



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://mvmmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the Amended Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **October 8, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.** in the **Las Cruces City Council Chambers**, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

The Mesilla Valley 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 Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley 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 Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____
Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee. _____ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
5.1. *September 10, 2014 _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
6.1. Resolution 14-09: A Resolution Approving a Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO on planning responsibilities in certain areas of Doña Ana County _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
7.1. 2015 Meeting Calendar _____ **MPO Staff**
7.2. Transportation Improvement Program Procedures Briefing _____ **MPO Staff**
7.3. NMDOT Updates _____ **NMDOT Staff**
7.4. Advisory Committee Updates _____ **MPO Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **4. CONSENT AGENDA***

2
3 Garrett: We will proceed with the consent agenda which consists of approval of the
4 minutes of August 13, 2014. Could I have a motion to approve the
5 consent agenda?
6

7 Sorg: Move to approve.
8

9 Hancock: Second.
10

11 Garrett: Who indicated second?
12

13 Hancock: Second, Hancock.
14

15 Garrett: Okay, sorry. I didn't recognize your voice. Motion was made by Member
16 Sorg, seconded by Member Hancock, any corrections to the minutes? In
17 that case, would you please poll the Committee?
18

19 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
20

21 Doolittle: Yes.
22

23 Wray: Councillor Small.
24

25 Small: Yes.
26

27 Wray: Trustee Flores.
28

29 Flores: Yes.
30

31 Wray: Trustee Bernal.
32

33 Bernal: Yes.
34

35 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
36

37 Sorg: Yes.
38

39 Wray: Commissioner Hancock. Mr. Chair.
40

41 Garrett: Yes. The minutes are unanimously approved. That's the extent of our
42 consent agenda.
43

44 Motion passes – Vote 6-0 (4 members absent for this vote).
45
46

1 **5. *APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **1.1 *August 13, 2014** – minutes approved under the Consent Agenda vote.
4

5 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

6
7 **6.1 Resolution 14-12: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019**
8 **Transportation Improvement Program**
9

10 Garrett: We'll now move onto action items. Item number 6.1 is a Resolution
11 amending the 2012-2019 transportation improvement program.
12

13 Andrew Wray gave a presentation.
14

15 Garrett: I think what I'd like to do is go ahead and get a motion on the floor and
16 then we can go into questions and discussion. So could I have a motion
17 to approve the Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation
18 Improvement Program?
19

20 Hancock: So moved.
21

22 Small: Second.
23

24 Garrett: Motion was made by Commissioner Hancock and seconded by Councillor
25 Small, any questions or comments? Yes?
26

27 Flores: I just want, look at Exhibit A on the second to the last one, LC00210, you
28 added 60,000 because it was 10,000 for construction and 10,000 for
29 design, so shouldn't that be on the project total, 310,000 rather than the
30 280,000?
31

32 Wray: I will have to defer to Ms. Herrera from NMDOT. I believe that this is
33 correct, but this was a DOT requested project.
34

35 Flores: Okay.
36

37 Herrera: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Trustee Flores. That amount actually is correct
38 because we didn't add the 30,000 in FY14, that was previously or already
39 in the TIP I guess.
40

41 Flores: Okay.
42

43 Herrera: I just put it there as a note to let everyone know that there is 30,000 in
44 design, so the only change is adding the 30,000 to construction.
45

46 Flores: Okay.

1
2 Herrera: So, the amount here shown is for the construction portion.
3
4 Flores: Okay.
5
6 Herrera: And it's the same comment for the ... the very last one LC00220.
7
8 Garrett: Does that answer your question?
9
10 Flores: Yes, thank you.
11
12 Garrett: Okay, other comments or questions?
13
14 Sorg: Yes.
15
16 Garrett: Yes, Member Sorg.
17
18 Sorg: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a ... just ... an inform ... information,
19 curiosity questions first. On the two highway presentation projects on
20 Interstate10, can you tell us approximately where those places are? The
21 mileposts I don't recognize.
22
23 Wray: Are you referring to, let me see ...
24
25 Sorg: One-fifty and 620.
26
27 Wray: One-fifty, the 133-143, that one I believe that's the Union Avenue project.
28 Is that ...
29
30 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, actually I can clarify that if you want.
31
32 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
33
34 Doolittle: Mile post 133 is about the Corralitos exit and milepost 146 is about the I-
35 10/I-25 interchange and then 140 ... and then 164 is the state line, so it's a
36 pavement preservation, two separate projects that will basically go from
37 Corralitos to I-10, I-10 and I-25, and then from that interchange to the
38 state line.
39
40 Sorg: The Texas state line, right?
41
42 Doolittle: Yes.
43
44 Sorg: Yes and where was the beginning, 133, again? I didn't hear it.
45
46 Doolittle: It's about the Corralitos exit, airport.

1
2 Sorg: Oh, yeah, okay. That's quite a bit. I have a rhetorical question then.
3
4 Doolittle: Sure.
5
6 Sorg: What happens if we vote "no" on this?
7
8 Wray: Then the funding isn't approved and the money gets to go someplace
9 else.
10
11 Sorg: I see. Thank you Mr. Chairman.
12
13 Garrett: Thank you, other questions? Member Small, did you have a question or
14 comment?
15
16 Small: Yes, sir. The ... and usually I think after speaking to turn off the mic, not
17 that ... yeah, oh, there we go, yeah, yeah, good, no, no. Thank you very
18 much, Mr. Chair. Briefly, with regard to the West Mesa Road, I guess
19 engineering phase addition, it doesn't come with additional funds you
20 outlined, what is driving its inclusion here?
21
22 Wray: I would have to defer to NMDOT on that.
23
24 Small: Understood. Thank you.
25
26 Herrera: Mr. Chair, Councillor Small, inclusion in this MPO's TIP, you mean,
27 because part of it goes through this, the MPO boundary, so we can't ...
28
29 Small: Oh, no, oh, and, and Mr. Chair, I apologize for the lack of clarity. Is there
30 any change of conditions, or I know there, there's different ideas both
31 about siting and different routes in addition to timing and, and necessity. I
32 guess from a, from a DOT policy context what is driving this inclusion, not,
33 not the jurisdiction? Sorry.
34
35 Herrera: Right, got you, okay. So, we're trying to be prepared for the future, I
36 guess. Right now, the ... the need and purpose is still kind of under
37 review by NMDOT, but this phase of the project is to kind of nail down a
38 specific alignment, the preferred alignment. So, Phase 1A looked at all
39 the different alternatives and now we're looking at a more specific
40 alignment for that. And, Mr. Chair, to answer a question that you asked at
41 last month's meeting, the first part of it did not include the 404/I-10
42 interchange.
43
44 Garrett: Thank you. Are you done with your question?
45
46 Small: For right now, Mr. Chair, but ...

1
2 Garrett: Thank you.
3
4 Small: Thank you very much.
5
6 Garrett: Let the record reflect that Members Pedroza and Benavidez have joined
7 us. Thank you. And I also had had an e-mail from Mayor Barraza that
8 she had other business and might be late. It also is possible that it could
9 preclude her ability to join us at all. Other questions about the ... the list?
10 Well, I'd like to follow up on Member Small's question. I have significant
11 problems with doing anything else on the, the West Mesa Road, I don't
12 think it's in the interest of the County. I think at some point in the far
13 distant future we might need a ... a relief road, but think that there are
14 other configurations that are much more in the interest of, of New Mexico
15 in general that need to be explored and I ... I ... I would prefer that we
16 send a clear message that just continuing this process doesn't help at all
17 in terms of looking at other alternatives. So, I would like to entertain, well
18 I'd like to ... I know, I guess I'm the Chair, I'm going to entertain a motion
19 to amend the ... the Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
20 to delete the West Mesa Road, if anyone would like to support that.
21
22 Small: Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair and for some of the reasons that were
23 outlined in addition to the fact that there isn't a funding component
24 attached here; I would make that motion to remove and just to get it right
25 here apologize, the Number 110820, thank you Trustee Flores ... to
26 remove that from the Amendments for, for the planning.
27
28 Pedroza: Second.
29
30 Garrett: Is there a second? Okay. Member Small made the motion to amend and
31 it was ... the second was by Member Pedroza. Do we have any
32 discussion on this particular amendment? Yes?
33
34 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I just have the comment, again, this is, this is purely a study
35 phase. I understand the concern about having other needs in the district
36 is; of course, pursuing other options for studies even within Dona Ana
37 County and the City of Las Cruces. I ... you know there is a rift that this
38 might either eliminate or delay this study which could lead towards further
39 repercussions. You know, I know that the 404 interchange is something
40 that you've been concerned about. I don't know how we can include that
41 in this Phase 1B study, but I ... I again caution about removing this from
42 the TIP and what ultimately will happen with that entire West Mesa Road,
43 knowing that it does include all of Dona Ana County, two MPOs, and
44 several other entities as well.
45
46 Garrett: Alright, then Member Small.

1
2 Small: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I, I, I take the, the warning and the
3 consideration, certainly very seriously. It, it does seem, in, in my last
4 recollection is where some of the different alternatives had been
5 introduced for different alignments. At that point, there was both
6 significant support, but I think also significant concern about again both
7 different alignments and their effects on the communities, and on the ...
8 going back to the more fundamental question of needing another
9 opportunity to specifically address some of the need that obviously is
10 driving that project. The fact that this wouldn't, you know, take us a very
11 big next step towards alignment, I understand why it could cause concern
12 for, for the project, but it, it is taking a very, it seems taking a very
13 significant step, and because of the lack, well we haven't yet seen other
14 opportunities for things like the 404 interchange to my knowledge and this
15 may be incorrect, but further follow-up on some of the concerns that had
16 been generated about different alignments. It seems like this is a, a
17 reasonable and balanced step to say that ... we're to put the question
18 forward and ask and obviously it's up to a vote; whether there's comfort
19 with dialing us in so to speak on a, on a route that chooses the West Mesa
20 and furthermore on a specific route up there when we still have a lot of
21 other basic questions that haven't been answered and it doesn't seem like
22 as part of the study necessarily a way to answer those questions. So,
23 understanding the concern and taking it very seriously but to also show
24 that, that there's a to need to answer some of the other more basic
25 questions and understand the next phase in the study, if it likely selects
26 that route. It's a very significant step, would push me towards still
27 supporting the amendment to remove it right now. Thank you.

28
29 Garrett: Yes, Member Flores.

30
31 Flores: I'd like to hear some more about the concerns, because I ...

32
33 Garrett: Okay.

34
35 Flores: Do take it seriously, taking something off.

36
37 Garrett: As I understand it this ... the proposals for this go back as far as 20 years
38 ago. There was no Union Pacific, there was no large-scale influx in terms
39 of really understanding what all the truck traffic could be. We had, even if
40 you go back ten years in terms of, of regional planning for the County and
41 how we would interface with the whole border industrial area and the
42 continued development of traffic from Mexico and to Mexico. I don't think
43 there was very much of a sense that there was an, a real stake for New
44 Mexico in this, and yet we're ... you know as ... as a Commissioner I find
45 myself in a position of having to approve billions of, of dollars of
46 improvements and investments and underwriting. And what the West

1 Road, West Mesa Road does is to bypass the, the entire Valley. It's a
2 connection between, if you will an industrial park in the south and
3 industrial park on the north. It does not help in terms of providing other
4 opportunities for economic development along a transportation corridor,
5 because the whole idea of, of running a, a road along the West Mesa and
6 then sprawling out additional development along that corridor would be
7 disastrous in terms of trying to build infrastructure, trying to provide
8 services along those areas, whereas if we, we look at now we have six-
9 lane divided highway from El Paso to Las Cruces, if there's a, a
10 connection that's made in the vicinity of 404, probably north of that so you,
11 you miss the majority of existing development, you're in a position to have
12 a new center for development in the south that's in New Mexico, not in
13 Texas. And almost all of the major interchanges that are being developed
14 are in Texas coming out of Santa Teresa. So they're benefiting. We don't
15 actually have a good way now to connect in with Chaparral, so we've got
16 25,000 people that are there; some of whom could use jobs in Santa
17 Teresa. If, if the connection at 404 was extended as part of the proposed
18 loop that would go around El Paso with the Northeast Parkway, this would
19 be a compliment to that entire development. So you'd have a way to both
20 connect in with potential workforces, you have a way of strengthening the
21 basic corridor that runs through the valley. Trucks that want to come from
22 Albuquerque and points north and go directly in, they would not have to go
23 on surface roads, or go into Texas in order to get to Santa Teresa. It also
24 pulls, could pull the development away from Sunland Park in terms of
25 congestion and away from Anthony in terms of congestion. And then if we
26 get to the point where there's enough traffic and we say "Enough," then
27 you can always have, if you will, an additional spur that comes off at a
28 certain point for the trucks that want to go west or that are coming from the
29 west, and that could be a relief connection from the 404 spur to I-10 West
30 at, at, at the Las Cruces industrial park/the airport area. So, I, I think part
31 of this is there's been so much that's happened since the original idea and
32 I, I was encouraged initially because we had had some discussions with
33 the people doing the study on the West Mesa road. I understood they
34 were going to try to get a consideration of what the option would be and
35 how to connect in with West Mesa to I, to I-10 at 440. That hasn't
36 happened. I'm very disappointed that that did not happen. I think that the
37 issue before us is that we have a project that has some momentum and
38 I'm not sure that that's the best way for us to go. So what would be much
39 better as far as I'm concerned would be an evaluation of an alternative to
40 the West Mesa Road which would be a spur from 404 at I-10 to Santa
41 Teresa. So we would be able to know how it actually plays out in today's
42 metrics in terms of today's truck traffic, pedestrian, you know other kinds
43 of traffic and so forth. We're, you know we, we get going on these, these
44 projects and we're trying to figure out how to make positive changes with
45 Viva Dona Ana and looking at border economic development strategies,
46 and then we have something like this that looks like it could be a real

1 viable very powerful idea and it takes so long to move things along, we're
2 basically dealing with something that we've got to ... if it's, if it's a really
3 good choice, we better move fast to get it into the line in terms of
4 consideration. So, I, I appreciate the fact that there's long history on this.
5 I'm very concerned that that might be a very bad decision for us and I'd
6 love to have the information that would help us be able to do an, a good
7 evaluation of the alternatives. So that would be, I, it's not so much that I'm
8 saying I want that particular option is I, I mean, it makes a lot of intuitive
9 sense to me. I'd love to have good analysis of what that alternative would
10 look like so we could all fairly say, "Well, you know, do these work?" And I
11 ... again I think that the West Mesa road might be great as a long-term
12 relief route after we get everything else in place. Yes, Member Pedroza.

13
14 Pedroza: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am remiss because I had not read the packet. I, I
15 thought it ... the meeting was tomorrow so I apologize for that. But what I
16 have not seen and I think would be very, very helpful is a graphic of
17 exactly what was proposed and the alternatives because I've been to
18 Chaparral lots of times and I've been to El Paso, etc. etc. etc., but, it's
19 hard for me to, to ... right now your explanation was the first time I'm
20 finally beginning to kind of visualize in my mind exactly where the
21 proposed road is going and so, yeah, I, I would love to see a graphic
22 description of what is proposed, where, and, and then it would not feel so
23 much as a rubber stamp to, to be asked to approve it. And so that's why I
24 feel that, yeah deleting that particular part at this point would be a good
25 thing to do. Thank you.

26
27 Garrett: If, if I could, it would seem to me that one of the, the options that we have
28 is if we pull this off at this point, we could have at the next meeting or
29 whenever staff is ready, we could have a briefing and we could have lots
30 of information brought in for us to look at. If we do that, I would really
31 appreciate having the information about the alternative as well as what's
32 being proposed for the West Mesa so that we, you know, might be ... we
33 need some assistance here in terms of how to strategically ... if, if we're
34 looking at things at a policy level, I mean this to me is at a policy level in
35 terms of, "Okay, where do you want a major truck route to go?" That's a
36 huge decision. I, you know and, and so, I think that, that having this
37 question is a, is a legitimate issue for this Policy Committee to be
38 concerned with. But I would agree with you that, that for those who
39 haven't been looking at the, the issue, it makes sense to have some
40 additional briefing and discussion. Yes, I'll look back over this way in just
41 a minute. Yes, Member Doolittle.

42
43 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I do have a question either for Andrew or Jolene. What
44 happens to this \$305,000? I mean, you say it's lost, but how long before
45 it can be re-encumbered, or moved, or ...
46

1 Herrera: It really depends on what other plans are sitting on the shelf. I haven't
2 looked at the Consultant Management Unit's priority list but I know that
3 there are a lot of other studies that need to be done right now, so chances
4 are high that this money will be moved immediately.
5

6 Doolittle: If I may, Mr. Chair, to expand a little bit on, on that, we are currently
7 pursuing of course, the Border Master Plan. We submitted a TIGER
8 application to do a study specifically on NM136 and NM273. We are
9 pursuing some funding ...
10

11 Garrett: Which are those roads by other names?
12

13 Doolittle: I'm sorry. That is Artcraft and McNutt.
14

15 Garrett: Yeah.
16

17 Doolittle: We are currently pursuing options to fund a study on NM404 to see if we
18 need a four-lane section over the pass to include an interchange
19 realignment, and again that's all study ... We, there is no funding set aside
20 for any of that so the ... again the intent of these studies is to try to figure
21 out what is truly indeed, going on with the border. The Phase 1A provided
22 opportunity for public comment either from the entities or, or public
23 citizens. I don't know why 404 itself wasn't included in the Phase 1A, but
24 there certainly was an opportunity to, to voice those concerns, and again
25 the Phase 1B is just to move forward with the study. It's the second step
26 in many, of many studies taking place in the border area. So I ... the
27 reason I ask is we as a, as a department are pursuing some other options
28 for some studies. Another example that we're going to look at is US70
29 from Three Crosses to Elks. Right now, we don't have anything that says
30 that warrants a six-lane. So we are moving forward with some of those
31 things, the problem is without these studies if it does get to that point we
32 need it, we cannot move forward.
33

34 Garrett: Let me just to follow up on that. How do projects get into the queue?
35

36 Doolittle: Ultimately it becomes a, a noticed need from either the department, the
37 MPO, citizen complaints, those types of issues. Really, it, it gets into the
38 queue based on, just, discussions internally and what the DOT feels it's, it
39 needs based on discussions like this or, or the public.
40

41 Garrett: So in other words, even if this money went away and ... for a while and we
42 asked for a project to evaluate ... to have a study done for a connection
43 from Santa Teresa to an area up north of Anthony in the approximate
44 vicinity of 404, that would be a project that then potentially could get into
45 line and if there's a lot of interest in that because there's a lot of pressure
46 on the infrastructure in the south, that potentially could come up to at least

1 get it to the level of the first, of, of what's been done for the West Mesa
2 road.
3
4 Doolittle: Sure.
5
6 Garrett: Okay, so, I mean I think the pressures are all there and, and as a matter of
7 fact the ... one of the things that'd be very interesting to know is if, if we
8 were able to actually develop a spur that went around some of that
9 development what kind ... how that would affect and potentially scale
10 down some of the other work that you're being asked to study you know in
11 terms of Artcraft and so forth. I don't know that people are even thinking
12 about the larger system, because part of the problem is to get from Santa
13 Teresa to I-10 whether you're going north or south, or if you're coming in
14 from the north how do you, how do you go? And, that's part of the
15 demand is that it's putting real stress on those roads.
16
17 Doolittle: Correct.
18
19 Garrett: Well if that's not the only way to get through the area, there might be some
20 alternatives that have other, other benefits. So ...
21
22 Herrera: Mr. Chair, one thing that we can do is go ahead and provide the Phase 1A
23 report, it was done by Molzen Corbin, so that report is written. We can
24 provide that to this Policy Committee.
25
26 Garrett: That'd be great.
27
28 Herrera: It is public information.
29
30 Garrett: And, and for what it's worth I had a number of meetings and spoke up and
31 sent in written stuff and all that and was led to believe, you know that they
32 were going to try to do as much as they could in terms of considering
33 some of that, but I ...
34
35 Herrera: And Mr. Chair I think that they, they probably did. I don't want to say lack
36 of funding was an issue, but they can only do as much as the funding will
37 facilitate.
38
39 Garrett: Oh, I understand. I think the other, the other issue is that if this ... if the
40 issue was the alignments of the West Mesa road, then it, then it's sort of
41 out of the scope of that particular study as I understood it, its intent, and
42 I'm, I'm not, I wasn't expecting somebody that suddenly, you know go
43 change the intent of the study. But, the problem is, I hope that there's a
44 record in there that there's concern about all this as the way to get things
45 done and that there needs to be evaluation of others and that might give
46 us a hook to another study that looks at the 404 Santa Teresa connection.

1
2 Herrera: Right, and Mr. Chair if I could just add one more tidbit of information to
3 that, the South Region Design Center works very closely with District 1
4 and they are pursuing funding right now for NM404 to connect up to the
5 Northeast Parkway to include the interchange, so, we haven't identified
6 the study funding yet, but we are pursuing that.
7
8 Garrett: That's great. Because that's just, I mean that reinforces to me the fact
9 that we're talking about a system in, in and around El Paso Metro that
10 connects then with Southern New Mexico, and that, and that's, you know
11 simple words that's to me the issue, is, is, sort of we're missing an
12 opportunity to, to connect in and support that so. Well, we have a motion
13 on the floor. Any further discussion about that?
14
15 Sorg: Yes, Matt, Mr. Chair.
16
17 Garrett: Alright, Member Sorg.
18
19 Sorg: I, too, would like more information. That 1A, I do think I sent a short
20 comment in on that myself. Just looking at this superficially and, and, and,
21 and at, and at a higher level, the Santa Teresa industrial area is going to
22 need infrastructure and needs it soon, and I just wonder if, if things that we
23 do here will delay the infrastructure that is needed, but I think we need to
24 know what the implications of all the different types of infrastructure that
25 might be built, that's what we have to do before we can make a decision.
26 And so, therefore just superficially looking at it, a, a connection between
27 Interstate 10 at Anthony or 404 to Santa Teresa which seems to me there
28 would be a lot of private land that would have to have a right-of-way to get
29 through it. I don't, just my limited experience down there, and that would
30 be a significant problem I would think. But anyway, be as it may, I'm all for
31 studying all the different options and getting all this out as much as ...
32 including maps by the way. You talk about places here that I ... different
33 names that I don't know what they are, and so I would be in favor of that,
34 and if this helps spur that along, I'm in favor of the amendment, too.
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36
37 Garrett: Thank you. Other, yes sorry, Member Hancock.
38
39 Hancock: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could we hear the, the amendment again so we
40 have clarity?
41
42 Small: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you Commissioner Hancock. And
43 then the amendment is simply to remove Item 1100820 for the West Mesa
44 Road currently from the, the amendment to the Transportation
45 Improvement Plan, the, the main amendment that's on the, on the table.
46

1 Hancock: Thank you. Do we have ... would it ... since there is a, a level of concern
2 about more information on this, is it possible to, and do we have the time
3 to simply table this particular item for the moment until we have further
4 information? Will that ... could that be possible, is it, are we at a, a, a
5 point of live or die, is it ...
6

7 Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock since there is now a live motion on the,
8 the table, on a ... up or down on that amendment I think we have to ...
9

10 Hancock: Well, it is possible to do ...
11

12 Wray: Yep.
13

14 Hancock: A friendly amendment or have that amendment withdrawn and change the
15 amendment. I think the question is, in light of the, of the concerns of
16 additional information ... it ... if it's possible to not kill it but to have more
17 time to evaluate it, is it even a possibility?
18

19 Herrera: It could be. If this is not approved here it won't go into the STIP, the State
20 Transportation Improvement Program, which means that it won't be
21 approved by FHWA. The money probably won't be moved in the next
22 month or so, just depending on priorities, I can't guarantee that though.
23 So we would have to wait for the next amendment cycle which will be in
24 October, late October, coming to you all in November or December.
25

26 Hancock: That being said, it strikes me that that is less invasive than simply
27 removing it in its entirety and then would satisfy the, the need for further
28 information, and I'd like to hear other thoughts on that. Thank you.
29

30 Garrett: Member Small, could I ask a question just to clarify before we do this?
31 Can the ...
32

33 Wray: Mr. Chair, if I, if ...
34

35 Garrett: I, I guess there are two questions I want to ask just to get clear on this.
36 Do we have to act on this today?
37

38 Wray: Mr. Chair it's my understanding from Ms. Herrera just now, yes.
39

40 Garrett: Okay. Second thing is, if we send this in with the, the West Mesa road as
41 part of it, can we pull that later?
42

43 Wray: I'm not sure. That, since this is an NMDOT requested amendment they
44 would need to make the request to ... I believe they would need to make
45 the request to modify it. And just to follow up from what Commissioner

1 Hancock was saying, if the, if effectively this project is tabled, that is
2 effectively voting it down for this, that there's no just tabling it, it's ...
3
4 Garrett: Finish the, this, though. It's, it's for this particular submission of an
5 amendment.
6
7 Wray: Yes.
8
9 Garrett: It does not mean that this ... could this be considered the next round?
10
11 Wray: It could be considered the next round, but as Ms. Herrera said that
12 wouldn't be until November or December.
13
14 Garrett: A few months down the road.
15
16 Wray: A few months down the road.
17
18 Garrett: Which would give us time to understand everything, but there's still the
19 question of how to get it under the list for consideration.
20
21 Herrera: Right and that was what I was going to say Mr. Chair, is we can't
22 guarantee that the funding will sit in this project.
23
24 Garrett: I understand.
25
26 Herrera: So.
27
28 Wray: Mr. Chair?
29
30 Garrett: Yes, okay. I just want to get clear, I, I think there was a good attempt to
31 make sure that we ... if we had an option to defer this, get further
32 information and make a decision, that we would do that, but it doesn't
33 sound like we have much flexibility. We need to make a decision today.
34 Okay. Yes, Member, Member Small?
35
36 Small: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks to Commissioner Hancock I think for a
37 great question. The, the answers suggest to me the ... is the conclusion
38 that we have to move forward with the larger amendment today. Striking
39 the West Mesa road for today knowing and really expecting for that to be
40 brought back at the very next funding cycle with potential changes or
41 expansions or for sure more information, gives me a level of comfort and
42 gives a middle ground between kind of abandoning this project for an
43 indeterminate amount of time. Think it's, it's right to ... my perception is
44 that there's, there's significant interest and in fact support from a lot of
45 different areas around the concept. I have confidence that a vote to strike
46 it today with the idea of, of looking, reopening potentially in the next couple

1 of months will not as a ... remove funding from this for an indeterminate
2 amount of time, and in fact will give us some very good time to be able to
3 more widely consider it. So I think it, it should be clear from the meeting
4 and the, the, hopefully the comments that this is not necessarily a, an
5 amendment to remove this item from consideration for the foreseeable
6 future, but it is a very clear statement that it if it in fact is supported, that
7 the next couple of months there needs to be consideration of, of, of
8 expansion of scope or clarity on other alternatives that do very much tie
9 into this project in different ways. So I think it's great questioning. I'm
10 actually given more comfort that this will be able to come back up again in
11 this calendar year, and again thanks to Commissioner Hancock for helping
12 start that. Thank you.

13
14 Wray: Mr. Chair may I interject?

15
16 Garrett: Sure.

17
18 Wray: I don't want to throw too much cold water on what Councillor Small just
19 said, but this is an NMDOT requested amendment and there's nothing
20 compelling them to bring this back if the money is not there, and so I mean
21 ... the thinking seems to be that if this amendment passes and the TIP is
22 passed without it, then this will just come back the next time around,
23 there's ... I just want to make sure that it's understood there's no
24 guarantee of that.

25
26 Garrett: I, I would just say that I, I think that is understood. It ... we're not talking
27 about holding that money at all. I think that, that the sense is that there is
28 an urgency that has to do with getting the infrastructure in the south
29 county right, and that getting these studies done in order to fairly evaluate
30 how they all work together is really important, and I think that the NMDOT
31 understands that and is supportive of that. I don't see this particular
32 project adding to our overall understanding of how the system down there
33 could work in an effective way, because there's a major thing that's
34 missing that actually would be precluded in many ways by this if we
35 continue down the road with this particular thing. I ... just to respond to
36 the point that was made by Member Sorg, I've gone down, I've driven the
37 area, that's one of the reasons I say slightly north of the current alignment
38 of 404, there's development along 404 when you go to the west. I don't
39 think that that's the right place to, to probably look at the interchange, but
40 there's lots of agricultural land that's just north of that that's sort of in a
41 transition zone, and if, if you look at the total cost of the connections that
42 are being proposed and are under study or going to be studied that go
43 from Santa Teresa over to I-10 in El Paso, the, the ones you were
44 referring to, there are a number of interchanges, there's, there's widening
45 of the roads, there's a whole lot of, of cost that's involved in that. If you
46 look at the cost of, of actually building the ... a four-lane divided highway

1 all the way up to the, the industrial park off of I-10, that's a long distance.
2 And so we're talking about something that's, that's shorter, that does have
3 other kinds of costs, but that when you put it together with everything else
4 in terms of a system, it might be the most cost-effective alternative. That's
5 what we don't have is the information now to fairly evaluate that, and I just
6 think it's not prudent to continue down the road with one idea when we're
7 looking at the system and saying, "Wait a minute. There seems to be
8 something else here," and if we can get that on the list for consideration in
9 ... at the next round, that would be great, because I think that would
10 compliment all the other work that's being done. So, and quite honestly I
11 don't know any other way to convey to a lot of people who are taking for
12 granted that we're going to build a West Mesa road that that is necessarily
13 the best way to do it because I don't know that everybody's thinking about
14 this. They're tending to just kind of ... they're on autopilot.

15
16 Sorg: Question.

17
18 Garrett: Yes, Member Sorg.

19
20 Sorg: Yeah, if this is dropped from this TIP, this project, I'll ask DOT what does
21 DOT think then, are they more prone to look at alternative routes, other
22 routes that do what we're talking about here, or are they more inclined just
23 to say, "Okay, we'll use the money somewhere else" and not think about
24 an alternative route, the route we're thinking about here? I mean what
25 effect will this have on DOT and, and the planning process?

26
27 Garrett: Yes, Member Doolittle.

28
29 Doolittle: Councillor Sorg, Mr. Chair, I think it's important for us to understand the
30 entire border. I, I, I agree with that statement and I think everybody
31 agrees with that statement. My fear is we've already spent a substantial
32 amount of money and time on Phase 1A. That is not the only study that
33 will take place. My guess is even if we drop this, this West Mesa study,
34 we, we seriously need to look at the 404 interchange at I-10 regardless of
35 what we do west of there. I don't think that the study will go away. I, I
36 think there's been a, a substantial amount of time and effort put into it, and
37 to just drop it and let it go away is problematic. But regardless of what we
38 do is it, it is currently an unfunded project. If, if an alignment does prove to
39 be warranted, the study goes through and says it needs to be built, the
40 Chair is right, it, it's a substantial costly effort that we currently don't have
41 the money to build. But, I, I don't see it going away, I truly don't. Will the
42 404 interchange study move in priority as opposed to this one? I, I can't
43 answer that question.

44
45 Sorg: Okay.

46

1 Doolittle: We haven't even begun seeking that Phase 1A on any other option except
2 this one.
3

4 Sorg: Okay. Well, I, I would encourage us to look at all these options and, and
5 proceed on post haste on that, post haste.
6

7 Garrett: Yes, Member Hancock.
8

9 Hancock: Two ... thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair. Two questions: One, when the
10 original study was made was there any consideration to the UAS area, the
11 unmanned aerial systems area? That road if I'm not mistaken goes right
12 through the middle of it.
13

14 Garrett: That, that's on BLM land?
15

16 Hancock: Right.
17

18 Garrett: Yep.
19

20 Hancock: So, the, the, the point is we could get into a second phase here, and it's
21 going to go nowhere because you're in the middle of a, of a, experimental
22 test area. Now, I, I, I understand that there is a need for both studies, and
23 I understand that there's been a considerate amount of money and effort
24 put into this particular one. If, if the UAS has nothing to do with it and, and
25 it's still something that should be studied and there is a commitment for
26 the other study as well, I can see doing both. But the question remains
27 UAS. Thank you.
28

29 Garrett: Thank you. Mr. Doolittle.
30

31 Doolittle: Commissioner Hancock, Mr. Chair, I don't know that I can answer that
32 question right now. I, it's been quite some time since I looked at that
33 Phase 1A study. I was not part of the initial progression of that study
34 because I was in a different position so at this point really all I've been
35 involved in is the review of the Phase 1A. I, I can't answer that question.
36 We'll have to ... maybe that can be part of the presentation ... I mean
37 regardless of what happens with this vote today, I think it's important for
38 us to have an update on, on the West Mesa regardless of what happens.
39 So, maybe we can get that from, from the MPO staff in the near future.
40

41 Garrett: Very good. Any other discussion? Any public comment or staff
42 comment? Then let's proceed with the vote on the motion to remove the,
43 the West Mesa Road Phase 1B engineering services from the overall
44 package of amendments for the TIP. Those in favor of removal say "yes,"
45 those opposed say "no." Would you please poll the committee?
46

1 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
2
3 Benavidez: Yes.
4
5 Wray: Commissioner Pedroza.
6
7 Pedroza: Yes.
8
9 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
10
11 Doolittle: No.
12
13 Wray: Commissioner, excuse me, Councillor Small.
14
15 Small: Yes.
16
17 Wray: Trustee Flores.
18
19 Flores: Yes.
20
21 Wray: Trustee Bernal.
22
23 Bernal: No.
24
25 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
26
27 Sorg: Yes.
28
29 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
30
31 Hancock: No.
32
33 Wray: Mr. Chair.
34
35 Garrett: Yes.
36
37 Wray: According to my tally the amendment passes.
38
39 Garrett: And it passes by six/three?
40
41 Wray: Yes, that's correct.
42
43 Garrett: Okay. So, we have an amended resolution. Do we need any further
44 discussion about the resolution as a whole? In that case would you poll
45 the board? And, those in favor of the amended resolution say "yes," those
46 opposed say "no."

1
2 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
3
4 Benavidez: Yes.
5
6 Wray: Councillor Pedroza.
7
8 Pedroza: Yes.
9
10 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
11
12 Doolittle: I apologize, Mr. Chair.
13
14 Garrett: We're, we're ...
15
16 Doolittle: As this is the first time I've dealt with this type of situation with an
17 amendment.
18
19 Garrett: Yes, so you're voting on the amended resolution and ...
20
21 Doolittle: But ultimately if I vote "no," that's "no" for everything, I guess?
22
23 Garrett: Yeah, it's for the entire thing.
24
25 Doolittle: Yes.
26
27 Wray: Councillor Small.
28
29 Small: Yes.
30
31 Wray: Trustee Flores.
32
33 Flores: Yes.
34
35 Wray: Trustee Bernal.
36
37 Bernal: Yes.
38
39 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
40
41 Sorg: Yes.
42
43 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
44
45 Hancock: Yes.
46

1 Motion passes 8 – 0, (1 member absent).
2
3 Wray: Mr. Chair.
4
5 Garrett: Yes. So that ... the amended, the amended resolution passes nine to
6 zero and I just want to say Mr. Doolittle, I'm really glad you're on the board
7 with us. It's been good to include you as part of this. Thank you. So, just
8 in terms of follow-up on that, we do need to have a briefing on the, on the
9 West Road Study, and I think it would also be helpful to have some kind of
10 presentation about what's necessary to request that a study be framed,
11 put together, a study request for a connection between Santa Teresa and
12 the area north of Anthony at approximately the 404 interchange, so that
13 we just don't miss what we might need to do in order to help get
14 something going along those lines, okay.
15
16 Wray: Is ...
17
18 Sorg: Mr. Chair?
19
20 Garrett: Who said something?
21
22 Sorg: Me.
23
24 Garrett: Okay.
25
26 Sorg: If there is information in the Master Plan for the Border that pertains to this
27 I'd like to ask that be included in the brief, in the presentation.
28
29 Wray: Mr. Chair just for clarity, this is a request for the October meeting, for a
30 discussion item for the October meeting?
31
32 Garrett: Yes. Anyone else have any follow-up comments on, on this item? Yes,
33 Mr. Doolittle?
34
35 Doolittle: Mr. Chair I think Jolene has something else she'd like to share.
36
37 Garrett: Thank you.
38
39 Herrera: Mr. Chair, just to get to what you brought up just now Councillor Sorg, the
40 Border Master Plan is in the very beginning stages. A consultant has I
41 believe just been selected, and I think we're in the negotiation section of
42 that, so the Plan hasn't been started yet so unfortunately, we won't be
43 able to provide really any information at this point.
44

1 Garrett: And the work on Viva Dona Ana is really just at the beginning of starting to
2 look at some of the alternatives that would affect transportation systems
3 as well so best we can do is go back and look at old plans. So okay.

4
5 Doolittle: Mr. Chair?

6
7 Garrett: Yes.

8
9 Doolittle: The ... one of the very first steps once we get the consultant on board will
10 be a stakeholders' meeting, so once we have that information and move
11 forward we'll be sure to keep the board involved so that certainly at that
12 initial steps we can be participating in that Border Master Plan.

13
14 Garrett: Right. And I would just let ... I think a number of you know that I've, I've
15 been encouraging consideration of this. I do want you to know that I've
16 talked to business interests in the south, I've talked to political leaders in
17 the south, and at least to my face, they're saying, "You know what? That's
18 worth exploring." Nobody has said, "That's a really, really bad idea." So,
19 the problem is that some, some of these things take so long to get to this
20 point and then it takes so long to move from here into actual money you
21 sort of hate to, hate to lose the opportunity but you also hate to make a
22 bad mistake because conditions have changed, so that's sort of where we
23 are and I appreciate the, all the discussion. It was good. Thank you.

24
25 **6.2 Resolution 14-13: A Resolution of Support for the South Central**
26 **Regional Transit District's proposed GRT election**

27
28 Garrett: The next item is 6.2. It's a Resolution of Support for the South Central
29 Regional Transit District Proposed GRT Election.

30
31 Andrew Wray gave a presentation.

32
33 Sorg: Move to approve.

34
35 Hancock: Second.

36
37 Garrett: We, we have a motion from Member Sorg and a second from Member
38 Hancock. Would, would you read the ... this is a relative ... it's not terribly
39 long but would you go ahead and read the resolution so that we ...
40 everybody gets it on, on record?

41
42 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. A Resolution of support for the South Central Regional
43 Transit District quarter cent gross receipts tax ballot initiative to develop a
44 sustainable regional public transit system for the citizens of South Central
45 New Mexico: Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Mexico passed
46 legislation and the Governor of the State signed into law Senate Bill 34 as

1 the Regional Transit District Act, and whereas the Mesilla Valley
2 Metropolitan Planning Organization is committed to supporting and
3 encouraging all modes of transportation and, whereas public
4 transportation both intracity and intercity is a critical component of a
5 multimodal transportation system and, whereas statewide multimodal
6 transportation systems improve access to education and jobs and are
7 critical to economic development and, whereas expanded public
8 transportation services help rural and urban New Mexico optimize
9 available regional services and, whereas regional public transit would
10 enable increased Federal investment in New Mexico and, whereas
11 multijurisdictional transportation systems would protect our environment
12 and enhance energy efficiency, decrease automobile accidents, reduce
13 noise and air pollution, improve public health, and reduce congestion
14 particularly along the I-10 corridor in connection to El Paso and Juarez
15 and, whereas regional transit districts function to coordinate public transit
16 services and connect all forms of existing and proposed transportation
17 services among different levels of government and jurisdiction and,
18 whereas coordinated regional public transportation would help sustain
19 New Mexico's cultural diversity and, whereas improved public
20 transportation service in New Mexico would extend the life of existing
21 roads and highways and protect current and future investment in regional
22 transportation infrastructure, now therefore be it resolved by the Mesilla
23 Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization that it supports the passage of
24 the South Central Regional Transit District's Quarter Cent Gross Receipts
25 Tax Initiative that will develop, plan, and promote, and operate a
26 sustainable long-term regional public transportation system for its member
27 jurisdictions.

28
29 Garrett: Thank you very much. Discussion? Yes, Mr. Doolittle.

30
31 Doolittle: Mr. Chair I just feel it important to, to share with you. I'm, I'm going to
32 abstain from this vote just based on the fact that it's a tax ballot, not that I
33 don't support a lot of the language that's in this resolution, but I will be
34 abstaining from this vote.

35
36 Garrett: Because of your position?

37
38 Doolittle: Yes.

39
40 Garrett: Right. Thank you. Understood. Comments or questions? Any
41 discussion? Yes, Member Hancock.

42
43 Hancock: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As a matter of disclosure, I am the Vice-Chair of
44 the South Central Regional Transportation District. However from this
45 perspective as a member of the Metropolitan Planning Organization and in

1 order to meet the goals of the organization, if the rest of the board would
2 permit I can use judgment that would enhance both positions. Thank you.
3
4 Garrett: There any issues with having Member Hancock participate? Okay.
5 Anything else? Any other comments, discussion. Any comments from the
6 public or staff? Sorry I missed the light down there. Yes, Member
7 Pedroza.
8
9 Pedroza: No, no, no, it, I just turned it on just now. Just a comment. I think that the
10 end product of the South Central Regional Transit District will be an
11 improvement in the lives of an awful lot of people and therefore I, I fully
12 support the resolution. Thank you.
13
14 Garrett: Thank you. Anything else? Would you please poll the committee? Those
15 in favor of the resolution indicate by saying "yes," those opposed "no"?
16
17 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
18
19 Benavidez: Yes.
20
21 Wray: Councillor Pedroza.
22
23 Pedroza: Yes.
24
25 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
26
27 Doolittle: Abstain.
28
29 Wray: Councillor Small.
30
31 Small: Yes.
32
33 Wray: Trustee Flores.
34
35 Flores: Yes.
36
37 Wray: Trustee Bernal.
38
39 Bernal: Yes.
40
41 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
42
43 Sorg: Yes.
44
45 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
46

1 Hancock: Yes.
2
3 Wray: Mr. Chair.
4
5 Garrett: Yes. And so, the motion is passed eight to zero with one abstention.
6 Thank you.
7
8 Motion passes 8 – 0 (1 abstention and 1 member absent).
9

10 **6.3 Resolution 14-14: A Resolution to Authorize the MPO Chair to send**
11 **an invitation to New Mexico members of the El Paso Transportation**
12 **Policy Board to discuss coordination with the Mesilla Valley MPO**
13

14 Garrett: Now, we move to Resolution 14-14: A Resolution to Authorize the MPO
15 Chair to send an invitation to New Mexico members of the El Paso
16 Transportation Policy Board to discuss coordination with the Mesilla Valley
17 MPO.
18

19 Andrew Wray gave his presentation.
20

21 Garrett: Comments, questions? Yes, Member Pedroza.
22

23 Pedroza: Thank you very much. I believe that I have been the one to say we should
24 invite them, and I still think that there is a very ... that it'll move us much
25 farther along if we talk, and it's important in my estimation to have all of
26 the people in, in New Mexico who have anything to do with an MPO to, to
27 talk to each other so that some of the questions that we've ... some of the
28 problems that have arisen will, will not arise, we will be able to talk about
29 them. I understand that the ... well we can talk about on the composition
30 of the El Paso MPO and so forth, I understand that they're quite
31 numerous, and we may not actually, we may not actually be able to have
32 an agenda item on there if at some point we want to, because of the
33 length and the number of, of members that it has. Nevertheless, talking to
34 our own representatives who, who are members, I think is a step in the
35 right direction. Thank you.
36

37 Garrett: Other comments? One way that I think we could approach this would be
38 to invite them to a meeting at which one of the topics, if not a primary
39 topic, would be actually how do we all work together better and how often
40 do we need to have meetings, how often ... or how do we make sure that,
41 that our respective interests and information are shared and, and then we
42 can go from there in terms of what the follow-up would be, but I think if we
43 can get agreement on, on the principle that there needs to be an, an
44 integration between El Paso MPO and the Mesilla Valley MPO, and that
45 ... a part of that starts with the New Mexico members, that that would be a
46 good place to, to have a discussion. Make sense to everybody?

1
2 Pedroza: Thank you, yes.
3
4 Garrett: Okay. Any other comments? Let's see. I need a motion.
5
6 Hancock: So moved.
7
8 Garrett: Could I have a second?
9
10 Small: Second.
11
12 Garrett: I have a motion from Member Hancock and second from Member Small to
13 ... for a resolution to authorize the MPO Chair to send an invitation to New
14 Mexico members of the El Paso Transportation Policy Board to discuss
15 coordination with the Mesilla Valley MPO. Any further discussion by the
16 committee? Any comments by the public or by staff? Would you please
17 poll the board? Those in favor say "yes," those opposed "no."
18
19 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
20
21 Benavidez: Yes.
22
23 Wray: Councillor Pedroza.
24
25 Pedroza: Yes.
26
27 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
28
29 Doolittle: Yes.
30
31 Wray: Councillor Small.
32
33 Small: Yes.
34
35 Wray: Trustee Flores.
36
37 Flores: Yes.
38
39 Wray: Trustee Bernal.
40
41 Bernal: Yes.
42
43 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
44
45 Sorg: Yes.
46

1 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

2
3 Hancock: Yes.

4
5 Wray: Mr. Chair.

6
7 Garrett: Yes. Thank you. The item passes nine/zero. One member absent.

8
9 **6.4 Resolution 14-11: Appointing a Mesilla Citizen representative to the**
10 **Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee**

11
12 Garrett: And no, we have a, a, an action that involves appointing a Mesilla Citizen
13 Representative to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory
14 Committee.

15
16 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. This particular position has been vacant for nearly two
17 years at this point. We've had some difficulty in obtaining a citizen of the
18 town of Mesilla which is the requirement for this position, to fill this spot.
19 As mentioned in the Action Form, the open position is jurisdictional as
20 opposed to modal. Mayor Barraza nominated Ms. Ashleigh Curry for this
21 position. She's currently serving as the staff position. To give a little bit of
22 background, historically the town of Mesilla has not necessarily appointed
23 employees of the Town of Mesilla to fulfill their roles on advisory
24 committees, as an example Mr. John Knopp who serves on the TAC, is
25 not an employee of the Town of Mesilla, but he is knowledgeable in
26 engineering and the technical aspects of transportation, and the Town of
27 Mesilla felt confident in appointing him to that staff position. Similarly, for
28 the past several ... I believe six months Ms. Curry has been serving in a
29 similar capacity on the BPAC, but it's my understanding that the Town of
30 Mesilla has designated another individual, Mr. Lance Shepan as the new
31 staff contact and allowing Ms. Curry to be able to be designated as the
32 citizen representative. However, according to the bylaws the Policy
33 Committee has to make that appointment.

34
35 Garrett: Thank you. I think this is pretty straightforward. I, I would entertain a ...
36 it's straightforward in terms of getting a motion on the floor. Some of
37 these things are never straightforward. I would entertain a motion to
38 concur with Mayor Barraza's nomination of Ashleigh Curry to fill the citizen
39 representative from the Town of Mesilla for the BPAC.

40
41 Sorg: Move to approve.

42
43 Flores: Seconded.

44

1 Garrett: Thank you. I have a, a motion from Member Sorg and a second from
2 Member Flores. Just, well, I'm going, I'm trying to do "Member" with
3 everybody. It's, gets confusing enough as it is. Okay.
4

5 Wray: Given the trouble I've had today with "Councillor" and "Commissioner," I
6 may adopt that practice myself.
7

8 Garrett: Practice, okay. Thank you. Thank you members for your support with
9 this. All right, any comments or discussion about this particular action?
10 Yes, Member Flores?
11

12 Flores: I, I'll just say that Ashleigh Curry has been very active in our community
13 and I'm very happy that she's serving.
14

15 Garrett: Thank you. You have anything to add to that? No?
16

17 Hancock: Mr. Chair?
18

19 Garrett: Yes?
20

21 Hancock: Does Ms. Curry ...
22

23 Garrett: Member, Member Hancock.
24

25 Hancock: Thank you. Does ... thank you, Mr. Chair. Does Ms. Curry ride a bicycle?
26

27 Flores: Actually she invited me to a midnight ride that she hosts every year and I
28 know she is very good at organizing the kids to ride bikes to school, so.
29

30 Hancock: That's great. That's great.
31

32 Flores: And she rides with her children all the time.
33

34 Hancock: Good choice, our compliments, thank you.
35

36 Garrett: Yes, Member Pedroza?
37

38 Pedroza: Can you repeat again Andrew what you said about the fact that Ms. Curry
39 is on the staff or is not on the staff, and how that affects her membership
40 as a citizen representative?
41

42 Wray: Mr. Chair, Councillor Pedroza, she is current ... she is employed by the
43 Las Cruces Public School Systems, but she has an extensive background
44 with working with the Safe Routes to School Program, as Trustee Flores
45 said she's a strong member of the cycling community, and again I, I point
46 to the example of Mr. Knopp on the TAC as being a resident of Mesilla

1 who's not on staff, but the town of Mesilla felt confident in appointing him
2 to fulfill that role and it's a similar thing with Ms. Curry currently is that the
3 Town of Mesilla felt confident in appointing her to fill that staff role for them
4 but they've now identified a, a Town of Mesilla Marshal, I believe he is ...
5
6 Flores: He's in the Marshal's Department, somewhere.
7
8 Wray: Yes, in the Marshal's Department, to be the, the bikes representative from
9 the Town of Mesilla for the staff, and now Ms. Curry is the, the nominee
10 for the citizens.
11
12 Pedroza: So, she's not on the staff of the, of the city of Mesilla.
13
14 Wray: No.
15
16 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.
17
18 Garrett: Thank you. Any further questions, clarifications, or comments? Any
19 comments by the public? By staff? Would you please poll the committee?
20
21 Wray: Member Benavidez.
22
23 Benavidez: Yes.
24
25 Wray: Member Pedroza.
26
27 Pedroza: Yes.
28
29 Wray: Member Doolittle.
30
31 Doolittle: Yes.
32
33 Wray: Member Small.
34
35 Small: Yes.
36
37 Wray: Member Flores.
38
39 Flores: Yes.
40
41 Wray: Member Bernal.
42
43 Bernal: Yes.
44
45 Wray: Member Sorg.
46

1 Sorg: Yes.
2
3 Wray: Member Hancock.
4
5 Hancock: Yes.
6
7 Wray: Mr. Chair.
8
9 Garrett: Yes. And that motion to appoint Ms. Curry is approved nine/zero. One
10 member absent.
11

12 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

13
14 **7.1 NMDOT updates**
15

16 Garrett: Discussion items. NMDOT updates.
17

18 Doolittle: I have four projects that I'll be giving some updates on. Our North Main
19 project basically from Chestnut just south of the three crosses; we're
20 working on finishing the paving, putting in some tapers along some more
21 detours and we're looking at switching traffic to the inside lanes in the next
22 couple of weeks. So we are starting to make a little bit of progress. One
23 of the things I just wanted to bring up at the last meeting, there was a
24 question about a concrete slab that we're placing in the median. What
25 that was, is we had some really unsuitable materials underneath and we
26 also did have the shallow City utilities that we were having problems with
27 breaking, so ultimately that's to stabilize the asphalt but also to protect the
28 utilities that are underneath. So, it, it looked like a big sidewalk but it really
29 was a protective measure so that we didn't have to excavate City utilities
30 to do some paving work.

31 The US 70 concrete wall barrier project, we're working on finishing
32 up that concrete wall barrier at the, at the far west end, getting ready to
33 paint it. We should be finished, at least have the roadway open in the next
34 couple of weeks, in the next week or so, as long as weather will continue
35 to cooperate. We'll, we'll have some punch list work and some minor
36 repair that we may have to get in there periodically but we should see that
37 roadway open up substantially in the next week or so.
38

39 Pedroza: Mr. Chair, may I speak?
40

41 Garrett: Yeah.
42

43 Pedroza: I noticed that there's a, a space where there is not the barrier and, and,
44 but it has been paved, and I'm wondering what, what's going to go there,
45 that, because there seems to be no, no barrier between the westbound
46 and the eastbound lanes. And I saw the lights and they're gorgeous.

1
2 Doolittle: Do you have ... can you give me a more specific location?
3
4 Pedroza: It's before the lights begin I believe, and it's kind of reddish in color. I'm
5 sorry. I, I don't remember the exact place, but there's, there's nothing
6 except what appears to be a reddish strip of, of land between the, the, the
7 traffic lanes.
8
9 Doolittle: I'll have to find out. That's ...
10
11 Hancock: Mr. Chair. That, that was the bridge area, and they're, and they're
12 breaking that up and taking it out, and, and they're putting in asphalt and
13 then now today they've put forms there to start the forming for completing
14 that wall in, in that space.
15
16 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.
17
18 Hancock: On my way here I saw that.
19
20 Pedroza: Yeah. Okay.
21
22 Hancock: Thank you.
23
24 Doolittle: I know they were having issues with that section, removing that thin lift of
25 concrete from the bridge deck itself. Believe it or not we did nice quality
26 work by attaching that concrete to the bridge deck and now we're having
27 problems getting it off, so that's the last section that they're working on
28 now. Plus that area's the slower-speeded, the slower speed area, so they
29 wanted to concentrate further out of town where the speeds are a little bit
30 higher before they moved into that, that slower speed area. Sorry, my
31 phone turned off on me.
32 Avenida de Mesilla, we are working on just a few small closeout
33 items on that project. We're putting back the post and cable, the cable
34 barrier in the median, working on seeding. We've got some, some small
35 repair work that we need to finish up. We should see the final application
36 of the stripe here pretty quickly and then we're working on chain link to, to
37 reestablish our access control along the frontage roads and everything
38 underneath. But the plan is still to be substantially complete with that
39 project by the middle of September, and then I would expect that you'll
40 probably see another week or so of, of repair and punch list work as we
41 get that project closed out. For the most part, with a few small items, we
42 are finished with Avenida de Mesilla.
43 Vado and ...
44
45 Garrett: Yes. One moment.
46

1 Bernal: I'd just like to comment, I mean, there's a, believe it or not, there's a lot of
2 traffic goes through there. It's tremendous, a lot of traffic. But that
3 company that's doing that, that project is outstanding. It's, it's really, really
4 great. I mean, it's, it's awesome. I mean it's just an eye-opener coming
5 in, eye-opener going out. Whoever that company is they're consistent.
6 The material they use, the quality, just everything that they do in there is
7 just amazing. It's something to keep in mind, I mean, that company's ...
8 cause I mean, look at the one up ... that they're doing the bridge up in
9 Vado. That project's taking a while and it holds a lot of traffic and that's
10 the freeway. But, down here, for what they're doing, it's a lot, and it's
11 really ... it's looking nice overall. It's really looking nice.
12

13 Doolittle: Trustee Bernal, I, I appreciate the comments. You know, the mayor's
14 been very supportive and certain, certainly, the Trustees have been, been
15 sharing and, and participating and playing mediators with business
16 owners. Just for your information the contractor is La Calerita and the
17 owner, Tony Villalobos is actually a, a citizen of Las Cruces. He lives over
18 on the Las Alturas area, so they are a ... for the most part a local, local
19 contractor and owner.

20 A good segue is the Vado-Mesquite project, that one is running a
21 little bit behind. We did have some issues driving the piles for the
22 abutments and the wing walls on the bridge itself. We had some, some
23 issues with geotechnical where we had to, to make some adjustments so
24 we are running a little bit behind on that schedule, but we have already set
25 the girders or the beams. We've begun ... we had our first bridge deck
26 placement just last week. That's another project we're having some,
27 some weather issues. It does seem like it's moving rather slowly, but now
28 that we've gotten through the geotechnical issues we're picking up quite a
29 bit of steam working through that project. So I'll continue to keep you
30 updated monthly as we move forward on that one. Those are really the
31 only four projects that we have ongoing within the Dona Ana area right
32 now. Does anybody have any questions for me?
33

34 Garrett: Bridgette's pretty good about letting me know when the meetings are
35 going to be held on the Vado-Mesquite, if it's at all possible for me to get
36 some earlier notification about when she's thinking that those meetings
37 would happen, I would appreciate that, because my ... I've had, I had a
38 conflict this last time, just didn't know for sure and I had something else
39 that I, I'd already booked, so ...
40

41 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, we can do that, certainly.
42

43 Garrett: And, and are there going to be celebrations or what's going to happen with
44 ... when some of these things are finished? We going to have mariachis
45 at the Avenida de Mesilla, what are we going to do for the concrete wall
46 barrier? These are big deals to people.

1
2 Doolittle: Honestly ...
3
4 Garrett: I don't think we want to get out in the middle of the road, but, you know ...
5
6 Doolittle: I'll visit with Bridgette on that. Honestly we haven't had much discussion
7 about any kind of ribbon-cutting celebrations. The last one that I can think
8 of that we had was actually the I-10/I-25 interchange, but you're probably
9 right, it is, what ... you know a cable barrier, a concrete wall barrier project
10 to us may seem like a small, small project because in reality it's a small
11 dollar amount, but you're right, it is a, it is a big improvement to the
12 community for both safety. We try to do our best to improve the aesthetics
13 when we're building these projects and clean up the area so I'll have a
14 discussion with staff but I think that's an excellent idea and, and we'll see
15 what we can do. There's not a whole lot of cost to it; we have the tents,
16 we have the, the PA system. Any donations for you know snacks and
17 those types of things are appreciated, but for the most part it is a low-cost
18 option to, to really recognize the work that our contractors, local or not,
19 and our, our inspectors and, and whatnot are doing. So I'll, I'll have a
20 discussion with staff and see what we can do. That's an excellent idea.
21 Mr. Chair, I, I, I did fail to mention one thing at Vado and Mesquite. We
22 did close the west, I'm sorry, the eastbound off-ramp at Mesquite this past
23 Monday. I was afraid that it would cause a stir with the citizens and
24 specifically with the Landmark Mercantile. We did have some discussions
25 with that property owner before we did it. I actually spoke to him myself
26 on Monday. He was very complimentary, not happy with the closure, but
27 we're working with the contractor to expedite it. We're looking at about
28 four weeks, but the contractor talked like he may be able to expedite to
29 three, so we continue to work through those types of issues. It's never
30 good when you're shutting down ramps.
31
32 Garrett: Right.
33
34 Doolittle: You were at the, I believe you were at the first meeting where the citizens
35 of that area basically told us to travel ten miles out of their way each way
36 is a financial burden to them. That's stuck with me from, from the day we
37 did it, so we're doing, we're doing everything we can to expedite, at least
38 getting access to that area without having to detour. So, I, I was pleased
39 with, with the level of support that we got from the community because
40 when you close a ramp that's typically not the case.
41
42 Garrett: Great. Well, I think that just the fact that the meetings are continuing, I
43 don't know what the attendance was this last time, but there weren't too
44 many people the time before that, but it shows a continued ... you're there
45 in case people want to come and, and find out what's going on or talk to
46 you, so that's important. And we just never want to lose an opportunity to

1 explain what, what's being done with taxpayer dollars and, and, I think to
2 give recognition to the various people that are involved. And I think that's
3 a good thing to do. It also kind of closes you know it marks a transition
4 that, that we all need on, on these kinds of things, so very good. Any
5 other questions or comments?
6

7 **7.2 Advisory Committee updates – None**

8
9 Garrett: What about Advisory Committee updates?

10
11 Wray: Mr. Chair, there are none.
12

13 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

14
15 Garrett: Committee and Staff comments. Yes. Member Flores.

16
17 Flores: Mesilla is having its Diez y Seis de Septiembre celebrations this weekend,
18 so I'd like to invite everybody to come, and then note I'm on the Corridor
19 Plan for Viva Dona Ana and there's going to be some people out at the ...
20 supposed to be at The Bean but they're going to be going up and down
21 the parade route basically asking people for feedback on our Corridor
22 Plan. And in addition there's ... so that's Saturday and then in addition
23 there's other meetings coming up in Mesilla's Community Center and now
24 the time has ... it's from five to six, the actual meeting starts at six on I
25 believe Tuesday evening, but I could be incorrect.
26

27 Garrett: Is this for Viva Dona Ana?

28
29 Flores: For Viva Dona Ana.

30
31 Garrett: It's ...

32
33 Flores: It's on the, on the ...

34
35 Garrett: I, I think it's Wednesday and Thursday.

36
37 Flores: Oh, you're right.

38
39 Garrett: Because Monday and Tuesday are in Anthony.

40
41 Flores: Wednesday and Thursday, it's two days, and ...

42
43 Garrett: Yeah. That's the 24th and 25th.

44
45 Flores: Right. And when they'll be talking about the comprehensive plan so, and
46 which could have some implications with the development code, so.

1
2 Garrett: Sure. Very good. I'll be there. Both times. All right. You know, these,
3 these, this is not the system I'm used to, so Member Sorg.
4
5 Sorg: Very quickly, I just had a couple of things that ... one of them came to
6 mind concerning the infrastructure to Santa Teresa. In both major routes,
7 are we going to have to coordinate with the MPO in El Paso? Okay. It, it,
8 it, it involves both MPOs then in, in both cases. Okay, that's what I
9 wanted to know. I didn't know if that would be a problem. That's just one
10 more little thing we have to do. Was it a year ago, let's see Councillor
11 Pedroza that we had a statewide MPO/RPO conference up in
12 Albuquerque? A year ago? I think so, yeah.
13
14 Pedroza: I believe so.
15
16 Sorg: And Hancock was there too. I just thought maybe we ought to throw that
17 out just to keep in the back of our mind to have another one next year,
18 have it some kind of like a biannual thing. Just if it doesn't fly, if okay, but
19 if there's some interest in it then maybe we should start thinking about oh
20 planning or being very in infant stage. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
22 Garrett: Thank you. And I would just encourage you that if you're interested in
23 that, to get together with one or two other people on the committee and
24 come up with some ideas and some suggestions. That keeps things
25 moving.
26
27 Sorg: Sure.
28
29 Garrett: Yep, okay. Yes, Member Hancock.
30
31 Hancock: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not sure who this should be directed to so I'll
32 just kind of throw it out there and see who it sticks on. I'd like to find out
33 how we go about trading roads with the state. I understand there is a
34 process, the state does not take roads anymore, but I would like to trade
35 the, the Spaceport Road to the state for some other road in the county.
36 How do we do that? Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37
38 Doolittle: Mr. Chair ...
39
40 Garrett: You don't need to answer that today but soon.
41
42 Doolittle: I was going to tell him that's not possible and leave. I won't answer that
43 question directly but I, I will tell you I'm in the process of, of learning how
44 to do that with the, with Elephant Butte. We're, we're, we're not
45 exchanging, we're basically abandoning and transferring two roads to
46 them. Commission hasn't, hasn't approved or supported this type of

1 activity in quite some time. They are supporting it now so I will, I will learn
2 as I go with them, I'll use them as a guinea pig but ultimately you and I
3 discuss that kind of offline and, and I'll continue to pursue those types of
4 options and we'll see. We'll see where it goes.
5

6 Hancock: Good. Thank you very much. Appreciate that.
7

8 Garrett: That is appreciated. Thank you. Other comments or thoughts? Well, I
9 would just say thank you for some robust discussion along the way. I
10 think we're ... as a Policy Committee, there's, there's real challenges to
11 stay on top of everything and being able to keep things moving, and I
12 thought that was good and I, I think we've got a, a way of, of continuing to
13 explore the issues that were raised, and that's what's important. So thank
14 you for that discussion and without objection we're at the end of our
15 meeting.
16

17 **8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

18
19 **9. ADJOURNMENT**
20

21 Garrett: We've already had public comment, so without objection, we're adjourned.
22

23 Meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.
24
25
26
27

28 _____
29 Chair

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 8, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the El Paso MPO

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 14-09 Approving the Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the El Paso MPO

Draft agreement between the Mesilla Valley and the El Paso MPOs

DISCUSSION:

Staff will present on the proposed Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the El Paso MPO, followed by the Policy Committee taking action on the proposed MoA.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 14-09

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
WITH THE EL PASO MPO ON PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES IN
CERTAIN AREAS OF DONA ANA COUNTY.**

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area as designated by the Governor of New Mexico in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134(b); and

WHEREAS, the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the New Mexico portion of the El Paso urbanized area as designated by the Governor of New Mexico and the Governor of Texas in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134(b); and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization and the El Paso Metropolitan Organization are responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federal and/or state funded transportation related projects within their respective MPO's Urbanized Areas; and

WHEREAS, due to the proximity, economic and social ties of the two urbanized areas, The US Office of Management and Budget has designated the two Metropolitan Statistical Areas as a Combined Statistical Area ; and

WHEREAS, combined efforts such as Viva Dona Ana have shown the benefits of greater regional collaboration; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution approving a Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO be approved.

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

(I)

THAT the Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization and the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby adopted.

(II)

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

DONE and **APPROVED** this 8th day of October, 2014.

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
Coordination of the Transportation Planning Activities Between the
El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization and the
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

I. Background and Purpose

- A. The Governor approved changes to the planning boundaries of El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (EPMPO) and the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization, now Mesilla Valley Planning Organization (MVMPO), within Doña Ana County, New Mexico on November 30, 2009. The update of the El Paso Urbanized Area (EP UZA), released September 27, 2012, extended the EP UZA into the MVMPO Planning Area generally containing the unincorporated community of Berino.
- B. On April 23, 2014, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Offices of Planning jointly issued Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs). PEAs are planning topical areas that the federal partners want to emphasize on as the State DOTs and the MPOs develop their respective planning work programs. One of these PEAs, *Promote cooperation and coordination across MPO boundaries and across State boundaries where appropriate to ensure a regional approach to transportation planning*, require action from both the EPMPO's and MVMPO's governing bodies.
- C. The purpose of this agreement is to provide the framework for the responsibilities of the EPMPO and MVMPO in regard to federally mandated planning, programming and funding for a portion of the EP UZA within Doña Ana County, New Mexico and address the new federal fiscal 2015 planning emphasis area.

II. General Points of Understanding and Agreement

- A. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to carry out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process.
- B. The MVMPO accepts the authority for the planning, programming and reporting of regionally significant transportation related activities for the portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within the Mesilla Valley MPO. The geographic area of responsibility will be referred to as Berino.
- C. The MVMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Berino portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County.
- D. The EPMPO retains the authority for the planning, programming and reporting of transportation related activities for the portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County but outside the MVMPO Planning Area which includes the cities of Anthony and Sunland Park and the unincorporated communities of Santa Teresa and Chaparral. This area will be referenced as Southern Doña Ana County.

- E. The EPMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Southern Doña Ana County portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County.
- F. This agreement will be reviewed when either agency identifies the need for a review and at a minimum, when the United States Census Bureau designates and updates urbanized area boundaries.

III. Specific Points of Understanding and Agreement

A. MPO Boundary

1. EPMPO and MVMPO recognize that Berino is part of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County and that Berino is within the MVMPO planning area boundary.
2. Berino will be represented in the MVMPO's travel demand model. Current and forecast demographic data will be captured in traffic analysis zones.
3. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to work together to identify the need for studies and multi-modal projects that abut and/or crosses the EPMPO and MVMPO planning area boundary.
4. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to willingly address urban area boundary issues and cooperatively develop and maintain a Federal Functional Classification System of public roads abutting the planning areas.

B. Planning Emphasis Area

1. EPMPO and MVMPO agree that staffs of both MPOs will meet and coordinate, as needed, to review progress of planning efforts, to discuss key findings from program activities, and to discuss the scope, plans and implementation of activities in coordination with FHWA, FTA, New Mexico Department of Transportation, and New Mexico Environmental Department. These planning documents included, but are not limited to, the unified planning work programs, annual performance and expenditure reports, long range transportation plans, transportation improvement programs, Title VI plans, and Limited English Proficiency plans will be developed consistent with 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450, Presidential Executive Orders, FHWA and FTA directives/guidance, other relative federal and state policies and practices.
2. The EPMPO and MVMPO agree to perform public outreach and engagement in accordance with respective policies and practices identified in the extant Public Participation Programs.
3. All planning documents are subject to public comment and will adhere to MPO's respective Public Participation Programs.

4. The Transportation Policy Board of the EPMPO is responsible for regional transportation policy making in the EPMPO planning area.
5. The Policy Committee of the MVMPO is responsible for regional transportation policy making in the MVMPO planning area.
6. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to exchange/share information of regional significance. Information will include, but not be limited, to studies, travel surveys, GIS data, and traffic data, and demographic information.
7. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to host a joint public meeting outlining current and future planning activities identified in the UPWPs, MTPs, and TIPs each year, or as deemed necessary. The format of this meeting may be, but not limited to, a joint meeting of the Policy Boards or their respective committees, an informational or open house meeting hosted by staff of both MPOs held in a location convenient to the residents of the area.

DRAFT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 8, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 2015 MPO Calendar Discussion

ACTION REQUESTED:

None

SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

Sample Meeting Calendar

DISCUSSION:

The MPO Meeting calendar for the upcoming year is traditionally adopted by the Policy Committee at the November meeting.

This item is to discuss the 2015 MPO Meeting calendar before bringing a proposed 2015 MPO Meeting calendar for a vote at the November meeting of the Policy Committee.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

2015 Schedule of Meetings Draft Version

Month	Policy Committee	TAC	BPAC
January	14 th	8 th	20 th (TIP)
February	11 th (TIP)	5 th (TIP)	
March		5 th	17 th
April	8 th	2 nd	21 st (If necessary for TIP)
May	13 th (TIP)	7 th (TIP)	19 th
June	10 th	4 th	
July			21 st (If necessary for TIP)
August	12 th (TIP)	6 th (TIP)	18 th
September	9 th	3 rd	
October	14 th	1 st	20 th (TIP)
November	???(TIP)	5 th (TIP)	
December	9 th	3 rd	
January 2015	13 th	7 th	19 th

Policy Committee Meetings for January – June 2015 and January 2016

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meetings for August – December 2015

Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for January – June 2015 and January 2016

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for August – December 2015

Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meetings 2015

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 8, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Procedures, Committee Briefing

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

This will be a briefing by MPO Staff on State Transportation Improvement Program Procedures Manual.