

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

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held August 12, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in
6 City Council Chambers at City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

7
8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
12 Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
13 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
14 Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
15 Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
16 Councillor Nathan Small (CLC)

17
18 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
19 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)

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

24
25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

26
27 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

28
29 Flores: All right so I'm going to call this meeting to order. It's about 1:15.

30
31 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**

32
33 Flores: And first we'll have a conflict of interest inquiry. Does any Committee
34 Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on
35 the agenda, and if so that Committee Member may recuse themselves
36 from voting on a specific matter or if they feel that they can be impartial we
37 will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.

38
39 Pedroza: No conflict.

40
41 Flores: Didn't I do a roll call first or call quorum, determination of a quorum.
42 Shouldn't that be first?

43
44 Wray: We can certainly do that.

45
46 Flores: Sorry.

1
2 Wray: Councilor Small.

3
4 Small: Here as of now. Thank you.

5
6 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

7
8 Benavidez: Here.

9
10 Wray: Mayor Barraza.

11
12 Barraza: Here.

13
14 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

15
16 Pedroza: Here.

17
18 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

19
20 Doolittle: Here.

21
22 Wray: Councilor Sorg.

23
24 Sorg: Yes. Here.

25
26 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

27
28 Hancock: Here.

29
30 Wray: Chair Flores.

31
32 Flores: Here.

33
34 Flores: Okay so we have a quorum and back to my question of anybody have a
35 conflict of interest? Okay. Seeing none.

36
37 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

38
39 Flores: We'll move to public comment. Is there anybody in the public? Seeing
40 none.

41
42 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

43
44 Flores: We'll move to the consent agenda.

45
46 Barraza: Madam Chair. I make a motion we approve the consent agenda.

1
2 Flores: Do I have a second?

3
4 Sorg: Second.

5
6 Flores: Okay. Second from Gill Sorg. All in favor?

7
8 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

9
10 Flores: Do we have any "nays?" Nope. Okay.

11
12 **5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

13
14 **5.1 *June 10, 2015** – minutes approved on consent agenda vote.

15
16 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

17
18 **6.1 Resolution 15-09: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019**
19 **Transportation Improvement Program**

20
21 Flores: Okay. Well then we'll move along to action items, 6.1, Resolution 15-09:
22 A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement
23 Program.

24
25 Wray: Thank you Madam Chair. The item is on page 43 of the packet. There
26 are a series of TIP amendments that have been requested by NMDOT. I
27 want to clarify that this is for the 2016-2021 TIP. That is the TIP that goes
28 into effect on October 1st of this year. We're currently operating under the
29 2014 TIP so just a little bit of clarification to make sure there's no
30 confusion on that.

31 The first item that been requested for an amendment is LC00110
32 which is the Dona Ana County project, El Camino Real at Dona Ana
33 School Road and there has been an addition of \$42,746 for right-of-way
34 and \$3,526, or excuse me \$3,500 in Fiscal Year 2016 for right-of-way.

35 The next project is LC00240 that is shoulder widening at, on San
36 Augustin Pass. That is, got \$300 and, or \$350,000 for preliminary
37 engineering and then construction is scheduled for 2017.

38 LC00250, that's the University Avenue and Triviz interchange that
39 received a lot of discussion during the run-up to the MTP. That one is
40 currently in the 2016 TIP but this amendment is adding \$1.2 million in
41 Fiscal Year 2016 for preliminary engineering.

42 Project LC00270 is a, a capacity and safety study along US-70
43 from the Spitz/Solano intersection to the I-25 interchange. That is a brand
44 new project proposed to go into the TIP.

1 The next project is on page 44, 1100820 is a Phases 1C to 1D
2 study of the potential West Mesa Road. It's a alternatives analysis and
3 environmental documentation study and this is a new project.

4 LC00230 is signal upgrades at various railroad crossings and this
5 has been moved from Fiscal Year 2018 to Fiscal Year 2020 and those are
6 all the amendments that have been requested.

7
8 Barraza: Madam Chair.

9
10 Flores: Mayor Barraza.

11
12 Barraza: A couple of questions is ...

13
14 Flores: Okay.

15
16 Barraza: On the project number 250 at the end, on University Avenue and Triviz on
17 the interchange, did I hear you say you were adding \$1.2 million for
18 engineering, preliminary engineering services?

19
20 Wray: Yes. That's correct.

21
22 Barraza: Is that normal, I mean that much for engineering services?

23
24 Wray: For a project of this size that's, that's a reasonable figure. Mr. Doolittle
25 looks like he wants to weigh in.

26
27 Flores: Okay.

28
29 Doolittle: Madam Chair, Mayor. That, that's correct. Just because of the size of
30 that project it's actually scattered over two fiscal years because of the, I
31 was trying to pull up the cost but its total cost is about, I believe it's about
32 \$20 million total split between two fiscal years for the construction so that
33 \$1.2 million is, is probably appropriate for a design that big. It's not just I-
34 25, it's also the University side on the west and then Triviz as far down as
35 Geothermal so it's actually a very large, the entire west side of that
36 interchange.

37
38 Flores: Okay.

39
40 Barraza: Thank you for that. That's, wow. And my other question is on the last
41 project, 230 on the signal upgrades and it's been moved from 2020, from
42 2018. I guess my concern is safety issues. Are, are there currently safety
43 issues going on there that I, my concern is that if we do have safety
44 issues, by pushing it back two years are we opening up liability situations
45 or signals that really need to be worked on?

1 Flores: Mr. Doolittle you want to comment on that?
2

3 Doolittle: Madam Chair, Mayor. Those are, it, it lists the DOT as the agency only
4 because we're providing the funding. Looking at the description all of
5 those crossings are within the City of Las Cruces so I don't have any
6 information on those.
7

8 Barraza: Okay. That would be my only concern Madam Chair, is if there are safety
9 issues going on right now that if we push it back two more years are we
10 just lingering on handling that problem? So those are all my comments.
11 Thank you.
12

13 Doolittle: Madam Chair, Mayor. My experience on some of those that we have
14 done, even within the County and the City, basically they're upgrading so it
15 may be you know deficient gates or crossings that are rough. They may
16 be replacing the, the tracks and the crossing themselves. Again I don't
17 have the specifics but that's been my experience on the previous ones
18 that we've done with similar funding, is it's not necessarily due to safety.
19 It's, it, it could be just enhancements itself but ...
20

21 Barraza: And just cause it lists signal upgrades on there and that was my concern
22 with, throughout the nation that we keep hearing that signals are not
23 working and vehicles have been hit or pedestrians. That was my concern.
24

25 Flores: Okay. Mr. Sorg and then after Sorg did you, then Commissioner Hancock.
26

27 Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. I have a question on two of the projects. On
28 250, the University/I-25 interchange, will part of the cost of that project
29 involve the underpass of Triviz underneath University as well as on the
30 other side, Don Roser, they connecting up or is it just the one side?
31

32 Doolittle: Madam Chair. That, that project will only include the Triviz underpass.
33

34 Sorg: Underpass, okay.
35

36 Doolittle: Right now Don Roser, with traffic volumes and counts didn't, didn't warrant
37 a bridge ...
38

39 Sorg: Okay.
40

41 Doolittle: Underneath so it would just be the Triviz, very similar to Lohman.
42

43 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. The second one is 270, Highway 70/North Main-
44 Spitz/Solano to the interchange. In, in, in a study or when you start
45 working on a project, can you also talk about finishing the project up with
46 landscaping in the medians? I notice there's a, a relatively small median

1 there that's just not been landscaped ever and I think it would be really
2 important if we have a median that is included, that landscaping would be
3 included in the project.
4
5 Doolittle: That funding that you're seeing there is purely for the, the study to
6 determine whether it warrants a six-lane. There is no construction money
7 in that one.
8
9 Sorg: Okay.
10
11 Doolittle: So once we establish that, then we can start looking at including it in the
12 STIP, some construction ...
13
14 Sorg: Okay.
15
16 Doolittle: For that section of roadway. If it's going to be some time or if for some
17 reason we can't fund that project we can always get with the City to
18 determine whether we'd enter into a landscaping agreement.
19
20 Sorg: Okay.
21
22 Doolittle: I'm currently working with David Maestas on some landscaping
23 agreements for the University interchange, Lohman, US-70, Missouri, I,
24 I'm sorry, not Missouri, Motel, Avenida de Mesilla. So the next time that
25 that committee meets I will be sure to bring up with David ...
26
27 Sorg: Okay.
28
29 Doolittle: The consideration of doing that US-70 corridor.
30
31 Sorg: Okay. Thank you very much. That's great. Thank you Madam Chair.
32
33 Flores: Okay. Commissioner Hancock.
34
35 Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. On LC00240, does that include drainage along
36 that stretch that's getting widening, widening?
37
38 Wray: Madam Chair. I'd have to defer to Mr. Doolittle on that one. I don't, I'm
39 not familiar with the design.
40
41 Doolittle: I'm sorry Commissioner Hancock. Can you ...
42
43 Hancock: That's the, the ...
44
45 Flores: 240.
46

1 Hancock: San Augustin Pass. It's the 240, LC00240. It's San Augustin Pass
2 shoulder widening. Does that, as, as we've talked before there's drainage
3 issues there running down into the trailer park and, and there's concern
4 about, about the drainage.
5
6 Doolittle: That project is actually the funding for the road safety audit that we
7 completed so it would just be the pedestrian facilities basically from Organ
8 over the pass to the Dripping Springs, I'm sorry, not Dripping Springs,
9 Aguirre Springs.
10
11 Hancock: Oh Aguirre Springs.
12
13 Doolittle: So it's only going to address drainage and pedestrian/bicycle facilities on
14 ...
15
16 Hancock: Okay.
17
18 Doolittle: On that section of roadway.
19
20 Hancock: Okay. Very good. I know you've addressed some of the other issues, the
21 drainage issues there on the side and that's appreciated by the owners
22 down there. I apologize for not being here on the, I don't think I was here
23 on the 10th. No.
24
25 Flores: No, you weren't.
26
27 Hancock: No, I wasn't. But as I see this, the policy was approved 2016 through
28 2021 and I don't see anything about the Upham exit planning for the
29 interchange at Upham. Did we just not, we weren't able, we're not going
30 to be able to get to that until after '21?
31
32 Doolittle: Commissioner Hancock. That's correct. I've, I've discussed that both with
33 Commissioner Garrett and with executive staff out of the General Office
34 and currently, based on the needs that we've got elsewhere it's, I don't
35 have the support to even get a control number to get it on our planning
36 STIP at this point. Secretary Church has said that if other entities come
37 up with, with some funding to conduct those types of studies that we
38 would certainly entertain that idea, very similar to what we're doing at
39 Arrowhead with NMSU but at this point with, with other needs we just don't
40 have the money to pursue those, those things.
41
42 Hancock: Could, could you give us a little guidance as to who we could be
43 approaching for those funds? Is that, would that be the Federal
44 Government or maybe Colorado or Texas? I don't know.
45
46 Doolittle: I can certainly try to find out, Commissioner.

1
2 Hancock: I, I'd appreciate that. Yeah. It's a, that, it's a problem. Thank you Madam
3 Chair.

4
5 Flores: Okay. Anyone else? Councilor Small.

6
7 Small: Thank you very much Madam Chair. Also on the, oh what is it here, the
8 240 with the shoulder widening and some of the drainage right there
9 onsite, is, is the wildlife underpass or wildlife corridor features in that area
10 being considered or can that be considered? Because it is an area of, of
11 very high traffic for a lot of different local creatures.

12
13 Doolittle: Councilor Small. At this point, I believe the, the proposed wildlife crossing
14 that we've been discussing with Game and Fish is further east than this
15 section. I will certainly bring it up to the project development engineers
16 but that was not part of the RSA so if we decide to include it in this project
17 because this one is safety funding, we would probably have to pursue
18 some other options to fund those portions of the, the construction.

19
20 Small: Understood, and it's good that the, the discussion is ongoing with New
21 Mexico Game and Fish. I guess maybe that's a separate item to address
22 but thank you for bringing that up and that's good that it's ongoing. Thank
23 you and I, I think, yeah that that's it. Thank you.

24
25 Flores: Okay. Anyone else? Member Doolittle.

26
27 Doolittle: I, I do have one, I just wanted to provide an update to the, to the Board
28 itself. That 1100820, that is the West Mesa Road. That is one that this
29 Board had elected to not approve on past TIP amendments. We are
30 moving forward with that utilizing 100% State money. I know one of the
31 concerns of the Board is what took place as part of the Phase A/B study.
32 We had requested a presentation to do a quick summary of that study and
33 couldn't because we did not have any more money as part of that original
34 Phase A/B contract so once we move forward with providing an
35 amendment to the consultant that did the Phase A/B, we can have them
36 come in and give a summary of that before they move forward with the C
37 and D portions of that study. But ultimately we as a department felt it was
38 necessary to complete that project, or at least that study so we are moving
39 forward utilizing 100% State funding.

40
41 Flores: Okay. Thank you. Mr., Councilor Small did you have another comment?

42
43 Small: Thank you Madam Chair and thanks Mr. Doolittle. I, that's one, the other
44 one that I was going to ask about because there have been concern and
45 as you pointed out it had been taken off. Is the, the summary is great.
46 Will there be in the presentation or in the C and D phase of this any

1 consideration for the concerns that have been expressed regarding traffic,
2 really more through the valley and trying to find ways to make that
3 economically viable and beneficial for communities in the valley, perhaps
4 with additional construction in strategic locations or is this solely on the
5 West Mesa and consideration of additional truck traffic in the valley is
6 entirely separate?
7
8 Doolittle: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. At this point it will, the, the Phase C/D will
9 further analyze the options that were in A/B so it's going to be mostly on
10 the west side. Commissioner Garrett has brought up concerns or, or the
11 request to analyze an option to tie into 404 on I-10. That was one of the
12 options in the Phase B that will be expanded upon and looked into further
13 as part of the C/D. At this point it's really too early to tell which, which
14 ones it's going to strictly focus on.
15
16 Small: Understood, but again that's appreciated that it's still part of, of, of the next
17 steps here that can tie into some of the concerns that had been
18 expressed. And I think, appreciate and, and kudos to you Mr. Doolittle for
19 bringing that up even though it hadn't yet been addressed by any of the
20 Board members. Ways to keep everyone abreast of that as it moves
21 forward I think is, is in everyone's interest and you're practicing that now
22 so thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.
23
24 Flores: So any more discussion? Did I get a motion on that? Okay. Could I hear
25 a motion?
26
27 Barraza: I make a motion that we approve Resolution 15-01, 09. I'm sorry.
28
29 Hancock: Second.
30
31 Flores: Second by Wayne Hancock, Commissioner Hancock. You may take a
32 vote.
33
34 Wray: Councilor Small.
35
36 Small: Yes.
37
38 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
39
40 Benavidez: Yes.
41
42 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
43
44 Barraza: Yes.
45
46 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

1
2 Pedroza: Yes.

3
4 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

5
6 Doolittle: Yes.

7
8 Wray: Councilor Sorg.

9
10 Sorg: Yes.

11
12 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

13
14 Hancock: Yes.

15
16 Wray: Madam Chair.

17
18 Flores: Yes.

19
20 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

21
22 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

23
24 **7.1 NMDOT Update**

25
26 Flores: Okay. Moving on to discussion items: 7.1, New Mexico DOT update.

27
28 Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. As part of my normal update I'll give you just a
29 quick update on our projects that we have in the area.

30 The one that always comes to question is the North Main project.
31 We're currently working on the concrete pavement near the Madrid
32 intersection. We're looking at probably about three weeks to finish that.
33 We're working on assembling the signal poles. You know right now at that
34 intersection we have a temporary signal span. The problem is one of
35 those posts sits right where the, the new one is supposed to go and then
36 another one, if you've been through that intersection actually sits on part of
37 the widened roadway of Madrid. So ultimately when we replace those
38 signals it will be on a four-way stop condition for, we're hoping about two
39 weeks but at that point some of the Madrid traffic will be rerouted but we're
40 moving forward with project. Right now the contractor is still behind the
41 original schedule. I think last, the June meeting I was think, I proposed a
42 date of July. Since then it's been pushed back even further. Last that we
43 had heard we're probably looking at more of an October or November
44 before they're completely finished. Understand that that's complete finish
45 of the project. We're working on trying to get a current update so that we
46 can figure out you know when the impacts to traffic will be reduced or

1 minimized or eliminated even though there may be some sidewalk work or
2 those types of things outside but right now we're, we're working diligently
3 with the contractor to try to get those kinds of updates but they are behind
4 schedule and there have been questions tied to you know how the
5 Department is handling that contract. Understand that the contract does
6 allow for liquidated damages, those types of things and ultimately that's
7 really our only repercussion at this point and to try to, to encourage them
8 to complete that project. It is moving forward, a little slower than we would
9 like to see but we, we're doing everything we can to encourage them to
10 get, get finished more quickly understanding the, the impacts that we're
11 having to the traffic in that area.

12
13 Flores: You were saying how much per day, much, do you, do you recall?

14
15 Doolittle: Madam Chair. I believe that that project, our liquidated damages are
16 based on the size of the contract monetarily and I believe that that one
17 has a liquidated damages cost of \$2,900 per day.

18
19 Flores: Okay.

20
21 Sorg: Does that include weekends?

22
23 Flores: Okay.

24
25 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg. I, I don't know that it's a, it, if it's a working day contract
26 it's based on working days. If it's a calendar day project it would be based
27 on calendar days and I can't remember specifically which one that is.

28
29 Flores: Okay. All right. Thank you. Anything else you want to add?

30
31 Doolittle: Just a couple of more quick projects here in the area. The Missouri bridge
32 for those of you that have been through there, they are moving very
33 quickly. Right now we have Don Roser shut down while we redo the Don
34 Roser portion of that roadway. The contractor is looking at being finished
35 with the southbound bridge in August, sometime this month and then
36 switching traffic over to that new bridge and then rebuilding the north side.
37 Contract time on that one expires in April. Contractor is, is hoping to be
38 finished in December so they're actually about three months ahead of
39 schedule at this point, so as long as weather continues to cooperate you'll
40 see that, that project finished three months ahead of schedule. Been very
41 happy with FNF and the work they're doing. Appreciate the, the
42 community. I know that the closures of Don Roser and Missouri and
43 before too long there'll be some closures on Triviz, but we've had a lot of
44 compliments and it's, it's moving along real well.

45 The last one I wanted to touch on is one we just started on a couple
46 of weeks ago which is the I-10/Union bridges and what we call Ramp E

1 which is basically the, the ramp at Whataburger that crosses under I-10
2 onto I-10 eastbound. We have switched traffic onto the eastbound lanes.
3 Union bridge will be closed this weekend on Saturday and Sunday while
4 we demolish the westbound bridge and then from there the, basically the
5 traffic will stay where it is now for several months while we, while we
6 demolish the westbound. We started on that project July 14th. It's
7 currently scheduled for about one calendar year, just short of that one
8 calendar year. So you'll see a lot of, a lot of construction there for quite
9 some time.

10 I, oh, I do have one more. We do have a maintenance project on
11 South Main which is New Mexico 478. We're working on pavement
12 preservation in that area. They're almost, actually I drove there earlier
13 today and they're almost past Carver headed south so once we get out of
14 town it will certainly speed up but that work will actually go on for quite
15 some time because we're going to do pavement preservation on all of 478
16 and so it will run all the way from the Texas border to the Las Cruces city
17 limits. Very similar to what we did on New Mexico 28 except it's a different
18 process but it will be the entire roadway, and then next year when the chip
19 seal crew's in the area we'll actually chip seal over that section of
20 roadway.

21 Madam Chair, and that's all the projects that we have in the area
22 ongoing right now and I'll stand for any questions.

23
24 Flores: Councilor Pedroza.

25
26 Pedroza: Thank you Madam Chair. I've heard so much about, oh around the
27 country not, not specifically you know focusing on our area or our state on
28 oh the need for rehabilitation of bridges etc. etc. but this sounds very
29 positive to me. Can you confirm that? Am I, am I right in thinking that in
30 fact our infrastructure is being repaired timely and, and so on?

31
32 Doolittle: Madam Chair, Councilor. That, that's correct. We were actually without a
33 bridge engineer in our district for quite some time and our, our deficient
34 bridge rating, and we were actually worst in the state. We still are to some
35 extent but we have been very aggressive in, in doing some bridge work.
36 The reason that you've been seeing a lot of bridge work specifically on I-
37 10 here in town is because several of them were road, load restricted so
38 we were having to detour all of our oversize loads onto our secondary
39 smaller routes and basically it was destroying them so we've been
40 focusing on, a lot of them on I-10 so that we can put those loads back
41 where they're supposed to be. Missouri is being replaced because it did
42 have some condition rating issues but it's a capacity problem as well.
43 Once we finish Missouri and, and Union here in town, that's really all of
44 the, the deficient bridges specifically here in the area. We are doing a lot
45 of other smaller bridge rehab projects. For instance, we have some in the
46 Anthony area where we're taking four, five, or six and we're either doing

1 concrete repair or we're taking off the deck and putting new decks on them
2 but we have been very aggressive, actually to the point that some of our
3 executive staff thinks that we ought to be doing more pavement
4 preservation as opposed to bridge but we're behind the eight-ball and
5 we're trying to catch up but we're, we're very aggressive on our bridge
6 program.

7
8 Pedroza: That sounds really very encouraging to me. Thank you.

9
10 Flores: Anyone else? Commissioner, I keep wanting to say Leticia. Leticia ...

11
12 Benavidez: Benavidez.

13
14 Flores: Commissioner Benavidez.

15
16 Benavidez: Thank you. Mr. Doolittle, I was coming south on Main close to the Madrid
17 intersection and I noticed that they had just poured some new concrete
18 but then I noticed that they were jackhammering the concrete again. So
19 why would they do that, pour some concrete, it looked like it was a freshly-
20 poured section of the road, it had already dried but then I saw them
21 jackhammering it. I said, "Why they doing that?" Do you know more or
22 less why they would be doing that?

23
24 Doolittle: Commissioner. I, I, on that section specifically I don't know why. It could
25 be a, a quality of materials issue, it could be cracking in the concrete, it
26 could be wrong grades or slope. I, I can certainly try to find out but there's
27 various reasons that they would be doing that. Typically it's a, it's a
28 control of materials or control of, of work issue.

29
30 Benavidez: Okay. I, I just don't want for the construction company to take advantage
31 for example of, of the, of the NMDOT because it just is, it looked like a
32 waste of money but I'm not, I'm not exactly sure what was going on. And
33 then the second thing is I was going south on I-25 close to the bridge on
34 Missouri and I noticed that there's a lot of speeding cars. I was going 45
35 miles an hour and people were passing me going over 60 right there in a
36 construction zone though, so do you have any say-so with the police when
37 they could be patrolling the area?

38
39 Doolittle: Commissioner. We do and we have actually been working real closely
40 with State Police. I agree with you that control of that speed's been rather
41 difficult but I've talked to Lieutenant Fietze with State Police on numerous
42 occasions. They've come out probably more so in the morning and the
43 afternoons when we're getting the university traffic, sporting events, those
44 types of things, concerts, they try to be, be visible. Same as anybody else
45 they have a lot of other work and other priorities and they typically come
46 out when we ask for you know a day or two and then they, they try to

1 move on to other things but we'll continue to ask them to come out
2 periodically and see if we can control that a little bit more.

3
4 Benavidez: Okay. You know my, my husband was in construction for many, many
5 years with the County and it just, it just makes me really sad that the
6 people don't respect construction sites. I, I notice that some construction
7 people got killed in El Paso not too long ago which is you know very scary
8 so we need to make sure that they respect the, the construction zones.

9
10 Doolittle: Absolutely. I agree.

11
12 Benavidez: Thank you. That's it.

13
14 Flores: Mayor Barraza.

15
16 Barraza: I just want to thank you Trent for the signs coming off the ramps on
17 highway, Avenida de Mesilla of, off the interstate. They're very attractive
18 and it definitely gives a direction which way is Mesilla and which way is
19 Las Cruces on both sides, so thank you so much. We appreciate it.

20
21 Doolittle: Absolutely. Thank you Mayor.

22
23 Flores: Okay. Anyone else want to make a, have a question or want to make a
24 comment? Oh, okay.

25
26 **7.2 Committee Training (Taylor Road Functional Classification)**

27
28 Flores: Then in that case we'll move on to 7.2: Committee Training on Taylor
29 Road Functional Classification. Ken Thurston came in last meeting and,
30 and was requesting a change and I guess I'll just let you explain it.

31
32 Murphy: Okay. Thank, thank you Madam Chair. And as you were saying last, last
33 meeting Mr. Ken Thurston came in and was requesting a, a change in the
34 MPO Functional Classification Map. I'm not sure why he did not come
35 again today. I just checked to see if he was in a different meeting there
36 but part of, part of the, the explanation there, the, this Committee directed
37 staff to put together a presentation to kind of walk you through what, what
38 goes into functional classification and when we do classify things what it
39 entails so even, even absence his presence this afternoon, I, the, this, this
40 presentation will still be beneficial to the Committee. Okay.

41 So functional classification's a federally, a federally, a federally-
42 designated, try and avoid using the same word but it, it, it's a require, it's a
43 requirement per Federal Code of Regulations and it, it establishes the
44 Federal Aid System in the country and I can get a copy of the language.
45 Please don't try and, try and read it. It just, this shows that it does come
46 from the Code of Federal Regulations and there's three takeaways from all

1 that text, is: 1) there's a difference between urban and rural; 2) the state,
2 State Transportation Agency is the agency that is charged with developing
3 and updating functional classification in cooperation with local elected
4 officials which would be represented by this body; and then the third
5 takeaway is that the final approve, approval of the functional classification
6 is by the Federal Highway Administration. Through that guidance NMDOT
7 has, has developed a classification guidance manual which we use, and,
8 and other MPOs and other jurisdictions in the state use to develop what
9 we recommend as functional classification upwards towards the state for
10 them to, to designate. The, the characteristics that are used include
11 mileage, volume, speed, route spacing, usage, existing and future land
12 use development, and then the regional and statewide significant and I
13 think kind of an, an important note relative to, to the individual's request at
14 the last meeting is the, the actual right-of-way width is not a, is not a factor
15 in this determination so, just kind of put that out there and leave it for a
16 while.

17 The state, the state uses the functional classification for many
18 things: Program prioritization, asset management, safety programs,
19 bridge programs, traffic control maintenance, it, and then it, pertinent to
20 this, this discussion that got us is the highway design also is guided by the
21 functional classification and that impacts the design standards, the speed
22 limit, lane width, horizontal and vertical alignment. Again it does not call
23 out a specific right-of-way width so. And then these are our functional
24 classification and I think everyone's been on this, served on this Board
25 long enough to, to understand most of them: The interstate, principal
26 arterial, you know other freeways such as US-70, and then other principal
27 arterials which you know is, which are our New Mexico 478s, our Lohman
28 Avenues; minor arterials of which Taylor Road is, is one and that was the
29 request that, that was brought forward and then it goes down through
30 major collector, minor collector, and locals. Everyone can read faster than
31 I can talk so I will pause just a moment.

32 Okay, and through all of that the MPO develop, develops its own
33 Functional Classification Map. Again this is, we'll, we'll focus in on a later
34 slide on, on the area in question but this is just to give a general overall,
35 the black lines represent the urbanized area so inside, outside that's urban
36 versus rural. On the maps that we publish we also have, have kind of a
37 Cliff Notes of those guidelines of, far as what makes a functional
38 classification. This map's available for download on our website, again not
39 meant to be, be read through this presentation. We also maintain the
40 Future Thoroughfare Map and that's where we're, what, what we as an
41 organization are calling for a future roadway system and again we, we
42 reiterate the, the differences between the different types of classifications
43 over there on the, on the left side of the document and then we have
44 potential future, future lines on the map itself and again this is also
45 downloadable on our, on our site.

1 Okay, and as promised the, the zoom-in. Okay, so if you can see
2 the mouse move this is the, the existing Taylor Road. We have it
3 designated as a minor arterial. It meets the Regional Significance Test
4 currently. It, it connects at least you know, you know it connects two
5 principal arterials from Valley to Elks. It also crosses two other minor
6 arterials so from that aspect the, it, it, it is an important for regional traffic,
7 traffic mobility. And then this is the excerpt of our future roadway plan and
8 I believe, I, I, not everybody was at the meeting last time but the IHAS
9 study does call for a possible future improvement of an underpass at
10 Taylor, Taylor and Tecolote similar to what was recently done at, at Engler
11 and Kennedy. Although that's not funded yet it does remain something
12 that's within the realm of possibility which would then increase the regional
13 significance as, as Taylor would be a continuation up to Peachtree Hills
14 Road. Okay.

15 While, while the MPO's functional classification does not set right-
16 of-way widths the, the County and as well as the City whose subdivision
17 regulations do account for, for right-of-way widths. This is a excerpt from
18 the County's Design Standards. It is also, it's also the, the same roadway
19 cross-section that's been included in the draft Unified Development Code
20 so we do expect that this cross-section will, will continue to be utilized and
21 so it, it calls out the right-of-way width, the design ADT, the design speed,
22 and so on. Also if you look below the table there's a note saying that a
23 three- or five-lane cross-section may be constructed depending upon the
24 improved traffic impact analysis, so while this cross-section shows five
25 lanes it does not, you know it does not mean that has to be built. There
26 need, there will be a traffic impact analysis to determine if there's a more
27 appropriate cross-section to be built. And then, then following down even
28 though Taylor Road is within our urbanized area it's still a relatively rural
29 characteristic part of the MPO area. You know it, it's certainly something
30 that the, the developer can negotiate through the County and the, and the,
31 and the Development Review Committee, a different cross-section. The
32 rural one would be even, even, even less amount of pavement width and
33 also you know achieve the, achieve the function of a minor arterial
34 roadway.

35 Okay so this comes us down to what our options are. So this, this
36 Committee can recommend, or direct staff to start pursuing the
37 amendment, the amendment process to recommend to NMDOT that we
38 change the functional classification on that and then if NMDOT agrees
39 with that then they would submit that up to FHWA for their approval or,
40 and this is the, this is the way that the staff has, had pursued it previously.
41 We advised the petitioner to seek administrative relief through the local
42 processes and, and you could also direct us to support a waiver meaning
43 that when it comes to vote at staff level committees, you could authorize
44 myself or Mr. Wray to, to vote to support the applicant's waiver if you, if
45 you so choose. We had this presentation at the Technical Advisory
46 Committee last week. The County Engineering staff member did, did state

1 that his recommendation would be that the second option is what County
2 Engineering would prefer they do rather than have the MPO attempt to
3 change the functional classification of the roadway and so with that I'll
4 stand for any questions.
5
6 Sorg: Madam Chair.
7
8 Flores: Councilor Sorg.
9
10 Sorg: Yes. Thank you Madam Chair. In my discussions with the developer
11 there, we just, I just threw out an idea and see if, if, if this is possible by
12 anybody who might know here especially maybe the engineer here. The,
13 the arterial that it's called for now requires a 100-foot right-of-way. Is that
14 not correct?
15
16 Murphy: Councilor Sorg. Yes, that is correct according to ...
17
18 Sorg: Okay.
19
20 Murphy: The County Design Standards.
21
22 Sorg: But if he, he is choosing to have an 80-foot road, wide road there instead
23 of 100-foot one. I said to him, "How about if you keep your development
24 out of the 100-foot right-of-way but only build the 80-foot," so someday in
25 the future, cause I'm worried at some point in time in the future there's
26 going to be somebody that's going to be very annoyed at us for allowing
27 this waiver, when they want to build that road wider and put the extra
28 lanes in because of the extra traffic coming all the way from Peachtree
29 and all the new development to the east there. I don't know what
30 timetable the DOT is, has for that underpass but I don't think it's very soon
31 is, wouldn't you agree? So but anyway it's going to be a long time but
32 allow them to build that 80-foot road but keep the development another 20
33 feet on each side, or ten feet on each side, in order to add it up, yeah
34 away so that, that right-of-way could be obtained in the, the future
35 someday. I don't know if some kind of a parkway or something that could
36 be done there. I, I, I don't even know if this is possible so I'm just throwing
37 that out as a, as an idea. No question, just an idea.
38
39 Flores: I'm just not sure I understand what you're proposing because if you ...
40
41 Sorg: The problem in the past, yeah the problem in the past is that people build
42 their houses right up to the edge of that right-of-way.
43
44 Flores: Yeah.
45

1 Sorg: And if it's just 80 feet they'll have to tear down buildings in order to get the
2 full 100 feet.
3

4 Flores: Right.
5

6 Sorg: I'm saying don't put any development other than maybe some landscaping
7 ...
8

9 Flores: Within the 100 ...
10

11 Sorg: In that ten foot on either side, 20 feet in all total, so that you know it
12 doesn't have to be damaging to the property owner. We obtain, in other
13 words you obtain the 100-foot right-of-way but you only build the 80-foot
14 street.
15

16 Flores: All right.
17

18 Sorg: That's all he wants to do is just to build the 80-foot street cause he, he is
19 not a, it's my opinion anyway that he is not that forward-thinking or
20 forward-viewing.
21

22 Flores: Right.
23

24 Sorg: That you know he, he might not be alive by the time this happens, none of
25 us may be alive by the time this happens ...
26

27 Flores: Yeah.
28

29 Sorg: But that, I'd just like we'd keep that option open should Taylor Road
30 become a minor arterial and need that 100-foot right-of-way.
31

32 Flores: Yeah, well I'm just going to talk and then I'm going to ...
33

34 Sorg: Okay.
35

36 Flores: Let Councilor Pedroza speak but, but the way I see it is that's why you
37 have the right-of-way to start with is to make sure that that right-of-way
38 stays clear and I'm just thinking from the perspective of University which
39 Mayor Barraza and I are painfully familiar with is we have the problem with
40 houses built up and just no room to grow and we're at a spot where we
41 were very, very rural and we've got Highway 28 which has 18-wheelers
42 coming up and I-10 and it's a horrible situation now trying to get right-of-
43 way after the fact. So I mean to me that's why you have right-of-way and,
44 to begin with and so, Councilor Pedroza.
45

1 Pedroza: Thank you Madam Chair. I was very surprised when the first time I saw
2 that in fact several of the highways were forward-thinking and had a space
3 in the middle that looked like a empty space, a median or whatever but it
4 was actually expressly reserved for future expansion of the highway itself
5 and I was very impressed with that. I said, "Hey, these guys really think
6 ahead." Did, did Mr. ...
7
8 Flores: Thurston.
9
10 Pedroza: Thank you. Whatever, yeah, did he agree with your, with your ideas?
11 Was, was he willing to, to do that voluntarily, say, "Okay, if I only build a,
12 an 80-foot-wide roadway I will provide some room for expansion later on in
13 the future." Is he willing to do that?
14
15 Sorg: He seems to be, yes. He indicated very positively towards that and keep
16 in mind that this land there is totally undeveloped now. It's 100% desert,
17 undeveloped land.
18
19 Pedroza: Is that something Tom or Mr. Doolittle that, that we could actually put into
20 writing?
21
22 Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Pedroza. I don't know what we would, would put
23 into writing there. I think that, I do know that he had pursued a waiver in
24 July through EDRC, he was going to go through the ETA request,
25 requesting a waiver for reduced right-of-way but similarly to what
26 Councilor Sorg had put, put, put forward. You know something that been
27 the staff's position was that, you know that he work a way with to you
28 know kind of negotiate with, with County Engineering on a ways to
29 accommodate that and, but not give away, give away possibilities for the
30 future and I guess we were, we were kind of surprised when he, he came
31 in requesting a waiver for, I, basically the, the, it was, to paraphrase it, "I
32 want to build, I want to build none of it, give none of it." So he you know
33 went through the waiver process and we recommended denial on that. I
34 do not know if that's gone through the, you know the Planning
35 Commission or the, or the ETA yet. I've not, I've not been tracking that
36 case but I think from, you know at least from the MPO staff standpoint it
37 does sound like you, you know, you know want us to, to enforce the right-
38 of-way preservation you know to keep future options open.
39
40 Pedroza: Would that be something that the, that administrative review would, would
41 be able to, to handle, not that I you know want to take it off of our plate if it
42 really belongs here but if it's some way that somebody else can deal with
43 it, that they already have a, a way to, to deal with it that might be the best
44 way to go?
45

1 Murphy: It is something that we deal with on a, you know a weekly basis. All, all
2 development cases do come in, staff reviews them. We, you know we
3 maintain or we, we enforce and seek, seek adherence to these regulations
4 and the County's regulations, the City's regulations. The reason that, that
5 this is coming to your attention now is cause the member of the public did
6 specifically want relief from those regulations that, that staff couldn't, does,
7 does not have the authority to, to, to give so we'd, you know you'd have to
8 give us that authority you know with, and of course I'll note that with the
9 caveat that we don't think that, that relief should be given in that nature for
10 all of, you know all of the discussion that has occurred here because there
11 are reasons why those, those standards are in place.
12
13 Pedroza: Thank you very much.
14
15 Flores: Anyone else? Councilor Small.
16
17 Small: Thank you Madam Chair and thanks to Mr. Murphy for the great
18 presentation and I, I join in agreeing that the right-of-way seems very
19 critical in this area given especially the constriction on east-west traffic,
20 something that we deal with in the city, inside the city limits, course this is
21 outside of it but inside the city limits in this area. It poses significant
22 challenges and so I think it would be quite unwise to create more of those
23 problems in the future when we have the opportunity to avoid it. Thank
24 you. Thank you.
25
26 Flores: Councilor Sorg.
27
28 Sorg: Yeah, just a quick question. I, I want to make sure I get it right here. Is
29 the major collector the 80-foot-wide right-of-way?
30
31 Murphy: The, at least from what I, I remember from City and County Design
32 Standards, there is only design standards for collector, the major and
33 minor collector is something that's ...
34
35 Sorg: Same width.
36
37 Murphy: Recently come down to us from FHWA and you know has not had time to
38 filter down to local governments, adjusting theirs. Having said that the,
39 those, both the City and the County call for an 85-foot right-of-way for a
40 collector roadway.
41
42 Sorg: Oh, any collector, yeah, okay.
43
44 Murphy: That's major or minor, yes.
45

1 Sorg: Okay. Because I, I believe that's what he was asking for is just to build a
2 collector rather than a minor arterial. Do recall if he mentioned that to
3 you?
4

5 Murphy: In my interactions with them he did not express a preference for which
6 specific classification. I think he wanted what, wanted it to get to a point
7 where the right-of-way that already exists would be sufficient so he, but he
8 did not, he did not specifically call out a classification request to me.
9

10 Sorg: Okay. We'll work on this later then I think, Madam Chair. Thank you.
11

12 Flores: Okay. So that's right, we didn't say, this isn't, this is just education. This
13 isn't requesting any decisions at this time so okay.
14

15 Murphy: I, Madam Chair. I guess the only thing would be whether you wanted us
16 to bring you know begin a formal amendment process and bring it back
17 that way but it sounds like we want to leave the processes in place as, as
18 they currently exist ...
19

20 Flores: Yeah.
21

22 Murphy: Which would mean that there, we would need no more action ...
23

24 Flores: Okay.
25

26 Murphy: Or no more direction.
27

28 Flores: All right. Does anybody have a problem with that? No, okay, I don't see
29 anybody.
30

31 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS** 32

33 Flores: And so then we'll move along to committee and staff comments, so
34 anybody in the Committee want to make a comment? Councilor Sorg and
35 then Commissioner Hancock, go ahead.
36

37 Sorg: I've been thinking lately about this Policy Committee. The question I have
38 is should be, shouldn't we be making policy in this Committee and are we
39 have, do we have any restrictions on what kind of policy concerning
40 transportation, of course. I just wonder if, if the rest of the Committee
41 members, what their feelings or thinking is on that and when I'm, what I'm
42 thinking about in more specifically is such as the wildlife crossing on, on
43 Highway 70 in the Organ Mountain/San Andreas Mountain area, also for
44 funding. It's been said over and over again, over year, over year that
45 there needs to be more work done but the, they're limited on funding and
46 so maybe we could make a policy recommendation to those places that

1 supply funding for projects that we're involved with can be done. So I'm
2 just throwing that out. Thank you Madam Chair.

3
4 Flores: Okay. Commissioner Hancock.

5
6 Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Great book, the Transport 2040, very nicely
7 done. In looking on page 23 when I looked at the South Central Regional
8 Transportation District there are some facts that are listed there that I
9 need to correct. Since the time that this was put together Sierra County
10 has voted to exit from the Transportation District. I've not received their
11 formal letter yet but I've spoken with their Chair and with the County
12 Manager in Sierra County and he has indicated that they are withdrawing.
13 They are, we're working with them and the COG. The COG is trying to
14 negotiate with the hospital that has a bus and they are trying to create a
15 circulator route within Sierra County and we've agreed to try to connect
16 with them with South Central Regional Transportation. Subsequent to that
17 discussion we learned that the Board of Directors at, at Ben Archer at Rio
18 Grande Transit decided to cancel fixed-route services in the north part of
19 the county, in fact fixed-route services period. They're only going to be
20 doing basically dial-a-ride.

21 There was, I had a phone conversation with NMDOT and a number
22 of other individuals on the subject and it turns out that Rio Grande
23 Transit's receiving federal transit funds and they have two buses that are,
24 that were purchased with the federal transit funds but if they do fixed-route
25 services with Regional Transportation District they do not get to count the
26 passengers towards their federal funds. So they chose to stop doing
27 fixed-route which means that South Central Regional Transportation
28 District will not have services going north from the Move It Center. We will
29 only have south services and east services. When we, the County has
30 hired a, Dona Ana County has hired a transportation consultant to revise
31 stops and revise the plan in consideration of those factors and we, the
32 County has, County Commission voted on July the 30th to approve the
33 budget and within that budget was \$750,000 a year for the Transportation
34 District. So the Transportation is, District is funded and we will not be
35 doing, be able to do services going north until the State Legislature very
36 possibly allocates more funds for buses in the next ICIP. We have
37 requested buses, funds for buses in our ICIP package that will be going to
38 the Legislature this next year. So that, in addition to those factors the
39 buses have been ordered. However, Ford lost their manufacturer for the
40 rear axles and they've had to go out and get another manufacturer and the
41 buses, the delivery of the buses has been delayed. The first 30 buses will
42 come off the assembly line in mid-September and they're hoping that, I've
43 begged for our five, to try to get our five buses by October the first. Even
44 at October the first we, it requires close to 30-60 days for us to get all, all
45 of the elements in place: Hire personnel, train personnel, do all the other
46 things. We, the Transportation District is in the process of negotiating

1 right-of-ways with NMDOT and with the County and obtaining private right-
2 of-ways where necessary in order to try and get out of the way all those
3 elements that we can so that when the buses do arrive the amount of time
4 that it takes to become operational will be less. So some of the elements
5 within the, the book, unfortunately anytime we print things it, things
6 change so I did want to bring those factors to the attention of the Board
7 because I know we are all concerned with transportation within the, within
8 the County. Thank you Madam Chair.
9

10 Flores: Councilor Small.

11
12 Small: Thank you very much Madam Chair. Thank you to, actually it's a brief
13 question if that's okay for Commissioner Hancock and, who will the, and
14 see in, in not having routes going north but seeking funding for buses to
15 facilitate those routes, who will own those buses should that funding be
16 available?
17

18 Hancock: The, it's on the South Central, Madam Chair and Councilor. Those, it's on
19 the ICIP for South Central Regional Transportation District. The buses will
20 be owned by the South Central Regional Transportation District as is, or
21 as will be the five that we are going to be taking delivery on.
22

23 Small: Understood. Thank you and, and thanks for your, your really committed
24 and, and excellent work on this. Madam Chair, and then just one other I
25 guess quick comment. The Valley Drive, of course which was included
26 and we just approved, it's a very exciting project. I compliment the
27 process so far. The Amador Proximo which was a, a development
28 Charrette that recently took place included a great deal of work on Valley
29 Drive to help facilitate safety as well as additional investment and
30 development and I wanted to see if we might at our upcoming September
31 meeting perhaps get a presentation on some of those thoughts, or at least
32 an update on that because I know there's great opportunity to kind of mix
33 and mold the best thinking that's come forward including with the Amador
34 Proximo where over 200 members of the public came and participated, so
35 just to put that out there and flag it without any specific recommendation
36 but to make sure that it does be brought up publicly. It's been very public
37 up until this point and it's a great opportunity perhaps moving forward.
38 Thank you very much Madam Chair.
39

40 Flores: Member Doolittle.

41
42 Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. Councilor Small, just one question. When you,
43 when you ask for a presentation are you talking about a presentation on
44 the Valley Drive development or are you talking about the presentation for
45 the Charrette on the Proximo or ...
46

1 Small: I, I guess it's, we'll have to work on it cause it would be a, thank you
2 Madam Chair and thank you Mr. Doolittle. We'll have to work on it cause it
3 would be a bit of both because the redevelopment of Valley Drive is such
4 an exciting opportunity for the City and for this area in addition to of course
5 a very important project for NMDOT. I think the, some of the new exciting
6 thinking that's guiding the visioning for the road is connected to how the
7 potential development would influence in-fill in that area so I'll be happy to
8 work in appropriate capacities to make sure that it's a, the right mixture of
9 both without going too heavy on the, the actual neighborhood which I
10 know is not this Committee's concern.
11

12 Doolittle: Okay. And I, and I would, I would say that we could probably get Molzen
13 involved too, to, to provide information on the development to Valley so I
14 guess another question I have is are we asking MPO staff to take the lead
15 on preparing, compiling that information or ...
16

17 Small: Thank you Madam Chair, thank you Mr. Doolittle. I, I always defer to
18 experts. At, I would say that because we're looking at transit-oriented
19 development in a very, in a corridor that's quite close to the Intermodal
20 Transit Center and some of the other very fine efforts that MPO has been
21 significantly involved with that I would feel very comfortable to have, for
22 them to have a leadership role in shaping of the presentation and the
23 product. Thank you Madam Chair. Thank, and, and, oh, and with, and of
24 course if I might add Madam Chair, with New Mexico DOT as we've said
25 before here, really compliment the approach that NMDOT has taken in
26 terms of the stakeholder outreach although not everybody always comes
27 when there's great opportunities, the incredible way that social media and
28 multiple forms have been integrated into that outreach I think is absolutely
29 a model and a standard that we can all aspire to. Thank you.
30

31 Flores: All right. Mayor Barraza.
32

33 Barraza: I just wanted to know if a date or a tentative date has been set for the
34 public hearing on the University Avenue project.
35

36 Murphy: Madam Chair, Mayor Barraza. I was going to cover that in the staff
37 updates but I ...
38

39 Barraza: Oh, okay. That's okay. Well I can wait till then.
40

41 Murphy: Okay.
42

43 Barraza: Okay.
44

1 Flores: So you wanted a public presentation, are you willing and you said you
2 were fine with that, do you mean here or somewhere else, I'm kind of,
3 sorry.
4

5 Small: Sorry, no, thank you Madam Chair. And thank you for following up. I, at
6 the MPO.
7

8 Flores: Okay.
9

10 Small: Yes.
11

12 Flores: That's what I thought, so can I, I don't see anybody that's against that idea
13 so I'll just direct you to get together with staff and Mr. Doolittle as well to
14 set something up.
15

16 Small: Perfect.
17

18 Flores: Do we want to set a specific time or just leave it?
19

20 Small: Thank you Madam Chair. I, I, I would hope, and I'll connect with folks very
21 quickly. I would hope that it might be ready at least for just from a brief
22 informational perspective at our next meeting.
23

24 Flores: Okay.
25

26 Small: Our next regular meeting.
27

28 Flores: All right. And you don't see any problem with that, with what's coming up?
29 Okay. Then let's do that. Okay, so moving on to staff comments.
30

31 Murphy: Okay. Thank you Madam Chair. I believe I'll, I'll start with the University
32 Avenue project, one of the study corridors that MPO staff is working on
33 under contract with Bohannon Huston. We've, in addition to since the, the
34 kickoff meeting we've met, the consultant's come down, has met with the,
35 the, you know the meeting out in the general public, meeting of the
36 Technical Advisory Committee, Bicycle and Pedestrian. The, based, and
37 based on all the feedback received from that, our communication last
38 week with them is they've narrowed it down to two cross-sections that they
39 expect to you know plan on studying further and then we'll present that
40 back out, we're going to present that first to the BPAC at their, at their next
41 meeting I believe is, it's next week, right? BPAC. Yes. You know we, we
42 don't have meetings in July and I lose my head, my calendar inside of my
43 head. So we'll present that forward and I think we're tentatively looking at
44 bringing that back out, we have a public information meeting in early
45 October and then, and then take it through, back through the committee
46 process for approval of the report ultimately I think it, at this, at your

1 November hearing and, or your November meeting and throughout that
2 time we'll you know, excuse me. The, there is no November meeting this
3 year, it's, so approval for your December meeting but we will, we will
4 provide updates through that time and, and in direct response to the
5 question I think we're looking early October for the next public opportunity
6 for.

7 Missouri study corridor, we had a stakeholder meeting last week
8 with City, County, NMDOT, all, all, and, and Bureau of Land Management
9 all represented. We're looking at the, the possibility of connecting from the
10 east side of the city to, more directly to Centennial High School. We're
11 looking at, I guess we're, I, I think we're also looking about a mid-October
12 public hear, hearing for that one. The consultants is going to be putting
13 together various options based on the input from the staff, the, the staffs
14 that we met with on there. It's looking like there's a, there's a preference
15 for some sort of non-motorized access first. They don't, they, the sense
16 from the technical staff members is that there's probably not a, a, a, a
17 vehicle traffic need for that but the connectivity aspect would be more
18 important but again we're going to be developing a list of alternatives, take
19 that out to the, out to the public. We're, I think we're, our consultant's
20 going to be speaking with the Farm and Ranch Museum about hosting a,
21 hosting a public meeting and we've also learned that they're, they have
22 some expansion plans that may be impacted as well so we're bringing
23 them into the stakeholder, into the stakeholder group.

24 Staff is also working on a short-range transit plan update for the
25 city. We went out, we went out for public meetings on that in early July.
26 Staff is revising some of those recommendations based on public input.
27 We're testing the running time for those routes and we expect to present
28 that back to a, a meeting of the Transit Advisory Board next time that they
29 meet, I, I believe it'll be in, in September. Thank you Councilor Sorg.

30 And I, and then one last thing from Committee, or from staff and
31 this kind of relates to, I, I, I believe something Councilor Small was
32 alluding to. We don't always get thanks but we did get an unsolicited
33 thank-you card. I, it's addressed basically to all of us: "Thanking you for,
34 thanking you for your work and, and caring about transportation issues,"
35 and I'll go ahead and pass that, pass that around.

36
37 Flores: All right.

38
39 Murphy: That's all I have.

40
41 Flores: Okay. Councilor Sorg did you have a comment you wanted to make? I
42 thought I, I thought you raised your hand. No? Okay. Well then that
43 being said I'll let people look at the card as they want to.
44
45
46

1 9. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

2
3 10. ADJOURNMENT (2:26 p.m.)

4
5 Flores: And we'll go ahead and go to adjournment. So thank you everyone.

6
7
8
9
10
11 

12 Chairperson