**

Friday, May 01, 2015
CN: LCA0034  MVMPO - Rec Num: 89  NMDOT Dist.: 1  County:  Municipality:
Fed ID: LCA0034  Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport  Length: 0 Miles
RT: Proj  Terminal Apron Rehabilitation
Fr:  To:
Category: Reconstruction
Project Desc.: Construction Phase I

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years

- 2016: $67,500
- 2017: $67,500
- 2018: $1,215,000
- 2019: $1,350,000
- 2020: $0
- 2021: $0

Friday, May 01, 2015
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LCA0035</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 90</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LCA0035</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Runway 8-26 - Phase I</td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.: Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est. Letting:**
- **Est. Proj. Cost:** $550,000
- **TIP Amendment Pending:** □

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

- **State Match:**
  - 2016: 
  - 2017: 
  - 2018: $27,500
  - 2019: 
  - 4 Yr. TOTALS: $27,500
  - 2020: 
  - 2021: 

- **Local Match:**
  - 2016: 
  - 2017: 
  - 2018: $27,500
  - 2019: 
  - 4 Yr. TOTALS: $27,500
  - 2020: 
  - 2021: 

- **FAA:**
  - 2016: 
  - 2017: 
  - 2018: $495,000
  - 2019: 
  - 4 Yr. TOTALS: $495,000
  - 2020: 
  - 2021: 

- **Totals:**
  - 2016: 
  - 2017: 
  - 2018: $550,000
  - 2019: 
  - 4 Yr. TOTALS: $550,000
  - 2020: 
  - 2021: 

**TIP Informational Years**
- **2020:**
- **2021:**
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport

**Category:** Rehabilitation

**Project Desc.:** Design and Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $1,750,000

**Est. Letting:**

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

**TIP Informational Years**

- **2016:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000

- **2017:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000

- **2018:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000

- **2019:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000

- **2020:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000

- **2021:**
  - State Match: $87,500
  - Local Match: $87,500
  - FAA: $1,575,000
  - Totals: $1,750,000
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LCA0037</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 92</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LCA0037</td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj</td>
<td>Terminal Apron Rehabilitation - Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category:** Rehabilitation

**Project Desc.:** Construction

**Estimated Project Cost:** $1,750,000

**TIP Letting:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- **Work Zone:**
- **TIP Amendment Pending?:**

Friday, May 01, 2015
### Project Details

**MVMPO - Rec Num:** 93  
**Fed ID:** LCA0038  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**County:**  
**Municipality:**  
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Est. Letting:**  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $2,100,000  
**RT:** Project  
**Proj:** Airport Equipment Storage Facility  
**Fr:**  
**To:**  
**Category:** Storage  
**Remarks:** PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- 2016: $0  
- 2017: $0  
- 2018: $0  
- 2019: $0  
- 2020: $0  
- 2021: $0

- **Work Zone:**
- **Environ. Document:** □  
- **Prel. Engr.:** □  
- **Design:** □  
- **Right-of-way:** □  
- **Construction:** □  
- **Other:** □  

**Friday, May 01, 2015**
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LCA0039</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num: 94</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LCA0039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Runway 8-26 - Phase II</td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $3,024,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Construction

**Category:** Construction

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

**Work Zone:**

**Remarks:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,024,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num:</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.:</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCA0040</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fed ID:** LCA0040  
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport  
**Length:** 0 Miles  

**RT:** Proj Runway 8-26  
**Fr:** To:  
**Category:** Extension  
**Project Desc.:** Extension - EA

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

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

**Work Zone:**

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $500,000  
**Est. Letting:**

**TIP Amendment Pending?** □

Friday, May 01, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$237,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$237,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,275,000</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj</td>
<td>Construct West End Taxiway - Phase II</td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $500,000</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.:</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday, May 01, 2015
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Airport

**Est. Letting:**

1. **Proj:** Rehabilitate West End Apron
2. **Fr:** To:

**Category:** Rehabilitation

**Project Desc.:** Design and Construction

**Remarks:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$882,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Amendment Pending?** □

**Friday, May 01, 2015**
**Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>LCA0044</th>
<th>MVMPO - Rec Num:</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td>LCA0044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency:</td>
<td>Las Cruces Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length:</td>
<td>0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost:</td>
<td>$11,310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj</td>
<td>Runway 8-26 Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.:</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Phases:**
- Design
- Construction

**Remarks:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$565,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$565,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday, May 01, 2015
Resolution 15-07 Exhibit “B”

MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 450.334, the New Mexico Department of Transportation and the Mesilla Valley 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  

______________________________  ______________________

NMDOT  

______________________________  ______________________
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 10, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
6.3 Resolution 15-08: A Resolution Adopting the 2015-2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Transport 2040 Update)

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 15-08

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Final Draft of Transport 2040, Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update (under separate cover)
Transport 2040 Plans and Maps

DISCUSSION:
Mesilla Valley MPO Staff has been working on the Transport 2040 Update since the summer of 2013. This plan is the result of analyses of the existing transportation system, identification of regional priorities, and analyses of larger trends around the nation. This plan is also the result of an extensive public involvement process stretching back to 2013. The public comment period closed at 5 PM on May 18, 2015.

The Policy Committee may choose to amend the document to include or remove items that are part of the TAC recommendation.
The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the transportation planning agency for the City of Las Cruces, the Town of Mesilla, and the urbanized area for Doña Ana County; and

WHEREAS, the United States Code 23 §450.322, requires that all MPO’s throughout the country adopt a minimum 20-year Metropolitan Transportation Plan for their respective jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley MPO previously adopted a long range transportation plan in 2010 and has conducted extensive review and involved the public and other governmental agencies to prepare this 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan represents a continuous transportation planning effort through identified goals, objectives and policies for all modes of transportation and being financially constrained within the 25-year planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Staff, as part of its public involvement process, held public input hearings in three phases from November 2013 to May 2015 in order to solicit input about the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan was recommended for approval by the Technical Advisory Committee at their meeting of June 4, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan was recommended for approval by the Bicycle Facilities Advisory Committee at their meeting of May 19, 2015.
NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I) THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby adopts the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as Transport 2040 as shown in Exhibit “A” attached to this Resolution.

(II) THAT the Mesilla Valley MPO Staff shall maintain a file of the actual public comments received for the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan in the offices of the MPO.

(III) THAT the MPO Staff and the Committees of the MPO are hereby directed to utilize existing documents and information for the continuous implementation of transportation plans and projects, including the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and all ongoing or new plans and projects identified within the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

(IV) THAT the MPO Staff is hereby authorized to administratively update the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan for spelling and grammatical errors, mapping errors or updates, the removal of identified projects as they are implemented and/or completed, or to reflect the implementation of projects on various data, graphics, maps, and charts contained within the Plan.
THAT the MPO Staff is hereby authorized to do all deeds necessary in the accomplishment of the hereinabove.

DONE and APPROVED this 10th day of June, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: ____________________________
Second By: ___________________________

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

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
Recording Secretary

__________________________
City Attorney
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 10, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 NMDOT Long Range Plan Update

DISCUSSION:
The New Mexico Department of Transportation is in the process of updating their long range plan, called the New Mexico Transportation Plan.

NMDOT Staff will present on the progress of this plan.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 10, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 NMDOT Projects Update

ACTION REQUESTED:
Update from NMDOT regarding current projects

DISCUSSION:
1100620 – I-10 Mill and Inlay Project, MP 146-164.3
1100830 – I-10 Bridge Replacement Project (Union)
LC00100 – I-25 Bridge Replacement Project (Missouri)
LC00150 – I-10 Pavement Preservation Project, MP 133-146
LC00160 – NM 188 (Valley Drive) Reconstruction Project
LC00210 – Goathill Road RR Crossing Project
LC00220 – NM 226 RR Crossing Project
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 10, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.3 Committee Training

DISCUSSION:
Mesilla Valley MPO Staff will provide a brief training.