



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the Amended Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **June 12, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Dona Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico**. Meeting packets are available on the [Las Cruces MPO website](http://lcmpoweb.las-cruces.org).

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ Chair
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____ Chair
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ Chair
4. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ Chair
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 5.1. *May 8, 2013 _____ Chair
6. **OLD BUSINESS** _____
 - 6.1. Statewide MPO summit _____ MPO Staff
7. **ACTION ITEM** _____
 - 7.1 Amendment to the 2012 - 2015 Transportation Improvement Program _____ NMDOT Staff
8. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 8.1. Transportation Alternatives Program _____ NMDOT Staff
 - 8.2. NMDOT updates _____ NMDOT Staff
 - 8.3. Advisory Committee Updates _____ MPO Staff
9. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ Chair
10. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ Chair
11. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ Chair

Published June 2, 2013

1 **LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **POLICY COMMITTEE (PC) MEETING**

3
4 Following are the minutes from the MPO Policy Committee (PC) meeting held on
5 Wednesday, May 8, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. at Dona Ana County Commission Chambers,
6 Las Cruces, New Mexico.

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
9 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
10 Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
11 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
12 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
13 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
14 Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
15 Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mayor Pro Tem Sharon Thomas (CLC)

18
19 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (Las Cruces MPO)
20 Andrew Wray (Las Cruces MPO)
21 Ezekiel Guza (Las Cruces MPO)

22
23 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Harold Love (NMDOT) Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
24 George Pearson (MPO BPAC)
25 Griselda Velez (Zia Engineering)
26 Francisco X. Urueta (Zia Engineering)
27 Bob Pofahl (CBI Holdings/Park Ridge)
28 Karen Pofahl (CBI Holdings/Park Ridge)

29
30 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

31
32 Meeting was called to order at 5:04.

33
34 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** – No conflict of interest

35
36 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comment

37
38 **4. CONSENT AGENDA** – Those items on the consent agenda and those indicated by an
39 asterisk (*) will be voted on by one motion with the acceptance of the agenda. Any
40 Policy Committee member may remove an item from the consent agenda for
41 discussion by the Committee

42
43 **5. *APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –

44
45 **5.1 *December 12, 2012**

46 **5.2 *January 9, 2013**

1 **5.3*February 22, 2013**

2
3 Tom Murphy asked that the February 22nd and December 12th sets of minutes be
4 removed from the consent agenda and put on the next meeting agenda.

5
6 Commissioner Hancock moved to remove the two sets of minutes from the agenda and
7 approve January 9, 2013.

8 Trustee Bernal seconded the motion.

9 ALL IN FAVOR.

10
11 Roll call to establish quorum.

12
13 Murphy: Mayor Barraza

14
15 Barraza: Here

16
17 Murphy: Trustee Flores

18
19 Flores: Here

20
21 Murphy: Trustee Bernal

22
23 Bernal: Here

24
25 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez

26
27 Benavidez: Here

28
29 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock

30
31 Hancock: Here

32
33 Murphy: Councillor Sorg

34
35 Sorg: Here

36
37 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett

38
39 Garrett: Here

40
41 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza

42
43 Pedroza: Here

6. OLD BUSINESS

6.1 Statewide MPO summit

Murphy: Madame Chair, members of the Committee, we're keeping this on our agendas to give you updates as we have and I know that since the last meeting we got a couple of Policy Committee rosters to the subcommittee established last meeting. Also I had a conference call with DOT and other MPOs this morning. DOT management is still tossing around various ideas for how the summit would take shape. They're talking about combining it with an RPO summit as well and have the RPOs meet with the MPOs. They want to align it with one of the regular MPO quarterly or one of the RPO quarterly meetings. They're talking March where they're usually in Albuquerque. I'm also trying to keep alive having it sooner. There's a regular MPO quarterly meeting in Santa Fe in September which, I think, is more suitable to the timing that this Board has expressed.

Pedroza: I also understand that we had a meeting about getting in touch with the other members of the MPOs but I was not there. Is anybody here who was there?

Sorg: Yeah, Madam Chair, I was there. It was very brief. We didn't have a whole lot of time but we noticed on the list of MPOs and RPOs and other organizations there aren't any committee members or policy members on there. It's all staff and so we were questioning whether or not we should contact each one of the staff in, like, Farmington MPO, FMPO, and so forth to get their list of committee members and that's all we did.

Pedroza: Tom, is that something that staff was going to do, compile a list of the Policy Committee?

Murphy: I had sent out, the day after the last meeting, a request to the other MPO officers for the lists of the Policy Committee members. I was pretty certain that Farmington and Albuquerque had responded back with their Policy lists and I had forwarded them on to the subcommittee. That does not appear to be the list that I had forwarded on.

Sorg: Yeah.

Pedroza: Do you still have it?

Murphy: Yes, I will double check my email records tomorrow morning.

Pedroza: All right.

Sorg: Okay.

1
2 Pedroza: And if you could forward it to Councillor Sorg and to myself again we can
3 get back together again and contact the other people.
4

5 Murphy: Okay.
6

7 Pedroza: All right. Thank you.
8

9 Sorg: Sharon Thomas, too.
10

11 Pedroza: Yes. Is that the only information that we have on the coming MPO statewide
12 summit?
13

14 Murphy: That is all the information I have.
15

16 Pedroza: Does anybody else on the Policy Committee have any information about
17 that? No? Okay. We don't have to make any kind of decision on this. All
18 right. For Information only
19

20 **7. ACTION ITEMS**

21

22 **7.1 Resolution 13-05: A Resolution Adopting an Adjusted Boundary for the Las** 23 **Cruces Urbanized Area** 24

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

30 Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

- 31 • Adding Onate High School and other land abutting US 70 from Sonoma Ranch to
32 Porter
- 33 • Using proposed Mesa Grande alignment to proposed Lohman extension to
34 square off UZA boundary south of US 70
- 35 • Using Desert Wind/ Arroyo Rd. from I25 to Sonoma Ranch extension to square
36 off boundary north of US 70.
- 37 • Include the Las Cruces International Airport and the West Mesa Industrial Park.
- 38 • Include Red Hawk Golf Club and NMSU Golf Course Clubhouse.
39

40 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.
41

42 Sorg: Madam Chair?
43

1 Pedroza: Yes, Councillor Sorg.
2
3 Sorg: Thank you. Is this Exhibit A?
4
5 Murphy: Yes, it is.
6
7 Sorg: I was wondering if you had a description of where these lines are, a literal
8 description in some kind of a document.
9
10 Murphy: We do not have a literal description of the boundaries. They exist as a GIS
11 shape file.
12
13 Sorg: I see. Does it really matter whether we get them precisely down to the, you
14 know, right where they are or is this kind of a general map, boundary?
15
16 Murphy: It's a general map. The request from Federal Highways and New Mexico
17 Department of Transportation was to provide them with a shape file.
18
19 Sorg: That's all?
20
21 Murphy: Yes.
22
23 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. That's all, Madam Chair.
24
25 Pedroza: Thank you. And, Tom, are you going to be able to put this on some sort of a
26 screen so that at some point the rest of the people present can also see
27 what changes have been made?
28
29 Murphy: I did not bring the picture file.
30
31 Pedroza: Okay, but maybe you can send it around. I'm sure you know who's here.
32
33 Murphy: Yes.
34
35 Pedroza: Then if anybody's interested you can send it around.
36
37 Murphy: We can probably manage to put in onto our... Well, it is actually, in fact, on
38 our web site as part of the Committee packet.
39
40 Pedroza: The new one?
41
42 Murphy: Yes.
43
44 Pedroza: Okay. Fine.
45
46 Sorg: Madam Chair?

1
2 Pedroza: Yes.
3
4 Sorg: Has there been a motion to approve this as a Resolution?
5
6 Pedroza: No, I don't believe we have that.
7
8 Sorg: I'll do so.
9
10 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you. It has been moved. Is there a second?
11
12 Barraza: Second.
13
14 Pedroza: Okay, moved by Councillor Sorg and seconded by Mayor Barraza, the
15 action item 7.2, which is Resolution 13-05, be approved.
16
17 Garrett: Madam Chair?
18
19 Pedroza: Yes, Commissioner Garrett.
20
21 Garrett: Just two areas I have a question about because in the earlier presentations
22 I actually hadn't seen these because they were not printed in color. As
23 you're going south there's this long, looks like a flag at the bottom, probably
24 goes along Main Street; and then there's a little area that's included then it
25 zips back up. What's going on there?
26
27 Murphy: That flag, as well as the flag that is to the east of the boundary that goes up
28 70 and takes in the Town of Organ, those are established by the Census
29 Bureau. I didn't go over this specifically, but the areas of 500 people per
30 square mile within the general area. They're allowed to jump it by
31 transportation corridors up to a mile-and-a-half and the Census Bureau
32 chose that these two areas would be included. We did not include the areas
33 between those within the smoothing. Staff was not real confident that those
34 areas would be urbanized at any point in the near future or at least until the
35 next census and it was not brought up at either Committee meeting so we
36 just kind of let it go.
37
38 Garrett: I understand. I'm simply saying that on the handout that we had before,
39 which was gray on black it was hard to read and I'm fine with including
40 Organ and fine including this other. I just don't know what it is. What's the
41 community that we're talking about as you go south on... is that Brazito?
42
43 Murphy: I believe that is Brazito.
44
45 Garrett: Okay.
46

1 Murphy: And it was the original census determination.
2
3 Garrett: It would be good if we could just get a clarification of that. I'm supportive of
4 this and... Because I had raised questions about the western boundaries in
5 particular I just would say I appreciate the configuration. I think that does a
6 much better job of actually describing the urbanized area and I appreciate
7 that change. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.
8
9 Pedroza: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Tom, the map that you had on
10 the picture file, does that have identified towns or populations zones?
11 Would it be difficult for you to pencil them in?
12
13 Murphy: We do not have landmarks. We can produce a map with landmarks, towns.
14
15 Pedroza: I think that would be very helpful as well. Okay. Do we need to vote on
16 this?
17
18 Murphy: Yes.
19
20 Pedroza: Okay. It has been moved and seconded that Resolution 13-05 be
21 approved. Is there any other discussion? Nobody from the audience or the
22 public? Will you poll the Members, please?
23
24 Murphy: Mayor Barraza.
25
26 Barraza: Yes.
27
28 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
29
30 Flores: Yes.
31
32 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
33
34 Bernal: Yes.
35
36 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
37
38 Benavidez: Yes.
39
40 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
41
42 Hancock: Yes.
43
44 Murphy: Councillor Sorg.
45
46 Sorg: Yes.

1
2 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

3
4 Garrett: Yes.

5
6 Murphy: And Councillor Pedroza.

7
8 Pedroza: Yes.

9
10 Passes 8 – 0.

11
12
13 **7.2 Resolution 13-06: A Resolution Amending the FY2012 – 2017 Transportation**
14 **Improvement Program**

15
16 On May 11, 2011, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2012-2017 Transportation
17 Improvement Program (TIP).

18
19 The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
1100930	2014	NMDOT	US 70 Concrete Barrier Installation	I-25 Interchange and Rinconada	New Project

20
21 Pedroza: The next item is agenda item 7.2. I believe that that begins on page 58 and
22 it is the Transportation Improvement Program amendments. Do I have a
23 motion to approve?

24
25 Barraza: So moved.

26
27 Garrett: Second.

28
29 Pedroza: It was moved by Mayor Barraza and seconded by Commissioner Garrett. Is
30 there any discussion on this Resolution? Nobody in the public? All right,
31 would you poll or do you want to read it?

32
33 Murphy: Would you like a short presentation on it?

34
35 Pedroza: Yes, please.

36
37 Tom Murphy gave a presentation.

38
39 Pedroza: I think it's a good idea. Are there any questions? Commissioner Hancock.

40
41 Hancock: I'm noticing on the TIP form the length is zero miles.

1
2 Pedroza: That would be hard to (inaudible). What page are you looking at?
3
4 Hancock: This is page 61. It's in the upper right-hand corner.
5
6 Pedroza: Um-hmm. Do we need to change that?
7
8 Murphy: That's an error. The length is two miles. I think that was an omission of data
9 entry and we can make that change.
10
11 Hancock: Thank you.
12
13 Pedroza: Any other questions or discussion?
14
15 Garrett: Good idea.
16
17 Pedroza: I think it's better to approve it with two miles than zero miles. Okay. Do
18 we need a motion to amend that or can you just take care of that
19 administratively?
20
21 Murphy: We can take care of that administratively.
22
23 Pedroza: Okay. If there is no further discussion would you poll the Members?
24
25 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
26
27 Garrett: Aye.
28
29 Murphy: Councillor Sorg.
30
31 Sorg: Aye.
32
33 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
34
35 Hancock: Aye.
36
37 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
38
39 Benavidez: Aye.
40
41 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
42
43 Bernal: Aye.
44
45 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
46

1 Flores: Yes.

2
3 Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

4
5 Barraza: Yes.

6
7 Murphy: And Councillor Pedroza.

8
9 Pedroza: Yes.

10
11 Motion passes 8-0.

12 13 **8. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

14 15 **8.1 Las Cruces Country Club Road Alignment**

16
17 Pedroza: Okay. Our next item of business is the Discussion Items, the Las Cruces
18 Country Club Road Alignment.

19
20 Murphy: Madam Chair, we have Bob Pofahl from Community Builders International
21 here to give the Committee a presentation on a development proposal that
22 they have with the City. The reason that we're bringing it to the MPO Policy
23 Committee is that their development will affect a proposed MPO
24 thoroughfare alignment within the area of the former Las Cruces Country
25 Club and there's been some discussions within the City about what shape
26 that alignment should precisely take place and all parties involved wanted
27 the feedback of the MPO on how that alignment should take place. I'll let
28 Mr. Pofahl go through his presentation and then we can have questions
29 based on that.

30
31 Pedroza: Thank you, Tom. Welcome, Mr. Pofahl.

32
33 Pofahl: Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation. This is a little
34 background on the project. It's 110 acres on the Las Cruces Country Club
35 and it's an infill project and we believe that it will very much bring economic
36 life and vitality back to this neighborhood and it's very close to our
37 Downtown. The project, as I said, is on 110 acres and we're working to
38 integrate into the community and do something we think that will support the
39 existing businesses and the residents in that neighborhood.

40 On the campus it's anchored by a medical complex, a regional
41 hospital and medical campus. We think this area is underserved. This
42 would be a full-service hospital and it's not meant to compete directly with
43 our existing hospitals so it's bringing a lot of new specialties that don't exist
44 in our community. The Galichia Medical Group will head up the operation of
45 this hospital along with local physicians. They've studied this market for a
46 long time and about 30-40% of our health care dollars leave and go to El

1 Paso, to Albuquerque, Tucson, Phoenix and the desire is to bring some of
2 the specialties here and support local physicians to bring some of those
3 dollars back. So that's the primary anchor for the project.

4 As a mixed-use infill project, in addition, it will include retail and
5 dining, commercial and hospitality and is very important in a hospital
6 campus to include what they call a "continuum of care." There's a rehab
7 hospital to serve recovery as well as an athletic performance center and
8 then a continuum of care retirement, which would have assisted living,
9 memory care. All these are very important services to the total health care
10 campus. In addition we'll have residential multi-family, very middle and
11 upper income, and it will include lots of parks, open space in the master
12 plan, along with walking trails and bike paths.

13 This is the original plan that we proposed. We have had seven
14 community meetings that we've voluntarily carried on in the community and
15 had many meetings with the City Planning staff. We did meet with your
16 MPO Technical staff last week. As you'll see, Main Street's right here,
17 existing club house is right over here, just to give you a point of orientation,
18 the Albertson's is here and I-25 is right up to our north. The plan was to
19 bring our main boulevard through and this follows your current MPO path as
20 I will show you on our next slides. This is a tree-lined boulevard and would
21 be the primary collector through the project as well as the other more local
22 streets through the property. After meeting with staff and the people in the
23 community they felt that there should be some other options that wouldn't
24 divide or bifurcate right through the middle of the park; Apodaca Park is right
25 here and the existing ball field is right here. So we've come up with a
26 couple other options to show you.

27 Again, I want to say, when we first began to pursue this we looked at
28 where the MPO route was and felt, with our engineering firm, Zia
29 Engineering, that we would follow the current MPO routes. This will show
30 you that same route. This is your MPO map. That dotted line right here
31 goes through the Country Club area. This is where Apodaca Park is and so
32 that is what we followed in our original plan. I want to bring up, too, that this
33 is the existing site here and bring up that there are bus stops existing and
34 once we know where the main streets are we would like to continue to
35 create pedestrian access to those as well as enhance the bus stops, transit
36 stops, inside this site. We think it's very important. In fact, one of our next
37 steps is to meet with the Transit people and, hopefully, we'd love to see a
38 trolley coming from the new inter-modal center, you know, that would make
39 regular stops through this development so we are very sensitive and want to
40 see those routes. I would want to say, going back to our master plan just
41 briefly, we want to be a pedestrian-friendly community and so we're going to
42 have lots of trail systems and we even would like to connect along the
43 existing power lines, we're looking at a park space and hopefully connecting
44 to the current Outfall Trail so it could come through the whole development
45 and circle back out. We think this would be a great amenity for the

1 neighborhood as well as another connection point to this great trail system
2 we have in our community.

3 We have two options in addition to original MPO route. One of them
4 connects to Solano Drive at the existing signalized intersection at Madrid
5 and Option B would connect to Madrid Avenue east of the existing ball field.
6 I want to make sure you know I'm not here to try and sell one of them to
7 you. We want to come up with what's best for the community. We might
8 lean slightly toward "A" but we are happy with which either option you pick.
9 We think the recommendations from City staff and, I think, not all City staff
10 but the majority of City staff liked Option B, which I will go to now, Option A
11 and B, and show them to you.

12 This is Option A and shows our various parcels that we would have.
13 The medical campus is up in this area. This is multi-family, retail, kind of a
14 life-style retail area with a plaza. This would be another multi-family site.
15 This option takes a little tiny slice off of the corner of Apodaca Park, a 0.218
16 acres, in order to create the proper geometry, I guess, to have the
17 intersection. So that's Option A. Right now there's the existing bathroom
18 facility in the Park and I think it would... This shows you a little bit better the
19 small amount of space that it would take. Some of the canopies in those
20 bathrooms we would propose to move up here and add additional parking in
21 this location.

22 The benefits of this Option, we felt, is it uses existing infrastructure,
23 the existing lighted intersection, it lessens the number of signalized
24 intersections in the area and some of the staff liked that. It promotes
25 integration of Apodaca Park into our development a little easier and the
26 proposed intersection will allow full traffic movements. It will lower traffic
27 and transportation costs, you know, for the whole project and it does not
28 negatively impact surrounding businesses and properties and, as you'll see
29 in Option B, it actually impacts less property area. Some of the challenges
30 or negatives to it, we'd have to move or replace approximately five mature
31 trees that would be existing, which are pretty sacred here in this park area
32 as we have found through our community meetings. The existing restroom
33 facilities would have to be relocated. They're relatively new but that would
34 be a cost that we would bear the cost of... And it impacts a point, as I said,
35 of about 0.216 acres of actual Apodaca Park. The other negative, it's not
36 consistent with the approved MPO Thoroughfare Plan.

37 Option B is to take our main collector road and, instead of coming
38 right through this area as your MPO route currently shows, we would go
39 east of the ball field and this area that's part of the Park is a large ponding
40 area that's kind of used for storage of old tree branches now. We'll call it a
41 compost-ponding area. We'll be meeting with the Parks Department next
42 Thursday but this was the preferred route to take out to Madrid. There's
43 some ponding area. What we would do is we would have to replace some
44 of this ponding into this area here to handle drainage on the site. This
45 shows a blow up of that intersection. You can see the baseball fields. This

1 is currently what's called a Girls' Scout Camp and the Parks felt that that
2 could be moved to another location behind the ball field.

3 Some of the benefits: it creates direct connectivity between North
4 Main Street and Madrid Avenue, would help mitigate traffic issues on North
5 Solano and Desert Drive and what that means is, right now people that
6 would take a left turn coming in and go up through Camino Del Rex and go
7 down through a residential neighborhood on their way to the school. This
8 would mitigate that. That seems to be an important issue to local residents.
9 It invites pedestrian traffic south of Madrid to the Park Ridge development
10 and it does not impact Apodaca Park at all as far as the main Park area.
11 The placement of the multi-family residential development adjacent to the
12 Park in our development would provide a good, compatible land use for the
13 existing Apodaca Park. The more residential eyes you have on a park the
14 safer a park is and right now there're not too many residential properties
15 facing onto that and we would propose to put our multi-family next to that. It
16 is consistent with the approved MPO Thoroughfare Plan. It just moves it
17 300-400 feet to the east.

18 Some of the challenges would be it's a challenging intersection
19 design due to the close proximity of the existing intersection between
20 Madrid Avenue and Sexton Street and most left turns off of Sexton or out of
21 the baseball park parking lot would have to be prohibited and have another
22 access point due to how close they are to the intersection. It could
23 negatively impact the surrounding properties and businesses, particularly
24 storage units; it didn't feel like that was a huge negative but it would have
25 some impact. It increases the number of signalized intersections in the area
26 and higher traffic-transportations costs and it impacts more City property,
27 although no property as precious as Apodaca Park. With that, any
28 questions?

29
30 Pedroza: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

31
32 Hancock: Madam Chair.

33
34 Pedroza: Commissioner Hancock.

35
36 Hancock: Can you describe what you mean by "could negatively impact?" What does
37 that mean? What kind of negative impact would that be to those
38 surrounding properties?

39
40 Pofahl: Let me go back to the photo here. Right here this left turn out of here,
41 because of how close it is to this intersection and the stop light there, you
42 would not be able to take a left turn anymore right there, after a Traffic
43 Study, please. But that's the preliminary findings of the Traffic Study and a
44 left hand turn here would probably have to be eliminated and eventually the
45 left hand turn traffic out of the parking lot here could come up onto this new
46 collector and come out. So it might, not substantially, but in some way

1 impact. It could be positive the fact that traffic stops here at a stop light but
2 it might have impact on that mini-storage business that's right there.
3
4 Hancock: Up at that bend that you had pointed to that's closest to the corner of
5 Apodaca Park...
6
7 Pofahl: Yes.
8
9 Hancock: Yes. Right in that area. I don't see a connection between that road and the
10 Park. Would that solve that problem?
11
12 Pofahl: It would. It would. We've worked on those with the Parks Department.
13 We're going to meet with them and their request was that we would meet
14 with you and get an approval of which is the preferred direction and then
15 we'd work out those other access points.
16
17 Hancock: Very Good. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.
18
19 Pedroza: You're welcome. Are there any other questions?
20
21 Benavidez: Madam Chair?
22
23 Pedroza: Yes, Commissioner Benavidez.
24
25 Benavidez: Thank you. The multi-family units, are they single or are they duplexes?
26
27 Pofahl: These are apartment-style, upscale apartments. They would be multiple
28 units, you know, they wouldn't be duplexes. They would be, probably six to
29 eight units to a building.
30
31 Benavidez: Okay. And then on the northeast kind of corner what is that? It looks like...
32 umm.. I'm looking at this right here.
33
34 Pofahl: Let me go back to that.
35
36 Benavidez: Yeah. Right there where it says "New Boulevard Drive Bank." It's like to the
37 east of it. It looks like a parking lot. I don't know what it is.
38
39 Pofahl: Well, these are medical office buildings right along this area. Is that what
40 you were talking about?
41
42 Benavidez: No the white place.
43
44 Murphy: I believe she's talking about the existing townhomes.
45
46 Pofahl: Oh, right there! Those are existing townhomes that are on Camino Del Rex.

1
2 Benavidez: Oh. Okay.
3
4 Pofahl: And we are proposing to do a 25-foot buffer behind those and run a sewer
5 line to hook those townhomes that are currently on septic tanks and we
6 would hook those onto a new City sewer system that we would install.
7
8 Benavidez: Okay. Thank you.
9
10 Pedroza: Thank you. Are there any other questions? I have a couple, Mr. Pofahl.
11 Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Garrett.
12
13 Garrett: Way down here. Thank you for the presentation. I'm curious... first of all,
14 from the point of view from the retail center and of the medical facilities. Do
15 you think that either of these would be more supportive of bringing traffic in
16 for those functions? I'm going to kind of back up and just say I think that if
17 you have the road tying in at Madrid then people didn't have to go down and
18 get on Main Street. It looks to me like you have to go in, get all the way
19 around in order to come into your main entrance. Right? Off of Main?
20
21 Pofahl: Yeah. That would be the main entrance. If you're asking which is the
22 stronger commercial, Option A is the stronger. It's going to be more of a
23 commercial access.
24
25 Garrett: That's who could have more retail also and you'd have people who are
26 coming in... I'm not sure how many people would turn onto Madrid, drive up
27 and then turn in to use the back road, if you will, so to the speak, to the area
28 if they were going to the medical offices or the retail.
29
30 Pofahl: You're correct. I think that that would... down at Solano and Madrid would
31 be a stronger commercial entrance. This'll create more access into the
32 whole development out of the existing residential community, you know,
33 with Plan B.
34
35 Garrett: So in a certain sense of providing some balanced access and in a way, I
36 think probably creating a little bit more traffic potentially on Solano through
37 that intersection as opposed to more on Main Street. A would definitely
38 have any effect. Is that your sense?
39
40 Pofahl: It could take a little bit of the stress off of Solano that exists now. You're
41 right. That would move more commercial traffic. It would be more
42 balanced.
43
44 Garrett: Okay.
45

1 Pofahl: And that's the only reason we... I really didn't want to get up here and start
2 selling one over the other because I've looked at the pluses and minuses of
3 both of them and so it's a difficult call. But that's why we leaned a little bit
4 towards Option A because it does tie stronger from a commercial
5 standpoint. Tom may be able to relate for you more precisely the
6 discussions with the MPO Technical or Willie Roman.
7

8 Garrett: How many residents are we talking about here?
9

10 Pofahl: Total apartments would probably be 350 to 450 in two different sites.
11 There's a multi-family here and a multi-family site here.
12

13 Garrett: And your projection in terms of number of residents per unit?
14

15 Pofahl: Probably in the 12-14 per acre.
16

17 Garrett: So this is a sizable neighborhood in a sense...
18

19 Pofahl: Yes.
20

21 Garrett: ... and it's unique also in the sense of having additional significant amounts
22 of traffic because of the retail and the hospital related functions.
23

24 Pofahl: Yes, and we've worked through some of that. We did a full Traffic Study,
25 has been completed and we are going to amend that slightly now that we
26 took out... Originally we had a configuration almost to move most of
27 Apodaca Park into a new location but we've done a full Traffic Study and
28 created four lanes here and that requires some improvements on Main
29 Street where we will improve the left turn into the site. So all of those have
30 been analyzed and we've been looking at those. It's a significant
31 development.
32

33 Garrett: Right. Actually, I would appreciate some information from the MPO staff
34 just in terms of given the nature of this development and looking back at the
35 earlier traffic plan that had been approved. Given the kinds of
36 considerations that need to be looked at for safety and for functionality is it
37 your thought that there's a problem with hooking into Madrid or do you think
38 that still should connect over to Madrid?
39

40 Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett, from a staff perspective we don't see
41 that much of a difference from which way it goes. We drew the line on the
42 Thoroughfare Plan as just kind of recognition that if that property were to
43 redevelop that given the size of it, it would need a thoroughfare in it. We
44 also, particularly with our collectors throughout the MPO area, we wrote into
45 the Plan a degree of flexibility that would allow if the City or the County,
46 based on details of developments submitted, to be able to evaluate the

1 more precise alignment. I think from our perspective we know that there
2 needs to be a collector there but whether it connects to Solano or to Madrid
3 it's going to serve equally well at getting that development toward the
4 arterial system.
5

6 Garrett: So given the current designations of Madrid and Solano, their current
7 volume and their intended purpose it doesn't make any difference which
8 road it goes to, that this particular boulevard would connect with?
9

10 Murphy: I don't believe it makes enough of a difference for us to push one Option or
11 the other.
12

13 Garrett: Just from a design perspective is it better for it to connect, in a very abstract
14 way, Madrid is a smaller road.
15

16 Murphy: Right. It goes in front of an elementary school into a neighborhood. There's
17 the apartment complex that actually has spaces that back out onto Madrid.
18 Probably it's not a road that can take a lot more traffic, although anything
19 that develops on that property we're likely to see more traffic on Madrid in
20 any instance. Solano, I would say I don't have the most recent traffic counts
21 with me and as part of my full disclosure many of those aerals that Mr.
22 Pofahl showed you can see my house from. The traffic counts on Solano do
23 have some excess capacity.
24

25 Garrett: So in a sense Solano is designed and intended to be able to take a certain
26 kind of traffic like this?
27

28 Murphy: Solano's a Principal Arterial. It extends all the way down to University.
29 Madrid ends shortly, you know, it's not even a traffic light but it's the next
30 major road, Triviz, and it's segmented to the west. It only continues to the
31 west down to Alameda so it's a relatively short run. Then to go to your
32 earlier statement: the TAC seemed to lean toward Option B. They liked the
33 fact that it did conform with what we drew on the MPO Plan, that it
34 preserves the City's ability to at some point connect Madrid East to Madrid
35 West.
36

37 Garrett: Could you explain what you just said?
38

39 Murphy: Right now you can see on the picture on the screen on the left side is East
40 Madrid and then right at the end of North Solano is another section of
41 Madrid that goes to the west and right now both of those intersections have
42 traffic lights with them. The City staff has long discussed doing the
43 realignment of Madrid to align that up as one road...
44

45 Garrett: Through Apodaca Park?
46

1 Murphy: Yes.
2
3 Garrett: Okay. Not okay, but I understand now the concept. Okay.
4
5 Murphy: Option A would take that more or less off the table. If I can relate some of
6 the City staff meetings that I've been to: I know that Fire had wanted the
7 connection at Solano. Traffic Engineering, Public Works were more in favor
8 of Option B.
9
10 Garrett: Okay. I just have a question of our Chair.
11
12 Pedroza: Yes.
13
14 Garrett: What exactly is it we are supposed to do with respect to this – just ask
15 questions?
16
17 Pedroza: Correct me if I'm wrong, Tom, we're just receiving information and
18 discussing. We're not about to decide anything particularly. Is that correct?
19
20 Murphy: Madam Chair, we have this on as a discussion item. Ultimately, with the
21 MPO's role as an advising body, our Thoroughfare Plan is merely a
22 suggestion and with this being within the city limits is ultimately the City's
23 decision on what they approve. However, based on the discussion of the
24 meetings with City staff they strongly wanted to hear what this Board felt
25 was the right option to pursue. So what staff is looking for is to get either a
26 consensus or, at the very least, some input back on what this Body feels are
27 the issues that need to be looked at that might push one option versus the
28 other.
29
30 Pedroza: But those are not the only two options that are ever going to be considered?
31
32 Murphy: I think those are the most practical options. The one that's on the screen
33 right now with the original submittal, I think that discussions with the Parks
34 Director and the push back on things as well as the City Legal staff, I think
35 the one that's shown on the screen right now is a non-starter. That might be
36 too strong but...
37
38 Pedroza: Is that Option A, approximately?
39
40 Murphy: That would be Option A if you moved the road to the other side of the
41 baseball field.
42
43 Pedroza: Okay. Oh, I thought that was B.
44
45 Pofahl: No, Option B. I'm sorry. B; that would be closer to...
46

1 Murphy: Yes, Option B. Option A is if you'd swing that road up and connect it the
2 Madrid and Solano intersection.
3
4 Pedroza: Now you've got me thoroughly confused. This over here is Option A. I see.
5 Okay; and Option B is the one that we saw which cuts just west of the
6 baseball field.
7
8 Murphy: It goes just east of the baseball field.
9
10 Pedroza: East of the baseball field... this one. What's that one that...
11
12 Murphy: The one was an original submittal...
13
14 Pedroza: Ah, and it's not under consideration at this point?
15
16 Murphy: It's not under consideration. The City Legal staff made the determination
17 that in order for the developer to submit this and have that considered the
18 City needs to be a signatory to the development application and since the
19 City Council has not acted on this in any way that option cannot be pursued.
20
21 Pedroza: Okay. Are there any other questions?
22
23 Sorg: Yes.
24
25 Pedroza: Councillor Sorg.
26
27 Sorg: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question about the property beyond the
28 outfield, in the baseball outfield that is, that is lined there, the pink line on
29 Option B or A, whatever. Was that the property you're talking about had this
30 ponding for yard waste?
31
32 Pofahl: Right now that area is right here.
33
34 Sorg: Yeah.
35
36 Pofahl: And under the other the... under either option that would have to be cleaned
37 up for ponding but under Option B we'd have to move some of that ponding
38 area up here.
39
40 Sorg: Um-hmm. And that would collect water from where? The Ojo?
41
42 Pofahl: There's an existing flow that comes through this community.
43
44 Sorg: Right.
45
46 Pofahl: I believe it's about right here.

1
2 Sorg: Right.
3
4 Pofahl: We'd pick that up and store it here.
5
6 Sorg: Okay. So this is a piece of City property that you're going through?
7
8 Pofahl: No. Right here is City property and this piece would be part of our property.
9
10 Sorg: Now that's what I mean: the first is the area you're describing. So is there
11 going to be any trading involved in this that the City gives up a property
12 for...?
13
14 Pofahl: Oh, yes. Of course.
15
16 Sorg: Okay. So that we could possibly increase the size of Apodaca Park maybe?
17
18 Pofahl: Our original proposal was to do that. We could still talk about that. We
19 think there are many parks in town that have a slight, like a 4-foot depth and
20 they're grassed and still have trees in them where you can have both a
21 ponding area and a park. You could increase the park area.
22
23 Sorg: Okay.
24
25 Pofahl: The original plan we had that we showed you, we had proposed to increase
26 the park but now that we're kind of cutting through with this road it's a little
27 bit more difficult to do that and...
28
29 Sorg: Oh, okay... no, finish what you were saying.
30
31 Pofahl: I want to clarify for the Madam Chairman; we've looked at lots of options
32 with City staff and pretty much it came back with the two that the staff and
33 then last week the MPO felt were the best Options and what we're looking
34 for, we can't go forward to complete our master plan PUD to go in and
35 propose until we figure out how we're going to make this connection 'cause
36 whether you go to Madrid or you go to Solano it radically changes our plan.
37 So we want to make sure that we're in compliance and, like I said, we could
38 go either way, you know. From a commercial standpoint we leaned a little
39 bit toward Option A because it's a better commercial intersection but
40 residentially, there're other things. They both have negatives and positives.
41 I think the most negative piece to the community is the potential touching
42 that little sliver. Parks Department feels it's getting close to Apodaca Park is
43 just...um...
44
45 Sorg: Touchy.
46

1 Pofahl: Touchy, yes. Good word. I was looking for the right word. And, you know,
2 we've had a lot of community meetings and our first goal on this was to work
3 to try and find the best plan for the ten or twenty year solution for traffic to
4 Madrid. Well, we've taken a lot of arrows at doing that because in the
5 beginning we didn't particularly want to mess with Apodaca Park at all. But
6 we were trying to be team players here and ...
7

8 Pedroza: We appreciate that.
9

10 Pofahl: I think, City staff and us found out that there were a handful of people
11 pretty emotional about Apodaca Park. It's a wonderful park. We think it's a
12 great amenity and we want to see the Park improved, if anything. But it
13 would be great so that we can be free to move forward to get some kind of
14 endorsement of which of the solutions this Commission would prefer.
15

16 Sorg: I would also be concerned about Option B limiting the seating in the ballpark
17 there on the right field side. Should we expand that ball field into a bigger
18 venue for a larger or a better baseball team? Does it actually limit that
19 potential? How close to the Park is it, the ball park?
20

21 Pofahl: That's relatively close but you still... that's the outfield part...
22

23 Sorg: Yeah.
24

25 Pofahl: ... and normally you would probably be expanding, you know, either along
26 the first base line or along this third base line. The City has felt with the new
27 field, the Field of Dreams, this park is being used less and less.
28

29 Sorg: There's a baseball park there at the Field of Dreams?
30

31 Pofahl: The school put in a new facility and the high schools no longer use this
32 facility now.
33

34 Sorg: Really?
35

36 Pofahl: Right.
37

38 Sorg: Okay.
39

40 Pofahl: So there's less and less baseball being played here.
41

42 Pedroza: But I believe we do have some commercial baseball, right?
43

44 Pofahl: Yes. Um-hmm. Right.
45

46 Sorg: Is that what you call it? Semi-pro?

1
2 Pedroza: Well, I don't know what you call it.
3
4 Pofahl: Semi-pro. Yes.
5
6 Sorg: Semi-pro. Yeah.
7
8 Pedroza: Thank you.
9
10 Sorg: Well, it looks like they're not going to be playing this year but maybe they'll
11 come back. We need more fans is what we need. Okay. So in Option B
12 then there would be some land trading of some sort...
13
14 Pofahl: Yes.
15
16 Sorg: ... that so we wouldn't lose any land there on that. I don't know. It's hard to
17 pick. I kind of favor the traffic going to Madrid somewhat because Solano is,
18 especially when you get to the intersection of Main and Solano, very heavy
19 traffic there and if this affects that somewhat I think it would be... I dunno,
20 it'd be detrimental to the traffic there. Of course, they're going to change the
21 whole intersection there in the not too distant future, right? Three, five
22 years, something like that? Yeah. And then you probably won't get this all
23 built in three years either, will you? Maybe?
24
25 Pofahl: I'm a developer. We're always optimistic, you know.
26
27 Sorg: So, year, I kind of would favor Option B, too, but I don't have a strong
28 feeling about it.
29
30 Pedroza: Thank you, Councillor. Commissioner Hancock.
31
32 Hancock: Thank you, Madam Chair. The problem I see with Option A is it's going to
33 make your road through that area a primary cutoff to avoid that intersection
34 at 70 and Solano. I think the other big problem there will be, because it's
35 going to be a cutoff and there'll be a lot more retail traffic going to our new
36 Trader Joe's right there on that corner, that it will create a little too much
37 traffic for the Park and I know there are a lot of children that play in that Park
38 and that'll be a problem. So that makes me move more towards B in order
39 to slow the traffic flow down. You'll still get the flow, I'm sure, with Trader
40 Joe's there, but the big issue with the B Option is that left turn problem and
41 the impact on those businesses and if something could be, in my opinion, if
42 something could be worked out with the Parks Department in order to try to
43 make some sort of connection there that would restrict the traffic so it's not
44 fast flowing traffic then that would solve the left turn issue and I would find
45 that one most appealing. Thank you, Madam Chair.
46

1 Pedroza: Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, Trustee Bernal.

2

3 Bernal: I know it's kind of (inaudible), A and B? I see your point but then, again, it's
4 like Tom was saying earlier, hopefully we have the answers to everything.
5 Okay? And how to convince what's best for the community, what's best for
6 the safety of our people and it's kind of for you that I'm seeing right now, like
7 they had mentioned earlier the possibility they were thinking of connecting
8 Madrid or a right through Apodaca Park. Okay? So if that was the case I'd
9 rather see a little piece of Apodaca Park than half of Apodaca Park. Now
10 the other Option, not Option, but maybe by moving the bathrooms like in A,
11 it would be closer to Apodaca Park, the baseball field for the future and
12 going with A, we're looking where they're dumping the trash or dumping
13 their trees and everything else. For the future they could utilize that but
14 (inaudible) for parking to go where that baseball field would go, to go, okay?
15 That's why I'm kind of like looking... I'm trying to look out there. I'm not
16 saying we are not all looking out there but I'm trying to look out there as for
17 the future. Two things is: they would connect Madrid, the other one if they
18 were to go with A there would be parking at that... a minor league would
19 come in, in the future, ten, five, fifteen years from now. That baseball field
20 we could make more parking, going to the bathrooms a little closer, it would
21 be more convenient for everybody else.

22 Now, the other thing I'm looking at, I myself, okay? 'Cause I live close
23 to the school and I know how much of an impact it has for constituents and
24 everybody around by going with Option A I think it would break up the flow
25 of traffic in the mornings, at noon and in the evenings, three o'clock when
26 school is out because if we go with Option B you're looking at the traffic if
27 individuals coming from that residential area at noon the site that we're
28 looking at, as it is look at the residential on the east side already as it is and
29 then bringing more traffic into Madrid I feel that Solano is built a lot stronger
30 to take the impact of traffic than Madrid is 'cause I see Madrid more as a
31 residential than a commercial. So those are my views. Okay? I see you're
32 not here to sell A or B but those are my concerns and I see, to me I see
33 Option A as the (inaudible).

34

35 Barraza: And I would agree with Mr. Bernal and I would also add that I spoke with
36 Mayor Barraza before she left. She apologizes. She had to go and she also
37 supported Option A and I would agree with that. I'd like to lessen traffic
38 where a school is involved and because I've also seen the traffic that goes
39 along Mesilla. It's a problem.

40

41 Pedroza: Thank you, Mayor. Commissioner Garrett?

42

43 Garrett: Madam Chair, thank you. I've asked questions but I really didn't express, I
44 think, clearly what my recommendation was. I favor A, similar to some of
45 the comments that were made earlier by Trustee Bernal. I would, just in
46 terms of the traffic coming north on Solano and those that are going to

1 potentially use the retail or the hospital being able to draw those people in. I
2 just don't see them turning on Madrid going up past the baseball field and
3 turning to go in. I think they're much more likely to go into that area if they
4 have the intersection at the signal at Madrid, turning right and moving
5 directly in and that would reduce additional traffic at the intersection of
6 Solano and Main. So, just in terms of helping reduce that congestion I see
7 that as a positive.

8 I'm also somewhat attracted to the idea of being able to have
9 Apodaca Park between the boulevard and the... what is that? East Madrid?
10 The Madrid that's to the south of the development. In that sense it's more
11 self-contained to me as opposed to being somewhat cut off under B, and I
12 think that in terms of, you know, when you've got... for that matter, when
13 you've got an additional event that's at Apodaca Park, the baseball field or
14 so forth being able to have that traffic potentially, I guess, go off of both the
15 boulevard and Madrid gives you a way of getting them out of that area as
16 opposed to just really having only one on B. So I think there are a lot of...
17 I'm also, I think.... I've driven through that area. I've been in that area many
18 times and it just feels more like the turn should be off of Solano, not turn
19 onto Madrid then turn off of that. It seems convoluted.

20 Quite frankly, the last piece to me is that's a more attractive
21 secondary entrance to the development. I mean, this is going to be an
22 upscale, prestigious, very solid development. It's going to have lots of
23 positive benefits to the whole neighborhood and it feels like the secondary
24 entrance is more of an entrance when it comes off of Solano rather than it
25 comes off of Madrid. So, I appreciate the opportunity to comments so I favor
26 A.

27
28 Pedroza: Thank you. Are there any other contributions, any other comments?
29 Councillor Sorg?

30
31 Sorg: I would like more time to decide *(all laughing)*.

32
33 Pedroza: Well, here are my questions, Mr. Pofahl. I was just waiting until everybody
34 else was finished. I know you've spoken to the Fire Department and so on,
35 but my understand is that when there are neighborhoods they benefit from
36 several entrances and exits and it's just an expression of concern because
37 either Option A or Option B gives them basically two out places, either on
38 Main or rather one on Main and then the other either on Solano or on
39 Madrid. I really think that making left turns more difficult or nonexistent is a
40 major drawback. I'm not suggesting you go back to the drawing board and
41 put another but that would almost seem to me to be safer in terms of, I
42 believe that you're going to have large numbers of people going into the
43 apartments, you know, in the morning to go to work and in the evening to
44 come home, using the Park for park purposes and then the hospital, in
45 addition. These are sizable numbers of people coming in and using the
46 area. I think it's a wonderful addition to our city and I'm glad that the New

1 Mexico Department of Transportation is going to be dealing with that
2 horrible intersection right now that we have at Main and Solano. But that
3 would be... and I think I have a couple of other little

4 Okay, no, you answered the other questions that had except for one.
5 I'm very glad that you're leaving the little townhouses intact and I'm also
6 very glad that you are going to be connecting them to the city sewer and
7 thank you very much for agreeing to reconstruct the bathrooms should that
8 be necessary. That's also very good. I guess because of who I am, Mr.
9 Pofahl, I'm going to ask whether you have considered more of a mix in your
10 housing. I believe that... I heard yesterday and I think you were there that,
11 yes, we do need more upper and the middle income apartments but I
12 believe that it's in fact true that the biggest shortage of apartments in that
13 area in the city are for low income and if you were to be able to do a little bit
14 more of a mix that would be to the benefit of everybody. Those are my
15 comments.

16

17 Pofahl: Absolutely. We absolutely agree with that and almost all lenders today
18 require a mix of sizes and we don't want to call these "affordable"
19 apartments but you can't really get financing for apartments if you do not
20 have mixed the affordable.

21

22 Pedroza: Okay.

23

24 Pofahl: So we would have all the price ranges in there on these. We absolutely
25 agree with you.

26

27 Pedroza: Perfect. Well, then I think I would go with A except for I think, and the Fire
28 Department certainly knows better than I do, but I think that you do need
29 more than those two points of entrance.

30

31 Pofahl: Oh, Griselda's showing me, we have an area in the back here that would be
32 a row of townhomes...

33

34 Pedroza: Right.

35

36 Pofahl: And so that's an ingress and egress there...

37

38 Pedroza: All right.

39

40 Pofahl: ... and when we meet with the Parks Department this is an area the same
41 as on Plan B, the Parks Department would like to see our residents be able
42 to come into the Park and at the same time they would like to see the Park
43 on those big occasions ten times a year at Easter and holidays be able to
44 overflow into our parking spaces; and so I think that tying the parking lots
45 together not as a main thoroughfare but they could allow people back and
46 forth as long as they're controlled access and that would provide what

1 you're talking about. Right here in Plan A, you connect here in a parking lot
2 not as a main street and in Plan B we had the same thing. We think those
3 provide good circulation through the development so the residents and
4 people in these parks can enjoy the entire development. We agree with
5 you.
6
7 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you. So when you present to the City Council when I imagine
8 you're going to be doing that, if you can address those things that would be
9 very, very good. Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments?
10
11 Benavidez: Madam Chair?
12
13 Pedroza: Yes, Commissioner Benavidez.
14
15 Benavidez: Okay, let me get this straight. The road west of the ball park, is that going to
16 be connected to the road that's coming up right there? Right there. Is that
17 going to be connected?
18
19 Pofahl: It wouldn't and, again, that's up to the Parks Department. We meet, I
20 believe, the 16th, which is Thursday. That's going to be at their favor and it
21 wouldn't be like a thoroughfare street. It would be connecting this
22 development into the parking lot and putting some parking together that
23 integrate the parking areas between the two, the public-City space as well
24 as our development. So there'd be a connection through those.
25
26 Benavidez: So, let's say I'm going up Solano, turn on Madrid and then I go west... no,
27 on Madrid and then I go right there by the ball park. I can go through there
28 and I can access up north to Main Street? You said it's going to be blocked,
29 right?
30
31 Pofahl: I think the way that parking will be I'm sure the City Parks Department is
32 going to want to make that a little bit of a maze where you have to go...
33 They wouldn't want it to become a thoroughfare, so to speak. It would be
34 great for emergency access and just for the convenience of people using
35 the park, but you wouldn't want that to become a thoroughfare.
36
37 Benavidez: Well, I also favor Option A because as you're going up Solano and you're
38 going to right there, it seems more logical than going on Madrid and then
39 turning left. So, therefore Option A is my favorite. Thank you.
40
41 Pofahl: Thank you.
42
43 Pedroza: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Thank you very
44 much.
45
46 Sorg: Madam Chair?

1
2 Pedroza: Yes.

3
4 Sorg: One last comment.

5
6 Pedroza: Okay. Councillor Sorg.

7
8 Sorg: If you build this whole street completely before you move any people in
9 there that'll be a big plus.

10
11 Pofahl: Yeah, you pretty much have to build. I think we'd like to start the medical
12 center but really you couldn't start other multi-family things. You'd have to
13 build that whole street pretty quickly. We agree.

14
15 Pedroza: Thank you, sir. Tom, we're not taking a decision. You've heard all our
16 comments.

17
18 Murphy: Yes.

19
20 Pedroza: Okay, thank you.

21 22 **8.2 NMDOT update**

23
24 Jolene Herrera, NMDOT, gave updates:

- 25
- 26 • The project on Picacho is on schedule. She spoke with the Project Manager that
27 date and the estimated completion date is May 20th and all lanes should be open.
28 The contractor will still be doing some minor work so there will be short closures
29 but traffic should be flowing through there again if everything stays on track.
 - 30 • Avenida de Mesilla will have bridge replacement projects. It will be similar to the
31 work done on Motel. The contractor received their notice to proceed on April 30th
32 and they have 60 days to ramp up. The project will take a little over a year to
33 complete.
- 34

35 Sorg: May I ask a question about that particular project.

36
37 Herrera: Sure, I can try to answer it .

38
39 Sorg: Will there always be, during the whole construction project, ability to go to
40 Mesilla from Las Cruces on Avenida de Mesilla?

41
42 Herrera: I really am not sure. I can check on that. I'll ask the Project Manage and I'll
43 make sure to get that information to Tom for you and he can send it.

44
45 Sorg: As I recall, Motel Boulevard was blocked off, wasn't it?

1 Herrera: Yeah, it was closed and so I'm not sure. I haven't seen the sequence of
2 construction on this but I'll check on that for you.
3
4 Sorg: Okay, and then, too, from accessing I-10.
5
6 Herrera: Right. Okay.
7
8 Garrett: Madam Chair?
9
10 Pedroza: Commissioner Garrett.
11
12 Garrett: Thank you. There have been, on some of these projects, community
13 meetings where people had an opportunity to get briefings. Do you know if
14 this project will have similar kinds of public meetings?
15
16 Herrera: Yes, typically all of our construction projects that are the urban area have
17 monthly public meetings. They are typically held in the evening around 6:00
18 or so at the Solano yard and our District 1 PIO, Bridget Spedalieri, she puts
19 out the press releases for those. I believe those go to the MPO staff.
20
21 Murphy: I just wanted to jump in on the question of the Avenida de Mesilla closure. I
22 was in a meeting with Trent and Mayor Barraza last week and he did tell the
23 Mayor that they did not anticipate any. The only complete closures of
24 Avenida de Mesilla would be overnight when they did the destruction of the
25 existing bridge and replacement of the beams for the new one. So the only
26 closures would be overnight.
27
28 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.
29
30 • Cable Barrier Project on US 70 is ahead of schedule. Contractor Smith & Aguirre,
31 local contractor, is moving quickly on that project and has begun installing the
32 cable barrier itself. They are working on the portion east of Holman right now,
33 putting the posts in and paving that last section.
34
35 • The Concrete Wall Barrier Project is on schedule. The project would probably start
36 in January depending on the weather.
37
38 Garrett: Madam Chair?
39
40 Pedroza: Commissioner Garrett.
41
42 Garrett: I have a question for NMDOT that's outside of the immediate MPO area. I
43 understand that it's NMDOT that's doing the work on Highway 28 south of
44 La Mesa, you know how Highway 28 hooks around and then you take a
45 hard right and continue south? And there had been some work on that road
46 and it was supposed to be, "We're going to do this once and it's done." But it

1 was once and it's terrible. I've been down there. I've driven the road. I've
2 had constituent complaints and I would appreciate having some information
3 about what's going to be done on that road and then what the time schedule
4 is.
5
6 Herrera: Okay. I'll definitely check with our Maintenance Engineer on that. That's
7 not a project that's federally funded. That's part of our maintenance
8 program so I'll get you some information on that and, again, I'll send it to
9 Tom and he can disseminate it to you all.
10
11 Garrett: I'd appreciate that. Thank you.
12
13 Pedroza: Okay. Commissioner Hancock.
14
15 Hancock: Since we're doing outside of the box stuff do I understand that there's some
16 discussion about putting up some hazmat signs out on I-10 and I-25 in order
17 to get the traffic moved out of the middle of the city?
18
19 Herrera: I'm going to tag team Harold on this one.
20
21 Hancock: Okay.
22
23 Love: Currently the department cannot do hazmat placarding and hazmat signage
24 on state roads because there isn't a state law that allows for it.
25
26 Hancock: Okay. Does that preclude County or City ordinances?
27
28 Pedroza: Probably. I believe so.
29
30 Love: On state roads, yes.
31
32 Pedroza: Yeah. Then we need to address the Legislature on it.
33
34 Hancock: Okay.
35
36 Love: It's my understanding that the County has brought that before the
37 Legislature in the past and it hasn't gone very far.
38
39 Pedroza: Okay. We can always try it again.
40
41 Hancock: Thank you. I appreciate that.
42
43 Herrera: Any other questions?
44
45 Pedroza: Any other questions?
46

1 Barraza: Yes, I have one. Isn't 8.2 current?

2
3 Pedroza: Yes.

4
5 Barraza: Oh, okay. Then I have one question.

6
7 Herrera: Okay.

8
9 Barraza: Right north on Valley Drive between Thorp and Lopez I've had constituents
10 call me that the speed limit is very high, that they would like to bring it down
11 to at least 45 after Thorp coming into town. Is that possible?

12
13 Love: We have received those concerns and our Traffic Engineer is currently
14 performing a study in that area.

15
16 Barraza: Oh, good. Thank you. I really appreciate that because there's a lot of new
17 homes up there and people coming into Valley and people coming in on
18 Valley Drive past Thorp they're still coming at 55 and they're getting kind of
19 scared because they're coming too fast down the road. So thank you. I
20 really appreciate that. No more questions. Thank you.

21
22 Pedroza: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

23 24 **8.3 Advisory Committee Updates**

25
26 **None**

27 28 **9. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS**

29
30 Pedroza: Any comments from the Committee? Councillor Sorg.

31
32 Sorg: I'd like to make an announcement, comment, that the Safe Routes to School
33 had a program of Walking School Bus this morning and Bike to School and
34 George and I were both down there at Jornada Elementary for their Walking
35 School Bus and Biking to School and it was great, fantastic. We had more
36 kids than we could almost handle. They just lined up and it was very
37 orderly. It went very, very well.

38
39 Pedroza: Good. Thank you. Any other comments? Yes, Trustee Flores.

40
41 Flores: I just wanted to let everybody know that in Mesilla they're going to be having
42 the Ride of Silence and I believe it's the 15th. It's Wednesday? I think that's
43 Wednesday and it's at 6:00 pm for anybody that would like to come. You
44 surely would be welcome.

45
46 Pedroza: What time?

1
2 Flores: 6:00 pm
3
4 Pedroza: Next week Wednesday?
5
6 Flores: Um-hmm.
7
8 Pedroza: And where is it?
9
10 Flores: The Plaza of Mesilla. It's easy to find.
11
12 Pedroza: Okay.
13
14 Flores: Off of Avenida de Mesilla.
15
16 Pedroza: Thank you. Any other comments?
17
18 Barraza: Trustee Flores, please repeat. What is that?
19
20 Flores: It's the Ride of Silence and it's in honor of a past Mayor of ours that was
21 killed riding a bike, I believe, in Katy, Texas and anybody else who's been
22 injured or killed while riding a bike. So it's just a reminder to share the road.
23
24 Barraza: Great. Thank you.
25
26 Pedroza: Do you have to be on a bike in order to do the route?
27
28 Flores: I believe they also have a walk or they have in the past. I'm not sure if
29 they're going to have a walk this time but you're welcome just to come out
30 and you don't have to ride a bike if you don't want to.
31
32 Pedroza: Are there any more comments from the Committee? No? Staff?
33
34 Murphy: Madam Chair, I passed out a staff comment sheet kind of updating projects
35 and it occurred to me, I did one last week for the work session and it
36 occurred to me that many of you were not able to attend that work session
37 and I should have printed that one out as well. There were many more
38 projects on that one but I will mail it out. First updates: the Transportation
39 Alternatives Program, the TAP, the funds that are envisioned for
40 programming by the MPO, the NMDOT has finalized the guidelines and
41 they've submitting them to FHWA. As of this morning they' have not heard
42 word back on whether that has happened, although in our conference call
43 they did say that we should advise our jurisdictions that these projects will
44 be coming so if you have some walking, biking, Safe Routes to School
45 projects you should have your engineering staffs start to figure out what

1 project they want to submit for and start putting together some project costs.
2 We should call for projects here very shortly.

3 The second update is the Climate Change Scenario Planning Project
4 Solicitation. We received a solicitation from the Federal Highway
5 Administration to apply for a pilot project. I understand that we are one of
6 ten inland MPOs to look at doing scenario planning in regard with our
7 Transportation Plan Update and effects toward climate change. I had a
8 conversation with Mr. Rasmussen from FHWA on Friday. We kind of went
9 over some of the efforts that we're doing here in the area. Our MTP's due
10 for an update in the next year-and-a-half. Both the City and the County are
11 working on Comprehensive Plan updates.

12 We have the EPA, DOT Livability Grant with the Camino Real, the
13 Viva Doña Ana Project and also I've spoken with Bill Childress of the
14 Bureau of Land Management and they would be willing partner in this grant
15 application. The grant would mainly be to get some technical assistance to
16 do scenario planning. There also may be a small monetary award to help
17 with grant activities from \$25K – \$50K. I do believe that it's worthwhile for
18 staff to prepare a Letter of Interest for this grant. A Letter of Interest is due
19 by May 30th and the selection, they'll only select one, will happen in June or
20 July and I just wanted to talk with the Committee and see if there are any
21 reservations about pursuing this or there are any thoughts on it.

22
23 Pedroza: Any comments?

24
25 Sorg: I say go for it.

26
27 Pedroza: Commissioner Garrett?

28
29 Garrett: I would agree. Have you talked with Daniel Hortert about this?

30
31 Murphy: I have not but I think that this would be... and actually if I could get on the
32 agenda for Friday...

33
34 Garrett: Yes. That's exactly where I was going and do you need letters of support?

35
36 Murphy: It probably would not hurt. The only stated letter of support that's a
37 requirement is from BLM

38
39 Pedroza: And they've already agreed to?

40
41 Murphy: Yes. I spoke with Mr. Childress. He's on our Technical Advisory Committee.
42 The way they explained the process, they did a pilot Project for Climate
43 Change last year and it was the Cape Cod MPO and they decided that it
44 was successful. They wanted to do it again this year but with an inland
45 MPO. They submitted a list of MPOs to the Federal Land Management

1 Agencies and they came back with the top ten who were of interest and
2 apparently we were a favorite with BLM for this endeavor.
3
4 Pedroza: That sounds very exciting.
5
6 Garrett: Do you know much about scenario planning?
7
8 Murphy: Uh-uh.
9
10 Garrett: It was new to me until about two weeks ago or something like that.
11 Councillor Thomas has been a strong advocate of this since she went to a
12 conference in Utah and they used it there. It may be helpful to narrow the
13 scope, I mean, if it's in a certain sense \$25K - \$50K, and it has to do with
14 climate change it seems to me that there's some interesting possibilities of
15 looking at our county as a whole, some of the areas that have to do with
16 access and some of the underserved populations that might benefit from
17 that and I'm thinking that the issue in a way is how to craft the project as a
18 small sub-set that fits into the larger, Viva Doña Ana, initiative. But I would
19 think that we should be able to put together a very compelling and
20 competitive package but it needs to be focused, I think, and that might be
21 something where, you know, maybe Jennifer Montoya from BLM and Daniel
22 and you could figure out what might be the perfect nexus as opposed to the
23 perfect storm.
24
25 Pedroza: I would also suggest that if reducing greenhouse gases by reducing the
26 number of miles driven and so forth that might be something to explore and
27 I don't know if alternative transportation is offered but I'll look those things
28 up and people are thinking about them.
29
30 Sorg: Absolutely. May I make one more comment?
31
32 Pedroza: Go ahead.
33
34 Sorg: There is a web site for the National Change Assessment and they break it
35 down into regions in the country and the Southwest is its own region and
36 they have an assessment of scenarios of climate change and I think it'd be
37 very useful to use that as a tool to go into this. I'll send you the link if you
38 want.
39
40 Murphy: I'd appreciate that.
41
42 Sorg: I'll just send you the link. That'll be good.
43
44 Murphy: Thank you.
45
46 Sorg: Okay.

1
2 Hancock: I concur.

3
4 Pedroza: Okay. Is that the end of staff comments?

5
6 Murphy: That concludes my comments.

7
8 **10. PUBLIC COMMENT**
9

10 Pearson: A couple of things: the League of American Bicyclists recently came out
11 with their ranking of bicycle friendly states. New Mexico was one of the
12 48. We're ahead of Alabama and North Dakota so that was like a drop of
13 two so we've got some work to do at the state level. At the local level the
14 Safe Routes to School I think we're doing quite well. Mesilla Elementary
15 had their usual Tuesday ride and they had a huge turnout. We had a
16 separate walking event that happened Wednesday but Tuesday I had
17 close to thirty kids and like twenty adults, a bit show out. Representative
18 McCamley was there. And then I was at Alameda, which turned out to be
19 more of a walking event but the total students involved in that was
20 reported to be around 150. Today at Jornada we had about a dozen
21 bicyclists and at least 150 kids. Mesilla Park had an event today where
22 Councillor Smith was there and they had a dozen kids or so, I think, on
23 bicycles. I'm not real familiar with the details there. Tomorrow we're
24 going to have an event for McArthur Elementary and so we don't know
25 what the turnout will be but it could be as good as the others so we're
26 doing some good work there.

27
28 Pedroza: Sounds like it.

29
30 Pearson: I'm sure Devashree could put together a more concise report if you're
31 interested. So that's supporting St. Francis School. It's a good thing.

32
33 Pedroza: Absolutely. It sounds like you've been doing a wonderful job.

34
35 Sorg: Madam Chair?

36
37 Pedroza: Yes, sir.

38
39 Sorg: May I also complement the New Mexico Department of Health for
40 assistance in the Safe Routes to School and the walking and biking and
41 so forth.

42
43 Pearson: Yes, funding for the new champions. There were some problems with
44 personnel. They hired three positions, which were to be part time
45 positions to champion different schools but two of those positions there
46 were some problems with things happening so there's only one champion

1 right now but they're looking forward. We're expecting to hire
2 replacements for the other two and have them in place to continue the
3 program into the fall. It's my understanding.
4

5 Pedroza: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments, questions?
6

7 Murphy: I forgot one staff comment. On Monday, the City as you are aware of, the
8 City Council passed the draft Joint Powers Agreement and we are
9 scheduled to go to the Town of Mesilla on Monday and then a discussion
10 item at the County on Tuesday just to give you an update on the progress
11 of that.
12

13 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.
14

15 **11. ADJOURNMENT (5:41pm)**
16

17 Trustee Flores moved to adjourn.

18 Commissioner Benavidez seconded the motion.
19



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 12, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

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

This is being requested as an urgent action by NMDOT District 1. The request was not received in time for the TAC to be able to take formal action. NMDOT staff will provide more information at the meeting.

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

FY2012 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Reports

DISCUSSION:

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

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
	2014	NMDOT	Vado Interchange		New Project

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 13- 07

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2012-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(I)

THAT the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Year 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

(II)

THAT the Las Cruces MPO's Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit "B", attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved

(III)

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

DONE and **APPROVED** this 12th day of June , 2013.

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

Resolution 13-07 Attachment "B"

LAS CRUCES MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

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

- (1) 49 U.S.C. 5323(l), 23 U.S.C. 135, and 23 U.S.C. 450.220;
- (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);
- (4) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and U. S. DOT implementing regulation;
- (5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and
- (6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d)).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR

Date

NMDOT

Date

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN: G18A4 **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** 87 **NMDOT Dist.:** 1 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** Unincorporated Area
Fed ID: G18A4 **Lead Agency:** NMDOT D-1 **Length:** 5.1 Miles
RT: 000I10 **Proj:** I-10/Vado Interchange Reconstruction **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$10,000,000
Fr: MP 150.7 **To:** MP 155.8 **Est. Letting:**
Category: Hwy & Brg Pres TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Project Desc.: This project will replace the bridges over I-10 at the Mesquite interchange and construct roundabouts at both the east and west bound off ramps at the I-10/Vado interchange, and reconstruct on/off ramps at both interchanges

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

Remarks: New Project as of 06/06/13

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2012	2013	2014	2015	4 Yr. TOTALS	2016	2017
State Match		\$0			\$0		
Local Match		\$1,456,000			\$1,456,000		
NHPP MAP-21		\$8,544,000	06		\$8,544,000		
Totals		\$10,000,000			\$10,000,000		

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT [JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us]

Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:39 AM

To: Andrew Wray

Subject: FW: TIP Amendment

Good morning Andrew,

I would like to request a TIP Amendment be added to the June 12 Policy Committee agenda as follows:

CN G18A4, funded at \$10M with NHPP closeout funds [for FY2013](#). The scope of work will be: Replace bridges over I-10 at the Mesquite interchange, construct roundabouts at both east and west bound off ramps at the I-10/Vado Interchange, and reconstruct on/off ramps at both interchanges.

The termini for the project will be: I-10 MP 150.8- 155.8.

NMDOT staff will be present at the meeting to answer any questions the Policy Committee members may have.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera

Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2

NMDOT South Region Design

750 N Solano Dr

Las Cruces, NM 88001

O: (575) 525-7358

C: (575) 202-4698

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 12, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Presentation

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

TAP Guide

DISCUSSION:

New Mexico Department of Transportation staff will give a presentation regarding TAP funds.

New Mexico Transportation Alternatives Program Guide FFY 2014 and FFY 2015

Transportation Alternatives Program projects are Federally-funded community-based projects that expand travel choices and improve the transportation experience for all users by integrating modes and improving the cultural, historic and environmental aspects of our transportation infrastructure.

-New Mexico Transportation Alternatives Program
Mission Statement

NM Transportation Alternatives Program Guide

Table of Contents

I. Program Background	5
A. Legislative History.....	5
B. Performance Management.....	5
2. Program Structure	6
A. Funding.....	6
B. Suballocation.....	6
C. Match.....	7
D. Cost Reimbursement / Sponsoring Agency.....	7
E. Availability.....	7
F. Project Selection.....	7
G. Eligible Entities.....	8
H. Ineligible Entities.....	8
I. Eligible Projects / Activities.....	9
J. Project Location.....	10
K. Ineligible Projects.....	10
3. Program Requirements	11
A. Compliance with Federal and State Requirements.....	11
B. Minimum Project Requirements.....	11
4. TAP Application & Selection Process Overview	12
A. Application Process.....	12
B. Required Documents.....	13
C. Project Selection Process.....	13
5. New Mexico TAP Project Selection Process	13
A. Introduction and Methodology.....	13
B. Scoring Matrix and Application Questions.....	15
6. Appendices	22
I. NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF) & TAP Application.....	22
II. TAP Scorecard	29
III. TAP Checklist / Cover Sheet.....	32
IV. Sample Resolution of Sponsorship.....	34
V. Federal & State Requirements.....	37
VI. NMDOT Environmental Review Scoping Form.....	38
VII. NMDOT Right of Way Handbook Introduction.....	40
VIII. NMDOT District Offices & Design Centers.....	41
IX. Additional Resources.....	42

NM Transportation Alternatives Program Guide

This document is intended as a guide for potential Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) applicants, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) and other transportation planning partners. It includes information on New Mexico's TAP structure, selection criteria, eligibility requirements, application process and funding distribution formula. Please direct any requests for additional information to:

Rosa Kozub / TAP Coordinator
1120 Cerrillos Road, South Building, I-N
P.O. Box 1149
Santa Fe, NM 87504
Tel. 505.476.3742
Email. Rosa.Kozub@state.nm.us

I. Program Background

A. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

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

TAP provides funding for: programs and projects for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, safe routes to school projects, historic preservation, environmental mitigation, recreational trails projects, and other infrastructure improvements to the transportation system.

TAP continues to build upon the legacy of the TE and SRTS programs by supporting community-based projects that expand travel choices, strengthen local economies, improve quality of life, protect the natural environment, and enhance transportation infrastructure. Projects may include the creation of bicycle or pedestrian facilities, streetscape improvements, stormwater management systems, or safe routes for non-drivers.

B. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The cornerstone of MAP-21's highway program is the transition to a performance and outcome based transportation program. Utilizing performance management processes, New Mexico will invest resources in projects to achieve individual targets that collectively will make progress toward national goals. MAP-21 established national performance goals (see box) that set the framework for how State DOTs will invest scarce transportation resources.

By Spring of 2014, or so, the Federal Transportation Secretary, in consultation with states, MPOs and other stakeholders, will have established national performance measures and will work with New Mexico to set performance targets in support of those measures. MAP-21 goes further to require that all states develop a competitive process specifi-

National Performance Goals

- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition
- Congestion Reduction
- System Reliability
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delays

cally for TAP project selection. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) encourages State Departments of Transportation to develop creative approaches to program structure and project implementation procedures.

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) views the development of a competitive process for TAP funds as an opportunity to develop transparent project solicitation, prioritization and selection processes. The result will be greater project quality, and infrastructure improvements that are supported by local, regional and State transportation planning efforts.

NM TAP Program Goals

1. The program's vision, goals, solicitation and selection processes are clear, understandable, reliable, and documented.
2. The program's vision, goals, solicitation, evaluation and selection processes are easily accessible by the public and supported by strong education and outreach efforts.
3. The operation of the program and the decision-making process are transparent and reliable.

2. Program Structure

Included in the following information is a summary of FHWA TAP Interim Guidance. More information is available at www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm.

A. FUNDING /

MAP-21 provides for the reservation of funds apportioned to a state under Section 104(b) of Title 23. The national total reserved for TAP each Federal Fiscal Year (the Federal Fiscal Year, or FFY, runs October 1 of a year through September 30 of the following year) is equal to 2% of the total amount authorized from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. Since MAP-21 is a two-year bill, the nationwide TAP amounts for FFY13 are known, but the FFY14 and FFY15 amounts are estimated, as follows:

FFY 2013 = \$808,760,000
FFY 2014 = \$819,900,000 (estimated)
FFY 2015 = \$819,900,000 (estimated)

Each state's TAP funding is determined by dividing the national total among the states based on each state's proportionate share of FY 2009 TE funding. In addition, New Mexico elected to continue the RTP, administered by the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, thus it is required to set aside a portion of TAP funds for this program. The FFY13 TAP funds have been programmed by NMDOT. The **estimated** breakdown of FFY14 and FFY15 TAP funds is as follows for each year (*the amounts do not include the State's obligation limitation, which is currently 94.6%*):

Total Reserved for NM TAP	\$7,281,999
NM Recreational Trails Set Aside	(\$1,429,831)
Balance Available for TAP	\$5,852,168

B. SUBALLOCATION /

Per MAP-21, 50% of NM's TAP apportionment (estimated at \$2,926,084 in FFY14) is suballocated to areas based on their relative share of the total State population with the remaining 50% (estimated at \$2,926,084 in FFY14) available for use in any area of the State.

The suballocation of TAP funds is made in the same manner as for Surface Transportation Program funds. Suballocated funds are divided into three categories:

- A. Urbanized Areas with population 200,000+
- B. Urban areas with population 5,001 to 200,000
- C. Areas with population 5,000 or less

The resulting distribution estimates for FFY14 and FFY15 TAP funds by population is as follows for each year (*these amounts do not include the State's obligation limitation*):

Total TAP Funds	\$5,852,168
A. Areas over 200K	\$1,097,051
B. 5K < Areas ≤ 200K	\$1,117,610
C. Areas ≤ 5K	\$711,423
D. Available for any Area	\$2,926,084

C. MATCH /

TAP requires a local or state match of 14.56% of the total project cost.

D. COST REIMBURSEMENT / SPONSORING AGENCY / TAP is a cost-reimbursement program. If your agency's application is selected for funding, the agency will enter into a Cooperative Agreement with NMDOT and serve as the sponsoring agency. As the sponsoring agency, your agency will be responsible for paying all costs up front and requesting reimbursement from the NMDOT by submitting an invoice and proof of payment. All costs submitted for reimbursement are subject to eligibility requirements.

Please note that any work completed before execution of the Cooperative Project Agreement is not eligible for reimbursement. For example, you cannot be reimbursed for costs associated with completing an application or for engineering/design work completed before the Cooperative Project Agreement is executed.

Sponsoring agencies are responsible for any costs that exceed the award amount.

E. AVAILABILITY /

TAP funds are available for the year authorized plus three Federal fiscal years, for a total of four years. Thus agencies that are awarded funds will have four years to spend the funds, unless the NMDOT determines otherwise.

F. PROJECT SELECTION / The NMDOT is responsible for administering TAP in New Mexico and developing a competitive and transparent application process. The FFY13 TAP funds have been programmed by NMDOT.

For urbanized areas with populations over 200,000 (Albuquerque and El Paso), the MPO selects the TAP projects through a competitive process in consultation with the NMDOT.

The NMDOT elected to distribute the FFY14 and FFY15 small urban and rural area TAP funds to the seven RPOs and five MPOs for programming, using the competitive process outlined in this document. The NMDOT developed this process in cooperation with the RPOs and MPOs, as well as with input from the New Mexico Division of FHWA. In addition to the process outlined, the MPOs will utilize the existing Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process. RPOs will submit their projects directly for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The MPOs and RPOs are re-

sponsible for programming FFY14 and FFY15 TAP funds by October 15, 2013. The NMDOT may, at its discretion, reallocate funding from MPOs or RPOs unable to program TAP funds by this date.

Sponsoring agencies are allowed to submit phased applications. For example, they may request FFY14 funds for design/engineering and FFY15 funds for construction, or they may phase construction over two years.

Prior to inclusion in the TIP or STIP, MPOs and RPOs must submit a list of prioritized projects to the NMDOT TAP Coordinator for review to ensure compliance with Federal and State laws and regulations. This list of projects and applications must be submitted to the Coordinator by October 1, 2013.

The New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department is responsible for administering the New Mexico Recreational Trails Program: <http://www.emnrd.state.nm.us/SPD/Rectrails.html>.

G. ELIGIBLE ENTITIES / The following entities are considered eligible project sponsors under TAP funding:

- local governments;
- regional transportation authorities;
- transit agencies;
- state and federal natural resource or public land agencies;
- school districts, local education agencies, or schools;
- tribal governments;
- Non-profits, NMDOT, MPOs and RPOs **only** if partnered with an eligible entity project sponsor; and
- any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than an MPO or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible, consistent with the goals of Subsection (c) of Section 213 of Title 23.

H. INELIGIBLE ENTITIES / The following entities are not considered eligible project sponsors under TAP:

- Nonprofits as direct grant recipients of the funds. Nonprofits are eligible to partner with any eligible entity on an eligible TAP project, if State or local requirements permit.
- State DOTs, MPOs and RPOs. State DOTs, MPOs or RPOs may partner with an eligible entity project sponsor to carry out a project.

I. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS / ACTIVITIES / Eligible projects and activities under the TAP program include:

- Planning, design and construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrian, bicyclists and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.
- Reconstruction and rehabilitation activities that are not considered routine maintenance (see Ineligible Projects on page 10) and either increase capacity of an existing facility and/or improve the functional condition of a system. Examples include resurfacing and widening an existing trail or reconstructing sidewalks to meet ADA requirements.
- Planning, design and construction of infrastructure related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.
- Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users.
- Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
- Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising.
- Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities.
- Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control.
- Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under this title.
- Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to, 1.) address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in Sections 133(b)(11), 328(a), and 329 of title 23; or, 2.) reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.

In addition to the above, the following projects and activities that meet the SRTS program requirements of Section 1404 of the SAFETEA-LU (<http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/saferoutes/guidance/>) are considered eligible for TAP funding:

- Planning, design, and construction of infrastructure projects on any public road or any bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail within two miles of a kindergarten through 8th (K-8) grade school that will sub-

stantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, including sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bicycle facilities, off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, secure bicycle parking facilities, and traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools.

- Non-infrastructure activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school, including public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs.
- Safe Routes to School coordinator.

J. PROJECT LOCATION / TAP projects are not required to be located along a Federal-aid highway. SRTS projects must be located within approximately two miles of a K-8th grade school.

K. INELIGIBLE PROJECTS / Section 1103 of MAP-21 eliminated certain activities which were previously eligible under the Transportation Enhancement, and Scenic Byway programs:

- Safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists (except activities targeting children in grades K-8, under SRTS).
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites and scenic or historic highway programs.
- Historic preservation as an independent activity unrelated to historic transportation facilities.
- Operation of historic transportation facilities.
- Archaeological planning and research undertaken for proactive planning.
- Transportation museums.
- TAP funds cannot be used for landscaping and scenic enhancement as independent projects. However, landscaping and scenic enhancements are eligible as part of the construction of any Federal-aid highway project under 23 U.S.C. 319, including TAP-funded projects.
- Routine maintenance is not eligible as a TAP activity except under the RTP. Routine maintenance consists of work that is planned and performed on a routine basis to maintain and preserve the condition of the transportation system or to respond to specific conditions/events that restore the system to an adequate level of service. Routine maintenance activities include repainting markings, filling potholes and filling cracks.

3. Program Requirements

The goal of the NM TAP Project Selection Process is to encourage and reward efforts that go above and beyond the minimum program requirements. The following is a list of the basic eligibility requirements that all NM TAP projects must meet.

A. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS /

TAP funds are Federal-aid funds and must be expended in accordance with all applicable Federal and State regulations. Applicants are advised that compliance with Federal and State regulations requires a significant time and resource commitment on the part of the applicant/sponsoring agency.

Applicants are encouraged to consider the following questions prior to submitting an application for TAP funding:

- Does the agency have the necessary staff to administer the funding?
- Does the agency have the funding to pay the costs until reimbursed?
- Does the agency have the funding to support costs that cannot be reimbursed?

Projects must comply with all applicable Federal and State requirements from project design through implementation/construction, administration and close-out. See Appendix V for an introduction and link to the Federal Highway Administration's Construction Program Guide, as well as NMDOT's Tribal/Local Government Agency Handbook.

B. MINIMUM PROJECT REQUIREMENTS /

In addition to the above, applicants for TAP funds are required to meet the following minimum requirements:

- Sponsoring agency and proposed activity/project must meet eligibility requirements (see pages 8-10).
- Sponsoring agency must provide a Resolution of Sponsorship indicating proof of local match (currently 14.56%), commitment to operating and maintaining the project for the useful life of the project, and availability of funds in agency budget to pay all project/program costs up front. See Appendix IV for sample resolution.
- Sponsoring agency must submit letter(s) of support from the jurisdiction(s) that has ownership over the affected right(s)-of-way. This requirement only applies when a project is not entirely located within the jurisdiction of the sponsoring entity.
- Sponsoring agency understands and agrees that there can be no change in the usage of any right-of-way or land ownership acquired, without prior approval from the NMDOT and FHWA.
- All certifications (environmental, right of way, ITS, utility and rail-

road) are required prior to obligation of funds.

- All TAP projects must be included in or consistent with the local Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan (ICIP) and/or other eligible planning documents. See page 14 for a list of potential documents.
- For MPOs, TAP projects must be consistent with their Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- All TAP projects must be included in the STIP, and if they take place in metropolitan areas, they must be in local TIPs.

4. TAP Application & Selection Process Overview

A. APPLICATION PROCESS

MPOs and RPOs are responsible for requesting, reviewing and ranking TAP projects in their respective areas. MPOs and RPOs must submit selected FFY14 and FFY15 TAP projects to the NMDOT TAP Coordinator by October 1, 2013.

Sponsoring agencies are allowed to submit phased applications, for example, requesting FFY14 funds for design/engineering and FFY15 funds for construction, or phasing construction over two years.

Prior to submitting an application for TAP funds, all potential applicants are required to consult with their MPO or RPO to ensure project eligibility. The respective MPO/RPO will work with the NMDOT TAP Coordinator to determine if the proposed project(s) and sponsoring agency are eligible to submit an application.

FFY14 and FFY15 Funding Cycle/Deadlines

The application process and funding cycle for programming FFY14 and FFY15 funds is as follows:

May 2013	MPOs/RPOs issue call for applications.
October 1, 2013	List of selected projects submitted to TAP Coordinator for final review.
October 15, 2013	MPOs/RPOs submit FFY14 and FFY15 TAP projects for STIP preview; NMDOT Local Government Agreement Unit (LGAU) starts Cooperative Project Agreement process.
November 30, 2013	MPO board approval of TIP Amendments due to NMDOT.
December 2013	Transportation Commission STIP meeting.
July 15, 2014	Certifications and final designs for FFY14 projects due to NMDOT.
September 30, 2014	NMDOT obligates FFY14 TAP project funds by this date and issues notice to proceed to sponsoring agency.
July 15, 2015	Certifications and final designs for FFY15 projects due to NMDOT.
September 30, 2015	NMDOT obligates FFY15 TAP project funds by this date and issues notice to proceed to sponsoring agency.

B. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Applicants must submit the following documents as part of the TAP application process:

- Project Identification Form (PIF) – see Appendix I
- TAP Application (see Appendix I) - submitted with PIF
- Resolution of Sponsorship (indicating proof of match, maintenance and budget from sponsoring entity) - see Appendix IV
- Letter(s) of support regarding right(s)-of-way (see page 11)

C. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

New Mexico's TAP project selection process is administered by MPOs and RPOs in collaboration with NMDOT. MPOs and RPOs shall work cooperatively with the NMDOT TAP Coordinator and District Offices to assist eligible applicants with the project development and application process. MPOs and RPOs will review and rank all eligible projects using the scoring factors outlined in the following section. The NMDOT TAP Coordinator will review the list of selected projects to ensure compliance with all applicable State/Federal requirements before projects are included in the STIP.

5. New Mexico TAP Project Selection Process

A. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

The NMDOT developed the following TAP project selection criteria in consultation with the NM MPOs and RPOs. The criteria will be used by all of the New Mexico RPOs and MPOs to review and rank applications submitted for TAP funding.

Scoring Factors:

The two most critical factors are Project Readiness and Planning. These factors are included on the Project Identification Form (PIF) and will be scored as follows:

Project Readiness

Projects that are “shovel-ready” will score the highest in this section. This section considers: Right-of-Way, Design, Environmental, Utility, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Railroad clearances. Documentation of certifications, clearances or proofs of exemption must be provided with the application. Projects receive 5 points for each certification, clearance or proof of exemption received, if documentation is submitted with application.

Planning

The Planning factor is intended to ensure that TAP projects are consistent with adopted plans and policies. If the TAP project is identified in a local, regional or state plan, study or other document (e.g. ICIP), this indicates a level of public involvement and support for the project. In addition to completing this section of the PIF, applicants must submit the documentation with the application. Rather than attaching the entire plan or document, please provide a copy of the title page and page(s) identifying the proposed TAP project(s). All TAP projects must be included in or consistent with the local ICIP **and/**

or other eligible planning documents. See the box below for a list of potential documents. If the proposed TAP project is included in the ICIP, the project is awarded 5 points. Proposed TAP projects identified in other plans receive 2 points per plan, with a maximum of 10 points available (meaning the project is listed in 5 documents). Documentation is required, as outlined above.

In addition to the Project Readiness and Planning considerations, eligible TAP projects are evaluated using the six factors described below, derived from the transportation planning factors outlined in Chapter 53 of Title 49, United States Code, as amended by MAP-21 (§ 5304).

1. Support **economic vitality** by enabling competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.
2. Increase the **safety and security** of the transportation system.
3. Increase the **accessibility and mobility of people by enhancing the integration and connectivity** of the transportation system.
4. **Protect and enhance the environment** by promoting energy or water conservation, improving quality of life, and promoting consistency between transportation improvements and locally planned land use goals.
5. Promote **efficient system management and operation**.
6. Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

Rather than merely a means of scoring projects against each other, the intent of the Project Selection Process is to serve as a guide for local entities developing TAP projects. The scoring factors are signals and targets for entities to identify in the project development process. All of the scoring factors will not apply to all projects. The factors are diverse and meant to pertain to many different types of projects, all working toward the broad transportation goals of MAP-21.

ELIGIBLE PLANNING DOCUMENTS

- State Long Range Plan
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans
- Economic Development Plans
- Comprehensive Plans
- Land Use Plans/Studies
- Corridor Studies
- Master Plans
- Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plans
- Sector Plans
- Road Safety Audits
- Regional Transportation Plans
- Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan (ICIP)
- Safety Plan
- And other documents deemed eligible by the reviewing MPO/RPO

B. SCORING MATRIX AND APPLICATION QUESTIONS

Scoring Factors	Possible Points
Project Readiness (up to 5 points for each certification/clearance/proof of exemption completed AND documentation is submitted with application). Refer to Project Readiness section of PIF.	
a. Right-of-Way	5
b. Design	5
c. Environmental Certification	5
d. Utility Clearances	5
e. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	5
f. Railroad	5
Planning (must provide documentation, such as cover of plan and page(s) on which project is identified). Refer to page I of PIF.	
a. Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan	5
b. Other eligible plans (2 points each, max of 10)	10
Factor 1: Economic Vitality	5
Factor 2: Safety and Security	5
Factor 3: Accessibility and Mobility through Integration and Connectivity	5
Factor 4: Protection and Enhancement of the Environment:	
a. Promote environmental conservation	5
b. Improve quality of life for residents	5
b. Achieve community's land use goals	5
Factor 5: Efficient System Management and Operation	5
Factor 6: System Preservation	5

Total	85
--------------	-----------

Responses to application questions are scored according to the following scale:

5 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides clear and compelling documentation on how the project meets and exceeds the factor.

4 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides some documentation on how the project meets the factor.

3 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor, and provides minimal documentation on how the project meets the factor.

2 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor in general, but does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.

1 point: The application demonstrates very little understanding of this factor, and does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.

0 points: Does not meet factor.

Factor 1: Economic Vitality

In addition to achieving transportation goals, TAP projects may provide positive economic impacts to a community. The economic vitality of an eligible TAP project is measured through economic impact to local, regional or statewide economic development efforts. Consider how the project interacts with activity centers, employment generators, or other economic development activities. For example, a potential project, such as a regional trail, could provide economic benefits to nearby local businesses by attracting tourists.

Application Question:

Provide detailed information on how your eligible TAP project will benefit local, regional and/or state economic development efforts. Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

Factor 2: Safety and Security

The livability of a community is related to safety and security. A community where it is safe to walk, bicycle and use transit will have more people on the streets interacting with neighbors, visiting businesses, walking to school and enjoying local amenities.

For example, installing solar lighting along a sidewalk to a park could increase the safety and security of children walking to the facility.

Note: for projects primarily focused on safety issues, such as high crash rates at an intersection, please consider whether your project would be better suited for the NMDOT Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). For more information on HSIP, contact your MPO or RPO representative.

Application Question:

Please explain the safety issue you are trying to address and provide any available data. Describe how your eligible TAP project will increase the safety and security of different user groups by making it safe for them to walk, bicycle or access public transit in their community. Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

Factor 3: Accessibility and Mobility through Integration and Connectivity

Access to destinations and people's mobility are defined by the integration and connectivity of a community's transportation system. Gaps exist in our transportation systems, creating congestion and making it difficult for people to access necessary services, such as a grocery store, hospital, or job centers. Integrating alternative transportation networks into a community or fixing gaps in existing systems can increase people's mobility and access to necessary services. This factor also considers intermodal connectivity between pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, and park-and-ride infrastructure.

For example, completion of a sidewalk between a transit stop and a nearby employment center would address an existing gap in the system, making the employment center more accessible and increasing mobility of the transit users. In addition, this would address intermodal connectivity.

Note: all Federally-funded transportation projects must meet the minimum standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Application Question:

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will increase accessibility and mobility through the integration and connectivity of transportation networks. Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

Linking bicycles and transit together is a win-win proposition.

- USDOT Bicycles + Transit website

Factor 4: Protect and Enhance the Environment

This factor emphasizes how TAP eligible projects can protect and enhance the environment, whether through the promotion of energy or water conservation, quality of life improvements, or the funding of transportation improvements that are consistent with local land use plans.

Projects may promote environmental conservation in diverse ways, from reducing motorized vehicle usage to erosion control vegetation in transportation system rights-of-way.

Projects can also provide a broad array of quality of life improvements, such as access to culturally or historically significant sites or through improved community health due to increased infrastructure for bicycling and walking.

Through local planning processes, governments and community members articulate land use visions and goals to improve or enhance community quality of life. These are incorporated into local planning documents. TAP projects may help communities achieve desired land use patterns and goals as described in local planning documents.

Examples of such projects could include bicycle lanes and sidewalks that increase multi-modal access to a school, thus reducing motor vehicle congestion, improving air quality and providing opportunities for daily physical activity, which helps improve quality of life and overall community health.

Application Question:

Please provide information as to how your eligible TAP project will:

- a) promote environmental conservation,*
- b) improve the quality of life for community residents, and*
- c) help achieve the community's desired land use goals, as described in local planning documents.*

Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

“Livability means being able to take your kids to school, go to work, see a doctor, drop by the grocery or post office, go out to dinner and a movie, and play with your kids at the park—all without having to get in your car.”

-Ray LaHood, U.S. DOT,
Secretary of Transportation
US DOT Livability Webinar.
September 24, 2009

Factor 5: Efficient System Management and Operations

TAP funds are Federal-aid funds. Project sponsors are required by Federal law to maintain projects constructed using Federal-aid funds. The project sponsor must acknowledge in the Resolution of Sponsorship (see page 11 and Appendix IV) both the short-term and long-term maintenance of the TAP project(s). The community may also have processes and maintenance plans in place that would benefit the maintenance and overall efficient system management and operation of the TAP project. For example, your community may have a maintenance plan for inspecting and re-painting crosswalks on an annual basis and a new crosswalk built with TAP funds would be integrated into this maintenance plan.

Application Question:

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will promote efficient system management and operation, particularly with regard to the maintenance of the TAP-funded improvement. Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

Factor 6: System Preservation

The costs of maintaining existing infrastructure can be burdensome to communities. As such, building new infrastructure in certain communities is not always the most appropriate course of action. Certain TAP projects may preserve or enhance existing infrastructure, thus eliminating additional costs to local communities. Potential projects include: safety improvements to existing infrastructure, or adaptive reuse of existing infrastructure. For example, your community has a closed bridge that is no longer safe for motor vehicles, but the community wants to convert the use of the bridge to a pedestrian and bicycle facility.

Application Question:

Please explain how your eligible TAP project will enhance, preserve or offer an adaptive reuse of existing infrastructure. Please cite and provide supporting documents or studies as necessary.

TAP Questions?

For all TAP project and application questions, please contact your MPO/RPO planning staff:

MPOs:

El Paso MPO

Christina Stokes
(915) 591-9735 x 34
cstokes@elpasompo.org

Farmington MPO

Joe Delmagori
(505) 599-1392
jdelmagori@fmrtn.org

Las Cruces MPO

Tom Murphy
(575) 528-3225
tmurphy@las-cruces.org

Mid-Region MPO

Steven Montiel
(505) 724-3633
smontiel@mrcog-nm.gov

Santa Fe MPO

Keith Wilson
(505) 955-6706
kpwilson@santafenm.gov

RPOs:

Mid-Region RPO

Loretta Tollefson
(505) 724-3611
ltollefson@mrcog-nm.gov

Northeast RPO

(within Eastern Plains Council of Governments)
Renee Ortiz
(575) 714-1410
rortiz@epcog.org
(within North Central NM Economic Development District)
Lesah Sedillo
(505) 476-0107
lsedillo@ncnmedd.com

Northern Pueblos RPO

Eric Ghahate
(505) 827-7333
ericg@ncnmedd.com

Northwest RPO

Robert Kuipers
(505) 722-4327
rkuipers@nwnmcog.com

South Central RPO

Tony MacRobert
(575) 744-0039
tmacrobert@sccog-nm.com

Southeast RPO

(within Eastern Plains Council of Governments)
Renee Ortiz
(575) 714-1410
rortiz@epcog.org
(within Southeastern NM Economic Development District/Council of Governments)
Mary Ann Burr
(575) 624-6131
mbsnmedd@plateautel.net

Southwest RPO

Ruben Medina
(505) 388-1509
rmedina@swnmcog.org

For all general questions about TAP, please contact the NMDOT TAP Coordinator:

Rosa Kozub
NMDOT TAP Coordinator
(505) 476-3742
rosa.kozub@state.nm.us

Appendix I: NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF) & TAP Application

To apply for TAP funds, eligible entities must first complete the NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF) and then the TAP Application, which is a supplement to the PIF.

Editable, electronic versions of this forms are available from the NMDOT TAP Coordinator.

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

**INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete all sections thoroughly.
See the end of this document for required distribution.**

1. **Date of Submittal:** Click here to enter date.
2. **Initial or Revised PIF?** Initial / Revised
3. **Is this project phased?** Yes / No **If phased:** Enter phase number and total # of phases.
4. **Sponsoring public entity:** Enter entity name. 5. **Project Name:** Enter project name.
Note: per MAP-21, Non-Profit Organizations cannot be lead agencies, but they can contribute to projects.

6. **Is the project on the ICIP?** Yes / No **If yes, year and priority #:** Year, priority # (if available)
7. **Is the project in or consistent with a MPO/RPO/Local planning document?** Yes / No
If yes, which document (MTP/SLRP/TTP/etc.): Enter document name and year.
8. **Is the project in the STIP?** Yes / No **If yes, year(s):** Enter year(s). **Control #:** Enter CN.
9. **Is the project on the MPO TIP/RPO RTIPR?** Yes / No **If yes, which year(s):** Enter year(s).
Notes: Please contact your MPO/RPO planner if this project is not in any local planning documents; if it is, please include the first page and the page on which the project is listed for any relevant documents.

10. **County:** Select a county.
11. **US Congressional District:** Select a district.
12. **New Mexico House District:** Enter House District.
13. **New Mexico Senate District:** Enter Senate District.

14. **Contact Person and/or PDE:** Click here to enter contact person/PDE name.
15. **Address:** Enter street address, city, state (if not NM), and zip code.
16. **Phone:** Enter phone #.
17. **Fax:** Enter fax #.
18. **E-mail:** Enter email address.
19. **MPO or RPO:** Select a MPO/RPO.
20. **NMDOT District #:** Select a district.

Project Description

21. **In the space below, please provide a narrative describing the Project, its Purpose and Need, i.e., the rationale behind the project. If this project has or will go through the NEPA process, the description below should match the NEPA description as closely as possible.**

Enter a project description – this field will expand as needed, but please be concise.

22. **Select an Improvement Type for the project:** Select the (primary) Improvement Type.

Notes: See FMIS Improvement Type Codes for complete improvement descriptions. List additional improvement types here:

Enter improvement type(s), including improvement type number.

Project Details (fill out where applicable)

23. **Route # or (Street) Name:** Enter route number or name. 24. **Length (mi.):** Enter length in miles.
25. **Begin mile post/intersection:** Enter begin point. 26. **End mile post/intersect.:** Enter end point.
27. **Directions from nearest major intersection or landmark:** Enter directions, field will expand.
28. **Google Maps link (see tutorial for help):** Enter shortened Google Maps URL [goo.gl/maps/xxxx].
29. **Roadway FHWA Functional Classification(s):** Select a road type, or enter road types.
-

Funding Information

30. **Has this project received Federal funding previously?** Yes / No **If yes, which years?** Enter year(s).
Which program(s)? Enter program(s).

Please Itemize the Total Project Costs by Type

31. **Environmental/Planning:** Enter \$ amount. 32. **Preliminary Engineering:** Enter dollar amount.
33. **Design:** Enter dollar amount. 34. **Right-Of-Way:** Enter dollar amount.
35. **Construction:** Enter dollar amount. 36. **Other (specify):** Enter cost type, dollar amount.

Funding Sources

List all sources and amounts of funding, both requested and committed, for the project.

37. **Total Project Cost Estimate:** Enter TOTAL dollar amount, to match sum of all other funds below.
38. **Local/County/Tribal Gov't Funds*:** Dollar amount, source. [Committed/Not Committed]
39. **State Funds:** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
40. **Tribal Transportation Program (TTP):** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
41. **Other Federal grants:** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
42. **Federal Funds (STP/CMAQ/TAP funds requested):** Enter dollar amount.

** Identify the specific local/ city/ county/ tribal government fund(s) source, such as gas tax, sales tax, etc.*

Project Readiness

This is a list of certifications, clearances, and other processes that could apply to the project. These steps may not be required at this time, but could be necessary at a later date. Identify the **date** that the certification or clearance was received **OR** if a certification/ clearance is under way **OR** will be started in the future **OR** the step is not applicable (N/A). **Do not leave any field blank.**

43. **Public Involvement:** Date completed, under way, OR to be started.

44. **Right of Way:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
45. **Design:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
46. **Environmental Certification**:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
47. **Utility Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
48. **ITS Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
49. **Railroad Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
50. **Other Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.

** NEPA assessment may evaluate: Threatened & Endangered Species, Surface Water Quality (Clean Water Act), Ground Water Quality, Wetlands, NPDES Permit, Noxious weeds, Air Quality Analysis, Noise Analysis, Hazardous Materials Analysis, and other areas; 4-F properties. NHPA Section 106 Cultural Resources Investigation may include: coordination with land management agencies and State Historic Preservation Officer, Cultural Properties Inventory (buildings recorded), Traditional Cultural Property Inventory (consult with appropriate Native American tribes), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer and State Historic Preservation Officer. **For a full list of environmental and cultural areas that may be evaluated, see the Tribal/Local Government Agreement Handbook.**

Project Planning Factors

Below are the federally mandated planning factors for all transportation projects. Please check all that apply and provide a brief explanation of how the project addresses the factor. Comment area will expand as needed.

NOTE: if you are applying for TAP funds, leave this section blank and complete the supplemental TAP application.

51. ☐ **Economic Vitality:** Type explanation.
52. ☐ **Safety for Motorized and Non-motorized Users:** Type explanation.
53. ☐ **Security for Motorized and Non-motorized Users:** Type explanation.
54. ☐ **Accessibility and Mobility of People and Freight:** Type explanation.
55. ☐ **Environment, Energy Conservation, Quality of Life:** Type explanation.
56. ☐ **Integration and Connectivity:** Type explanation.
57. ☐ **System Management and Operation:** Type explanation.
58. ☐ **System Preservation:** Type explanation.
-

REQUIRED DISTRIBUTION

59. **Send a completed electronic version** to appropriate RPO/MPO, District staff, and NMDOT Planning liaison.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Applicants are required to read through the FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide prior to completing this application. Please complete the Project Identification Form (PIF) first, and then complete this TAP application form.

Introduction

As outlined in the FFY14/15 NM TAP Guide, this application will be used by all of the New Mexico RPOs and MPOs to score and rank projects submitted for TAP funding. The process is competitive and the highest scoring projects within each MPO/RPO will be the first priority for funding.

Please refer to the FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide when filling out this application, as the Guide provides information on the application questions, the overall TAP process, eligible entities and eligible projects. *Before submitting an application, local agencies are required to consult with their MPO/RPO to ensure eligibility.*

Basic Project Information

- A. Date of Submittal: [Click here to enter date.](#) B. Sponsoring public entity: [Enter entity name.](#)
C. Project Name: [Enter project name.](#)

Project Readiness and Planning

Two of the most critical factors in project selection are Project Readiness and Planning. MPOs and RPOs will score these factors based upon information you provide on the PIF and your supporting documentation. NMDOT does not expect that most TAP projects will score highly on project readiness; however, preference will be given to those projects closer to “shovel ready.”

Project Readiness: Scorers will refer to the “Project Readiness” section of the PIF. *Applicants must provide documentation of all certifications/clearances/proofs of exemption received*, in order to score points. Applications will receive 5 points each for documented: Right-of-Way, Design, Environmental, Utility, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Railroad.

Planning: Scorers will refer to the first page of the PIF, where applicants indicate if the project is part of the local Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan (ICIP) and/or other plans. Additionally, *applicants must provide documentation of all plans in which the project is identified*. Please include the cover sheet and the page(s) where the project is referenced. *Do not send entire plans*. If documentation is provided indicating that the project is in the ICIP, the application will receive 5 points. Two additional points will be awarded for each additional plan that includes the project, up to a maximum of 10 points. For a list of eligible planning documents, refer to page 14 of the NM TAP Guide.

Additional Scoring Factors

Beyond project readiness and planning, TAP projects are evaluated on the following factors, which are derived from the “planning factors” outlined in Federal transportation legislation. Responses to the questions will be scored according to the following scale:

- 5 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides clear and compelling documentation on how the project meets and exceeds the factor.

- 4 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides some documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 3 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor, and provides minimal documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 2 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor in general, but does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 1 point: The application demonstrates very little understanding of this factor, and does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 0 points: Does not meet factor.

In your application packet, provide any supporting documentation that is referenced in your responses to 1-6 below.

Your responses are **limited to 250 words** for each question below.

1. Economic Vitality

Provide detailed information on how your eligible TAP project will benefit local, regional and/or state economic development efforts. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter details regarding economic vitality, citing supporting documents or studies related to your project.

2. Safety and Security

Please explain the safety issue you are trying to address and provide any available data. Describe how your eligible TAP project will increase the safety and security of different user groups by making it safe for them to walk, bicycle or access public transit in their community. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding safety and security, and provide any available data related to your project.

3. Accessibility and Mobility through Integration and Connectivity

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will increase accessibility and mobility through the integration and connectivity of transportation networks. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding the accessibility, mobility, integration and connectivity of your project.

4. Protection and Enhancement of the Environment

Please provide information as to how your TAP project will promote environmental conservation. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information describing how your project will promote environmental conservation.

Please describe how your TAP project will improve the quality of life for community residents. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding how your project will improve the quality of life for the community.

Please explain how your TAP project will help achieve the community's desired land use goals, as described in local planning documents. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information explaining how your project will help achieve desired land use goals.

5. Efficient System Management and Operation

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will promote efficient system management and operation, particularly with regard to the maintenance of the TAP-funded improvement. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information detailing how your project will promote efficient system management and operation.

6. System Preservation

Please explain how your eligible TAP project will enhance, preserve or offer an adaptive reuse of existing infrastructure. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding how your project will enhance, preserve, or adaptively reuse infrastructure.

Application Submission

Please submit two copies of your entire application package to your MPO/RPO planner or contact. See page 21 of the NM TAP Guide for this information.

Your application should include:

1. NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. TAP Application
3. Resolution of Sponsorship from the sponsoring entity, indicating proof of local match, maintenance commitment, and available budget to pay project costs up front.
4. Letter(s) of support from the jurisdiction(s) that has ownership over affected right(s)-of-way. This is only required if the project is not entirely within the jurisdiction of sponsoring entity.
5. Any documentation—such as plans, certifications or studies—that are referenced and support the application.

Appendix II: TAP Scorecard

MPOs and RPOs will use the TAP Scorecard, found on the following pages, when scoring TAP project applications.

An editable, electronic version of this form is available from the NMDOT TAP Coordinator.

New Mexico Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Scorecard

Funding for FFY2014 and FFY2015

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Scorecard is intended to be used by MPOs and RPOs to score FFY14/15 TAP applications received from local entities within the applicable RPO/MPO planning area. Prior to accepting a TAP application, the MPO/RPO is required to screen the project AND entity for eligibility, according to the requirements outlined in the FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide. MPOs/RPOs will use the following point scale and scorecard to assess the application packets, which should include, at minimum:

1. NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. TAP Application (a supplement to the PIF)
3. Resolution of Sponsorship from sponsoring entity, indicating proof of local match, maintenance commitment, and available budget to pay project costs up front
4. Letter(s) of support from the jurisdiction(s) that has ownership over affected right(s)-of-way (only required if project is not entirely within the jurisdiction of sponsoring entity).
5. Any documentation supporting the application, such as:
 - a. Certifications, clearances or proofs of exemption for:
 - i. Right-of-Way
 - ii. Design
 - iii. Environmental
 - iv. Utility
 - v. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
 - vi. Railroad
 - b. Planning documentation, including the Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan (ICIP) or other plans in which the project is referenced. *Note: entities should **only** submit the cover page and page(s) where the project is identified.*
 - c. Any other supporting documentation referenced in the application responses that the entity wishes to be considered as part of the application packet.

When reviewing applications, the scorer(s), whether planning staff or RPO/MPO membership, should apply the scoring method as consistently as possible across all applications.

Responses to the narrative questions on the TAP Application are scored according to the following scale:

- 5 points:** The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides clear and compelling documentation on how the project meets and exceeds the factor.
- 4 points:** The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides some documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 3 points:** The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor, and provides minimal documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 2 points:** The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor in general, but does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 1 point:** The application demonstrates very little understanding of this factor, and does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 0 points:** Does not meet factor.

TAP Scorecard: FFY2014 and FFY2015

Project Sponsoring Entity: _____

Project Name: _____

Scorer's Name / Scoring Entity: _____

Date: _____ Name of MPO/RPO: _____

Population Target Area: ___ 200,000+ ___ 5,001-199,999 ___ 5,000 or less

Scoring Factors	Possible	Points
For the <u>Project Readiness and Planning</u> Scoring Factors, refer to the PIF, supporting documentation, and p. 13-14 of NM TAP Guide.		
Project Readiness: Refer to the list below (a-f). Award 5 points for each certification/clearance/proof of exemption that is completed AND documentation is provided in the application packet. Application receives 0 points if documentation is not provided. Refer to Project Readiness section of PIF.		
a. Right-of-Way	5	
b. Design	5	
c. Environmental Certification	5	
d. Utility Clearances	5	
e. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	5	
f. Railroad	5	
Planning: Award 5 points if the project is included in the ICIP. Award 2 points for each additional plan that includes the project, up to a maximum of 10 points. For both the ICIP and other plans, the application must include appropriate documentation, including the cover page of the plan and the page(s) on which the project is identi-		
a. Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan (ICIP)	5	
b. Other eligible plans (2 points each, max of 10)	10	
For Scoring Factors 1-6, refer to the TAP Application and p. 17-20 of NM TAP Guide.		
Factor 1: Economic Vitality	5	
Factor 2: Safety and Security	5	
Factor 3: Accessibility and Mobility through Integration and Connectivity	5	
Factor 4: Protection and Enhancement of the Environment:		
a. Promote environmental conservation	5	
b. Improve quality of life for residents	5	
c. Achieve community's land use goals	5	
Factor 5: Efficient System Management and Operation	5	
Factor 6: System Preservation	5	
Total:	85	

Appendix III: TAP Checklist / Cover Sheet

The TAP Checklist / Cover Sheet on the following page is to be used by MPO/RPO staff when submitting their TAP projects to the NMDOT TAP Coordinator.

An editable, electronic version of this form is available from the NMDOT TAP Coordinator.

TAP Checklist / Cover Sheet: FFY2014 and FFY2015

MPOs/RPOs must complete and send this form to the NMDOT TAP Coordinator, along with selected application packages and scorecards.

MPO/RPO: _____ Date: _____

1. List all projects *submitted* and each project's total score. Add rows as necessary.

Sponsoring Entity	Project Name	Total Score

2. List all projects *selected* and each project's total score. Add rows as necessary.

Sponsoring Entity	Project Name	Total Score

3. Enter total funding allocated for selected projects in each population target area for each FFY:

Population Target Areas	FFY 2014 Programmed	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2015 Programmed	FFY 2015 Target
200,000 +	\$	\$	\$	\$
5,001-199,999	\$	\$	\$	\$
Under 5,000	\$	\$	\$	\$

4. Summarize the application review and selection process used by your MPO/RPO. Include relevant meetings and the dates of those meetings.
5. All applications must be reviewed by the applicable DOT District. Please describe how your DOT District office was involved in the TAP application review/selection process.

Attach copies of complete application packages and scorecards for *selected* projects. Submit them either electronically or via USPS to the NMDOT TAP Coordinator by **October 1, 2013**:

Rosa Kozub
Transportation Planning & Safety Division
P.O. Box 1149
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1149
rosa.kozub@state.nm.us

Appendix IV: Sample Resolution of Sponsorship

The following pages contain a sample Resolution of Sponsorship for sponsoring agencies to use in order to demonstrate support for the TAP application, as well as the availability of funds and acknowledgement of maintenance responsibility. The Resolution of Sponsorship is a required component of the TAP application package, as described on page 11 of this Guide.

An editable, electronic version of this form is available from the NMDOT TAP Coordinator.

RESOLUTION OF SPONSORSHIP
For a Transportation Alternatives Program Application and Maintenance
Commitment

Resolution No. _____

A resolution declaring the eligibility and intent of the <name of sponsoring entity> to submit an application to the New Mexico Department of Transportation for Federal Fiscal Year 2014/2015 Transportation Alternatives Program funds.

Whereas, the <name of sponsoring agency>, New Mexico, has the legal authority to apply for, receive and administer federal funds; and,

Whereas, the <name of sponsoring agency>, is submitting an application for Federal Fiscal Year 2014/2015 (FFY14/15) New Mexico Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds in the amount of \$_____, as set forth by the Federal legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and as outlined in the FFY 14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide; and,

Whereas, the <identify project(s)> named in the TAP application are eligible project(s) under New Mexico TAP and MAP-21; and,

Whereas, the <name of sponsoring agency>, acknowledges availability of the required local match of _____% and the availability of funds to pay all upfront costs, since TAP is a cost reimbursement program; and,

Whereas, the <name of sponsoring agency>, agrees to pay any costs that exceed the project amount if the application is selected for funding; and,

Whereas, the <name of sponsoring agency>, agrees to maintain all project(s) constructed with TAP funding for the useable life of the project(s); and,

Now, therefore be it resolved by the governing body of the <name of sponsoring agency>, New Mexico, that:

1. The <name of sponsoring agency>, authorizes <agency representative> to submit an application for FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP funds in the amount of \$_____, from the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) on behalf of the citizens of <name of agency>.

2. That the <name of sponsoring agency>, assures the NMDOT that if TAP funds are awarded, sufficient funding for the local match and for upfront project costs are available, since TAP is a reimbursement program, and that any costs exceeding the award amount will be paid for by <name of sponsoring agency>.

3. That the <name of sponsoring agency>, assures the NMDOT that if awarded TAP funds, sufficient funding for the operation and maintenance of the TAP projects will be available for the life of the projects.

4. That the <agency representative> of <name of sponsoring agency>, is authorized to enter into a Cooperative Project Agreement with the NMDOT for construction of TAP projects using these funds as set forth by MAP-21 on behalf of the citizens of <name of agency>. The <agency representative> is also authorized to submit additional information as may be required and act as the official representative of the <name of agency> in this and subsequent related activities.

5. That the <name of sponsoring agency>, assures the NMDOT that the <name of sponsoring agency>, is willing and able to administer all activities associated with the proposed project.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this _____ day of 2013.

(Name of sponsoring agency)

(Agency representative), (Title)

ATTEST:

(Name), (Clerk or other appropriate entity staff)

Appendix V: Federal & State Requirements

To understand the Federal requirements associated with the construction aspects of TAP funding, please visit the Federal Highway Administration's Construction Program Guide web-site:

"The Construction Program Guide is intended to provide fast, easy access to Federal-aid construction program regulations, policy, guidance, and training. All construction related information is consolidated under key subject areas, with links to related information. The web site provides a consolidated source for Federal and State construction personnel to find updated information about FHWA's construction program."

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/construction/cqit/>

Applications should also review NMDOT's Tribal/Local Government Agency Handbook (currently under revision) to understand the State processes:

"The Tribal/Local Government Agency (T/LGA) Handbook is published by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (Department or NMDOT). This handbook provides guidance to tribal and local government agencies working to develop and construct highway, street, road, and other multi modal transportation related projects, funded by the Department with federal and/or state funds."

http://dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Local_Government_Agreement_Unit/TLGA_HANDBOOK_October07.pdf

Appendix VI: NMDOT Environmental Review Scoping Form

Please see next page for the Environmental Review scoping form. This form will allow NMDOT's Environmental Section to establish the level of environmental review for your project.

Local & Tribal Government Projects Funded Through NMDOT

The environmental review process is a critical part of planning a proposed action, and all local/tribal governments must obtain an environmental certification for their projects receiving funds administered through NMDOT. To determine the level of effort for environmental certification, please submit the following information by mail or email to Gwyneth Duncan, NMDOT Environmental Section, P.O. Box 1149, Room 205, and Santa Fe, NM 87504-1149. Email: gwyneth.duncan@state.nm.us. Phone: 505-827-0751.

Please do not send files over 7 MB via email.

- 1. Control Number (CN) and/or Project Number (PN).**
- 2. Attach first 2 pages of the Cooperative Agreement.**
- 3. If FHWA funded, attach page of STIP listing the project.**
- 4. City/Town/Village, or County, or Tribe/Pueblo** that is the **local lead** for the project. Include contact name, title, address, phone number, and [email address](#).
- 5. Engineering Firm and Environmental Consultant** retained by the local lead. Include contact name, title, address, phone number, and [email address](#) for each.
- 6. NMDOT Project Development Engineer** reviewing your project:
- 7. Purpose and Need:**
- 8. Project Description.** Include **nearest town, highway number or road name, termini**. Provide scope of activities associated with the project (e.g., drainage improvements, sidewalks, etc.). Describe the **width** and **length** of each construction activity and **depth(s)** of ground disturbance. **Public involvement?**
- 9. A map and photos of your project area are required.** Indicate the project area on map showing the **beginning** of the project area (**BOP**) and the **end** of the project area (**EOP**). Provide **photos** of the BOP & EOP as well as any drainage(s) in the project area.
- 10. Total Cost of Project?** _____ **Funding available through construction?**
- 11. List all funding sources (including CDBG and other sources):**

State Funded? Yes___ No___	Federally Funded? Yes___ No___	Local Gov % _____
Type of funds _____	Type of funds _____	Type of funds _____
Amount _____	Amount _____	Amount _____
- 12. Land status.** Is the highway right of way adjacent to:
Private land? **BLM** land? **Forest Service** land? **Tribal** land? **State Trust** land?
- 13. Will new right-of-way be required?** This also includes Construction Maintenance Easements (CMEs) or Temporary Construction Permits (TCPs):
- 14. List any issues associated with the project or with the project area** (such as a Superfund site)
- 15. Biological and cultural resource surveys are *not* always required!** If these types of surveys have been conducted, please indicate.

Appendix VII: NMDOT Right of Way Handbook Introduction

The NMDOT Right of Way (ROW) Handbook offers extensive information on acquiring ROW for projects. Below is the introduction to the purpose of the Handbook:

The purpose of the Right of Way Procedural Manual (Handbook) is to present the legal authority and the administrative procedures governing the functions of the Right of Way Bureau.

It is the responsibility of Department staff or persons contracting with the Right of Way Bureau to know, understand and to adhere to the provisions of the Handbook when conducting right of way business.

This Handbook will help to ensure that state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to the right of way program are implemented in a manner that is efficient and cost effective.

The Department's practice for all right of way functions shall be conducted to assure that no individual shall be subjected to discrimination or be denied benefits to which he/she is entitled, on the grounds of race, color, sex, national origin, age, religion or handicap.

The Handbook is intended to ensure that owners of property, displaced persons, and/or others are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably so that such persons will not suffer disproportionate injury as a result of projects designed for the benefits of the public as a whole and to ensure that the Department implements these regulations in a manner that is efficient and cost-effective.

In general, the Handbook has been developed for the Department's use in administration of the right of way program and is designed to assist Department right of way personnel and other governmental agencies when utilizing Federal-aid funds in complying with both state and federal laws, regulations, directives, and standards. The Handbook is intended to be in sufficient detail to adequately describe particular functions, and the operational procedures through which those functions will be accomplished.

The entire handbook can be viewed here:

http://dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Infrastructure/ROW_Handbook.pdf

Appendix VIII: NMDOT District Offices & Design Centers

District 1:

2912 E. Pine St.
Deming, NM 88030
Main: (575) 544-6530

District 2:

4505 W. Second St.
Roswell, NM 88201
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 1457
Roswell, NM 88202
Main: (575) 637-7200

District 3:

7500 Pan American Blvd.
Albuquerque, NM 87199
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 91750
Albuquerque, NM 87199
Main: (505) 798-6600

District 4:

South Highway 85
Las Vegas, NM 87701
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 10
Las Vegas, NM 87701
Main: (505) 454-3600

District 5:

7315 Cerrillos Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87502
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 4127
Santa Fe, NM 87502
Main: (505) 476-4100

District 6:

1919 Pinon Dr.
Milan, NM 87021
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 2160
Milan, NM 87021
Main: (505) 285-3200

North Regional Design Center:

1120 Cerrillos Rd.
Room 225
Santa Fe, NM 87504
Administrator: (505) 827-3284

Central Regional Design Center:

7500 Pan American Freeway NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
Business Operations: (505) 222-6776

South Regional Design Center:

750 N. Solano Dr.
Las Cruces, NM 88001
Administrator: (575) 525-7333

Appendix IX: Additional Resources

Pedestrian Facility Design Resources

Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities, A Recommended Practice, 1998. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, S.W, Suite 410, Washington, DC 20024-2729, Phone: (202) 554-8050.

Pedestrian Compatible Roadways-Planning and Design Guidelines, 1995. Bicycle / Pedestrian Transportation Master Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advocate, New Jersey Department of Transportation, 1035 Parkway Avenue, Trenton, NJ 08625, Phone: (609) 530-4578.

Improving Pedestrian Access to Transit: An Advocacy Handbook, 1998. Federal Transit Administration / WalkBoston. NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

Planning and Implementing Pedestrian Facilities in Suburban and Developing Rural Areas, Report No. 294A, Transportation Research Board, Box 289, Washington, DC 20055, Phone: (202) 334-3214.

Pedestrian Facilities Guidebook, 1997. Washington State Department of Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, P.O. Box 47393, Olympia, WA 98504.

Portland Pedestrian Design Guide, 1998. Portland Pedestrian Program, 1120 SW Fifth Ave, Room 802; Portland, OR 97210. (503) 823-7004.

Implementing Pedestrian Improvements at the Local Level, 1999. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), HSR 20, 6300 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA .

Guide to the Development of Pedestrian Facilities, 2004. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), P.O. Box 96716, Washington, DC, 20090-6716, Phone: (888) 227-4860.

Bicycle Facility Design Resources

Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), P.O. Box 96716, Washington, DC, 20090-6716, Phone: (888) 227-4860.

Implementing Bicycle Improvements at the Local Level, (1998), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), HSR 20, 6300 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA .

Bicycle Facility Design Standards, 1998. City of Philadelphia Streets Department, 1401 JFK Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicyclists, 1993. Federal Highway Administration

(FHWA), R&T Report Center, 9701 Philadelphia Ct, Unit Q; Lanham, MD 20706.

North Carolina Bicycle Facilities Planning and Design Guidelines, 1994. North Carolina Department of Transportation, P.O. Box 25201, Raleigh, NC 27611. (919) 733-2804.

Bicycle Facility Planning, 1995. Pinsof & Musser. American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report # 459. American Planning Association, 122 S. Michigan Ave, Suite 1600; Chicago, IL 60603.

Florida Bicycle Facilities Planning and Design Manual, 1994. Florida Department of Transportation, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Office, 605 Suwannee Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399.

Evaluation of Shared-use Facilities for Bicycles and Motor Vehicles, 1996. Florida Department of Transportation, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Office, 605 Suwannee Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Resources

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 1995. Oregon Department of Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, Room 210, Transportation Building, Salem, OR 97310, Phone: (503) 986-3555

Improving Conditions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians, A Best Practices Report, 1998. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), HEP 10, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

Traffic Calming Design Resources

Traffic Calming: State of the Practice. 1999. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, SW, Suite 410; Washington, DC 20024.

Florida Department of Transportation's Roundabout Guide. Florida Department of Transportation, 605 Suwannee St., MS-82, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450.

National Bicycling and Walking Study. Case Study # 19, Traffic Calming and Auto-Restricted Zones and other Traffic Management Techniques-Their Effects on Bicycling and Pedestrians, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Traffic Calming (1995), American Planning Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60603

Traditional Neighborhood Development Street Design Guidelines, 1997. Proposed Recommended Practice, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, SW, Suite 410; Washington, DC 20024.

Making Streets that Work, City of Seattle, 600 Fourth Ave., 12th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104-1873, Phone: (206) 684-4000, Fax: (206) 684-5360.

Traffic Control Manual for In-Street Work, 1994. Seattle Engineering Department, City of Seattle, 600 4th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-6967, Phone: (206) 684-5108.

ADA-related Design Resources

Accessible Pedestrian Signals, 1998. U.S. Access Board 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Accessible Rights of Way: A Design Manual, 1999. U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Part One. 1999. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), HEPH-30, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities, 1998 (ADAAG). U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, 1984 (UFAS), available from the U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253

Universal Access to Outdoor Recreation: A Design Guide, 1993. PLAE, Inc, MIG Communications, 1802 Fifth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710. (510) 845-0953.

Recommended Street Design Guidelines for People Who Are Blind or Visually Impaired. American Council of the Blind, 1155 15th Street NW, Suite 720; Washington, DC 20005. (202) 467-5081.



TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Applicants are required to read through the FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide prior to completing this application. Please complete the Project Identification Form (PIF) first, and then complete this TAP application form.

Introduction

As outlined in the FFY14/15 NM TAP Guide, this application will be used by all of the New Mexico RPOs and MPOs to score and rank projects submitted for TAP funding. The process is competitive and the highest scoring projects within each MPO/RPO will be the first priority for funding.

Please refer to the FFY14/15 New Mexico TAP Guide when filling out this application, as the Guide provides information on the application questions, the overall TAP process, eligible entities and eligible projects. *Before submitting an application, local agencies are required to consult with their MPO/RPO to ensure eligibility.*

Basic Project Information

- A. Date of Submittal: [Click here to enter date.](#) B. Sponsoring public entity: [Enter entity name.](#)
C. Project Name: [Enter project name.](#)
-

Project Readiness and Planning

Two of the most critical factors in project selection are Project Readiness and Planning. MPOs and RPOs will score these factors based upon information you provide on the PIF and your supporting documentation. NMDOT does not expect that most TAP projects will score highly on project readiness; however, preference will be given to those projects closer to “shovel ready.”

Project Readiness: Scorers will refer to the “Project Readiness” section of the PIF. *Applicants must provide documentation of all certifications/clearances/proofs of exemption received*, in order to score points. Applications will receive 5 points each for documented: Right-of-Way, Design, Environmental, Utility, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Railroad.

Planning: Scorers will refer to the first page of the PIF, where applicants indicate if the project is part of the local Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Plan (ICIP) and/or other plans. Additionally, *applicants must provide documentation of all plans in which the project is identified*. Please include the cover sheet and the page(s) where the project is referenced. *Do not send entire plans*. If documentation is provided indicating that the project is in the ICIP, the application will receive 5 points. Two additional points will be awarded for each additional plan that includes the project, up to a maximum of 10 points. For a list of eligible planning documents, refer to page 14 of the NM TAP Guide.

Additional Scoring Factors

Beyond project readiness and planning, TAP projects are evaluated on the following factors, which are derived from the “planning factors” outlined in Federal transportation legislation. Responses to the questions will be scored according to the following scale:

- 5 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides clear and compelling documentation on how the project meets and exceeds the factor.

- 4 points: The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of how this factor applies, and provides some documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 3 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor, and provides minimal documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 2 points: The application demonstrates a basic understanding of this factor in general, but does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 1 point: The application demonstrates very little understanding of this factor, and does not provide any documentation on how the project meets the factor.
- 0 points: Does not meet factor.

In your application packet, provide any supporting documentation that is referenced in your responses to 1-6 below.

*Your responses are **limited to 250 words** for each question below.*

1. Economic Vitality

Provide detailed information on how your eligible TAP project will benefit local, regional and/or state economic development efforts. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter details regarding economic vitality, citing supporting documents or studies related to your project.

2. Safety and Security

Please explain the safety issue you are trying to address and provide any available data. Describe how your eligible TAP project will increase the safety and security of different user groups by making it safe for them to walk, bicycle or access public transit in their community. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding safety and security, and provide any available data related to your project.

3. Accessibility and Mobility through Integration and Connectivity

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will increase accessibility and mobility through the integration and connectivity of transportation networks. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding the accessibility, mobility, integration and connectivity of your project.

4. Protection and Enhancement of the Environment

Please provide information as to how your TAP project will promote environmental conservation. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information describing how your project will promote environmental conservation.

Please describe how your TAP project will improve the quality of life for community residents. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding how your project will improve the quality of life for the community.

Please explain how your TAP project will help achieve the community's desired land use goals, as described in local planning documents. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information explaining how your project will help achieve desired land use goals.

5. Efficient System Management and Operation

Please describe how your eligible TAP project will promote efficient system management and operation, particularly with regard to the maintenance of the TAP-funded improvement. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information detailing how your project will promote efficient system management and operation.

6. System Preservation

Please explain how your eligible TAP project will enhance, preserve or offer an adaptive reuse of existing infrastructure. Please cite and provide any supporting documents or studies.

Enter information regarding how your project will enhance, preserve, or adaptively reuse infrastructure.

Application Submission

Please submit two copies of your entire application package to your MPO/RPO planner or contact. See page 21 of the NM TAP Guide for this information.

Your application should include:

1. NMDOT Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. TAP Application
3. Resolution of Sponsorship from the sponsoring entity, indicating proof of local match, maintenance commitment, and available budget to pay project costs up front.
4. Letter(s) of support from the jurisdiction(s) that has ownership over affected right(s)-of-way. This is only required if the project is not entirely within the jurisdiction of sponsoring entity.
5. Any documentation—such as plans, certifications or studies—that are referenced and support the application.



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete all sections thoroughly.
See the end of this document for required distribution.

1. Date of Submittal: [Click here to enter date.](#)
 2. Initial or Revised PIF? [Initial / Revised](#)
 3. Is this project phased? [Yes / No](#) If phased: [Enter phase number and total # of phases.](#)
 4. Sponsoring public entity: [Enter entity name.](#)
 5. Project Name: [Enter project name.](#)
- Note: per MAP-21, Non-Profit Organizations cannot be lead agencies, but they can contribute to projects.*
-
6. Is the project on the ICIP? [Yes / No](#) If yes, year and priority #: [Year, priority # \(if available\)](#)
 7. Is the project in or consistent with a MPO/RPO/Local planning document? [Yes / No](#)
If yes, which document (MTP/SLRP/TTP/etc.): [Enter document name and year.](#)
 8. Is the project in the STIP? [Yes / No](#) If yes, year(s): [Enter year\(s\).](#) Control #: [Enter CN.](#)
 9. Is the project on the MPO TIP/RPO RTIPR? [Yes / No](#) If yes, which year(s): [Enter year\(s\).](#)
- Notes: Please contact your MPO/RPO planner if this project is not in any local planning documents; if it is, please include the first page and the page on which the project is listed for any relevant documents.*
-
10. County: [Select a county.](#)
 11. US Congressional District: [Select a district.](#)
 12. New Mexico House District: [Enter House District.](#)
 13. New Mexico Senate District: [Enter Senate District.](#)
-
14. Contact Person and/or PDE: [Click here to enter contact person/PDE name.](#)
 15. Address: [Enter street address, city, state \(if not NM\), and zip code.](#)
 16. Phone: [Enter phone #.](#)
 17. Fax: [Enter fax #.](#)
 18. E-mail: [Enter email address.](#)
 19. MPO or RPO: [Select a MPO/RPO.](#)
 20. NMDOT District #: [Select a district.](#)
-

Project Description

21. In the space below, please provide a narrative describing the Project, its Purpose and Need, i.e., the rationale behind the project. If this project has or will go through the NEPA process, the description below should match the NEPA description as closely as possible.

[Enter a project description – this field will expand as needed, but please be concise.](#)

22. Select an Improvement Type for the project: [Select the \(primary\) Improvement Type.](#)

Notes: See [FMIS Improvement Type Codes](#) for complete improvement descriptions. List additional improvement types here: [Enter improvement type\(s\), including improvement type number.](#)

Project Details (fill out where applicable)

23. Route # or (Street) Name: Enter route number or name. 24. Length (mi.): Enter length in miles.
25. Begin mile post/intersection: Enter begin point. 26. End mile post/intersect.: Enter end point.
27. Directions from nearest major intersection or landmark: Enter directions, field will expand.
28. Google Maps link (see tutorial for help): Enter shortened Google Maps URL [goo.gl/maps/xxxx].
29. Roadway FHWA Functional Classification(s): Select a road type, or enter road types.
-

Funding Information

30. Has this project received Federal funding previously? Yes / No If yes, which years? Enter year(s). Which program(s)? Enter program(s).

Please Itemize the Total Project Costs by Type

31. Environmental/Planning: Enter \$ amount. 32. Preliminary Engineering: Enter dollar amount.
33. Design: Enter dollar amount. 34. Right-Of-Way: Enter dollar amount.
35. Construction: Enter dollar amount. 36. Other (specify): Enter cost type, dollar amount.

Funding Sources

List all sources and amounts of funding, both requested and committed, for the project.

37. **Total Project Cost Estimate:** Enter TOTAL dollar amount, to match sum of all other funds below.
38. **Local/County/Tribal Gov't Funds*:** Dollar amount, source. [Committed/Not Committed]
39. **State Funds:** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
40. **Tribal Transportation Program (TTP):** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
41. **Other Federal grants:** Enter dollar amount. [Select Existing or Requested]
42. **Federal Funds** (STP/CMAQ/TAP funds requested): Enter dollar amount.

* Identify the specific local/ city/ county/ tribal government fund(s) source, such as gas tax, sales tax, etc.

Project Readiness

This is a list of certifications, clearances, and other processes that could apply to the project. These steps may not be required at this time, but could be necessary at a later date. Identify the **date** that the certification or clearance was received **OR** if a certification/ clearance is under way **OR** will be started in the future **OR** the step is not applicable (N/A). **Do not leave any field blank.**

43. **Public Involvement:** Date completed, under way, OR to be started.
44. **Right of Way:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
45. **Design:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
46. **Environmental Certification**:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
47. **Utility Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
48. **ITS Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
49. **Railroad Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.
50. **Other Clearances:** Date completed, under way, to be started, OR N/A.

** NEPA assessment may evaluate: Threatened & Endangered Species, Surface Water Quality (Clean Water Act), Ground Water Quality, Wetlands, NPDES Permit, Noxious weeds, Air Quality Analysis, Noise Analysis, Hazardous Materials Analysis, and other areas; 4-F properties. NHPA Section 106 Cultural Resources Investigation may include: coordination with land management agencies and State Historic Preservation Officer, Cultural Properties Inventory (buildings recorded), Traditional Cultural Property Inventory (consult with appropriate Native American tribes), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer and State Historic Preservation Officer. **For a full list of environmental and cultural areas that may be evaluated, see the Tribal/Local Government Agreement Handbook.**

Project Planning Factors

Below are the federally mandated planning factors for all transportation projects. Please check all that apply and provide a brief explanation of how the project addresses the factor. Comment area will expand as needed. **NOTE: if you are applying for TAP funds, leave this section blank and complete the supplemental TAP application.**

51. ☐ **Economic Vitality:** Type explanation.
 52. ☐ **Safety for Motorized and Non-motorized Users:** Type explanation.
 53. ☐ **Security for Motorized and Non-motorized Users:** Type explanation.
 54. ☐ **Accessibility and Mobility of People and Freight:** Type explanation.
 55. ☐ **Environment, Energy Conservation, Quality of Life:** Type explanation.
 56. ☐ **Integration and Connectivity:** Type explanation.
 57. ☐ **System Management and Operation:** Type explanation.
 58. ☐ **System Preservation:** Type explanation.
-

REQUIRED DISTRIBUTION

59. **Send a completed electronic version** to appropriate RPO/MPO, District staff, and NMDOT Planning liaison.