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 9, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. in the Las Cruces 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 listed 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 ___________________________________ Chair
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ________________________________________________________ Chair
4. CONSENT AGENDA* _____________________________________________________ Chair
5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES _______________________________________________ Chair
   5.1. *September 11, 2013 __________________________________________________ Chair
6. OLD BUSINESS __________________________________________________________ MPO
   6.1. Statewide MPO summit review__________________________________________ MPO
7. ACTION ITEMS __________________________________________________________ MPO
   7.1. Resolution Inviting Legislators as Ex-Officio Members of the Policy Committee ___ MPO Staff
8. DISCUSSION ITEMS _______________________________________________________ MPO Staff
   8.1. 2014 MPO Calendar __________________________________________________ MPO Staff
   8.2. Transport 2040 update________________________________________________ MPO Staff
   8.3. NMDOT updates ______________________________________________________ NMDOT Staff
   8.4. Advisory Committee Updates __________________________________________ MPO Staff
9. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS ________________________________________ Chair
10. PUBLIC COMMENT ________________________________________________________ Chair
11. ADJOURNMENT _________________________________________________________ Chair
AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Statewide MPO summit review

ACTION REQUESTED:
None

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Email and attachments from Mayor Pro-Tem Thomas on September 14, 2013 meeting.

DISCUSSION:
To: MPOs, RTPOs, RTDs,

From: Sharon Thomas
Mayor Pro Tem
Las Cruces, NM
575 644 2517

Re: Summit

First of all, a huge thank you to those who joined us on Saturday, September 14, for the summit meeting at the Mid Region Council of Governments in Albuquerque. And even more thanks to those who presented, led discussions, took notes, supplied food, etc. And to those who had to stay home to deal with flooding, we wish you and your community a speedy recovery. Here’s an overview of the day along with PPts and handouts (attached).

MORNING
Councilor Issac Benton welcomed everyone to the City of Albuquerque.

We started with two presentations: Dave Pennella did an introduction to MAP-21, Claude Morelli did a presentation from NMDOT on the Impact of FHWA Performance Measures and the Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan. PPts are attached.

Dave Pennella
In MAP-21, 90 transportation programs were reduced to 30 programs. Two important changes in this current federal transportation legislation are the following: There’s a big emphasis on expediting projects and national performance goals are being set so that there will be a "performance driven outcome based approach to planning." Also, asset management is required. See http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/asset/tamp/workplan.pdf for an example of an assets work plan. See attached PPT for more information.

**Claude Morelli**
The national goal set by MAP-21 are Safety, Infrastructure Conditions, Congestion Reduction, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, and Reduce Project Delays. However, states can add their own performance measures that go beyond the national measures. When the measures are finished at the federal level, the state DOTs will then set theirs. Next, they will go to MPOs and RTPOs to set targets. If states do not make progress toward their targets, then money from other areas will have to be shifted to that area. Claude Morelli also talked about the State Long Range Plan (SLRP), the vision for a multi-modal system in our state. In the future, STIP projects will have to fit the state plan and the performance measures.

**Statewide Issues**
- We discussed ways to determine Return on Investments (ROI) for development projects. Should project selection be determined by ROI? A standard subdivision takes 20 years for a ROI. Higher density means more tax revenue collected for the cost of the development. Get return in 5 years.
- Problems with trucks being able to get across the city of Albuquerque because of restrictions on truck traffic. Intel is moving 400 jobs.
- NMDOT list of jobs for the interim committee did not include transportation projects needed to support economic development projects in southern NM.
- Transportation planning needs a more robust role in community development. Use scenario planning?
- Rail and trucking used to be at odds. Now, rail is seen as best for long hauls and trucks for short hauls. Need more rail for freight transport?
- Needs measurements other than population and traffic counts. Need to use functional classification? Using only population and traffic counts means that rural areas only get crumbs and much of NM is rural. Often because rural areas do not have the match funds. Possible to waive a required match for rural area projects? Rural communities are dying. People are leaving.
- What if we raised money for transportation on a regional level? In California, funding is raised by the MPOs.
- When the NM performance measures are finished, the State Transportation Commission decides on the plan.

**LUNCH**
Over lunch, we heard from Senator Sanchez who reported on the work of the Interim Committee on Transportation Infrastructure Funding. Senator Sanchez said the revenue for transportation projects is dropping because of more fuel efficient cars and fewer people driving. The committee is studying the Oregon pilot program to charge drivers...
for the vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Another possibility is to require vehicle inspections. They are not considering raising the vehicle fuel tax. The committee’s work plan is attached. The chair is Rep. Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales. You can contact him at Roberto.gonzales@nmlegis.gov or Office Phone: 575 751-1467 or Home Phone: 575 758-2674. There are two more meetings of this committee, both in Santa Fe—October 8th and November 4th. You can find more information at http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/committee_detail.aspx?CommitteeCode=TRANS.

Lobbying Models
Discussion of how the MPOs, RTPOS, and RTDs can work together across the state. See attachment for Statewide MPO models. There are several different ways MPOs have organized in other states. (See attachments.) Of the seven organizations listed by AMPO, four (Texas, Florida, North Carolina, and Oregon) explicitly state on their websites that they are engaged in efforts to “positively affect policies and decision-making,” that they “advocate for Oregon MPO policy, regulatory and funding interests at the state and federal levels,” “coordinate participation in state and federal policy development,” and “work “to augment the role of individual MPOs in the cooperative transportation planning process.”
Do we want a voice on state regulations? Work on the problems rural communities have with match fund requirements? Share our plans and problems?

Transportation for America (T4A) Andrea Kiepe
Andrea gave us an overview of the T4A assessment of MAP-21. No dedicated funding for bridge and road repair. 60% for larger roads. 30% cut to bike and pedestrian facilities. See their website for The Fix We're In. Can put in your town zip code and get the report for your area. NM is 4th worst in the U.S. for pedestrian safety. Performance measures. How your measure affects priorities. See attached PPT.

Next Steps
Given the changes that are occurring, especially due to MAP-21, what do we want to do next? If MPOs and RTPOs are to set the targets, how do we get involved in that process?
2013 APPROVED WORK PLAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE
for the TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE REVENUE SUBCOMMITTEE

Members*
Rep. Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales, Chair
Sen. John Arthur Smith, Vice Chair
Rep. Ernest H. Chavez
Sen. Lee S. Cotter
Sen. Timothy M. Keller
Rep. Larry A. Larrañaga
Rep. Patricia A. Lundstrom
Sen. William H. Payne
Rep. Jane E. Powdrell-Culbert
Sen. Clemente Sanchez

Advisory Members
Sen. Jacob R. Candelaria
Sen. Carlos R. Cisneros
Rep. Sharon Clahchischilliage
Rep. Nathan "Nate" Cote
Rep. Anna M. Crook
Sen. Ron Griggs
Rep. Edward C. Sandoval
Sen. William E. Sharer

Work Plan
The Transportation Infrastructure Revenue Subcommittee was created by the New Mexico Legislative Council on April 30, 2013 to identify current and new sources of transportation revenue and develop recommendations to meet the needs of the state's transportation infrastructure.

During the 2013 interim, the Transportation Infrastructure Revenue Subcommittee proposes to review and discuss the following topics, as time permits:

(1) existing sources and methods of funding for transportation infrastructure and ways to increase revenue from those existing sources and methods, including the gasoline tax, the special fuels tax, the motor vehicle excise tax and the weight distance tax;

(2) trends that are causing a decline in the amount of funding from existing revenue sources, including the uncertainty of the availability and amount of federal funds;

(3) short-term and long-term needs for maintaining and improving the state's transportation infrastructure, the levels of funding necessary to meet those needs and the
challenges in obtaining the necessary levels of funding;

(4) areas of greatest cost in the state's transportation infrastructure and opportunities for eliminating unnecessary costs;

(5) safety and liability issues due to aging and outdated equipment, bridges and roadways and options to better monitor and control speeding in construction zones;

(6) technological advances in transportation-related technology including "weigh-in-motion" sensor systems that calculate the weight per axle of a truck as it drives over-a-sensor pad;

(7) the economic impact that the transportation infrastructure industry has on the state, including potential job creation;

(8) ideas and perspectives from local governments;

(9) the feasibility of a more comprehensive rail and bus transit system to reduce congestion and use of surface streets in larger cities; and provide transportation opportunities for residents of rural communities.

(10) the benefits, issues and opportunities for improvement in commuter travel on the New Mexico RailRunner;

(11) alternative methods and sources of funding studied or implemented in other states to identify which methods and sources maybe best utilized in New Mexico, including:

(a) fees or taxes on alternative fuel or electric vehicles;
(b) imposition of "vehicle miles traveled," or VMT fees, where motorists are charged a fee for every mile driven within the state rather than for the amount of gasoline they consume;
(c) authorization of tolling or high-occupancy toll lanes;
(d) design-build contracts, which are arrangements whereby a single bid is accepted for both the design and construction of a project;
(e) public/private partnerships (TIFIA?); and

(f) tax incentives to encourage employees to work from home and reduce wear on roadways (lack of broadband); and

(12) other potential sources of funding and new strategies for financing transportation infrastructure in the state.

*Updated to reflect change in membership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>Santa Fe, State Capitol, Room 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, August 28</td>
<td>Santa Fe, State Capitol, Room 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 10</td>
<td>Santa Fe, State Capitol, Room 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 8</td>
<td>Santa Fe, State Capitol, Room 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 4</td>
<td>Santa Fe, State Capitol, Room 307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide MPO Associations (AMPO)

Association of Texas MPOs (TEMPO)
TEMPO, the Association of Texas Metropolitan Planning Organizations, was established to do the following:

- Provide a conduit for exchange of information and ideas
- Coordinate participation in state and federal policy development
- Promote professional development and continuing education
- Promote and develop better transportation planning in the State of Texas
- Enhance working partnerships with the Texas Department of Transportation, and the various agencies within the U.S. Department of Transportation

Membership
All Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) representing any area or portion of an area within the State of Texas are eligible for membership in TEMPO. Each member MPO is represented in TEMPO by their MPO Director or their duly appointed agent.

Associate membership in TEMPO is extended to the professional staff of the Texas Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration. Associate members are invited to attend and participate in TEMPO meetings but voting is reserved for MPO representatives.

http://www.texasmpos.org/

Florida Advisory MPO Council (MPOAC)
The Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council is a statewide transportation planning and policy organization created by the Florida Legislature pursuant to Section 339.175(11), Florida Statutes, to augment the role of individual MPOs in the cooperative transportation planning process. The MPOAC assists MPOs in carrying out the urbanized area transportation planning process by serving as the principal forum for collective policy discussion.

The organization is made up of a Governing Board (26 members) consisting of local elected officials from each of the MPOs and a Staff Directors Advisory Committee consisting of the staff directors from each of the MPOs. The MPOAC also includes a Policy and Technical Subcommittee and other committees as assigned by the Governing Board. The Policy and Technical Subcommittee annually prepares legislative policy positions and develops initiatives to be advanced during Florida's legislative session. The MPOAC actively participates in the activities of the national Association of MPOs (AMPO) and the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) in Washington DC and works with other stakeholder groups to help shape state and national policy regarding metropolitan transportation issues.

The MPOAC meets on the fourth Thursday during the months of January, April,
July and October at a central location. The MPOAC Policy and Technical Subcommittee meets between the quarterly MPOAC meetings at a central location.
http://www.mpoac.org/index.shtml

**Georgia Association of MPOs (GAMPO)**
The Georgia Association of MPOs (GAMPO) provides a forum for the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in the State of Georgia to exchange information and experiences, enhance the practice of metropolitan planning, provide educational opportunities, and discuss issues relative to local, state and federal policies and requirements for transportation planning. The association also provides a forum for state and federal transportation agencies to provide information and guidance on transportation planning to the MPOs in a collective manner.
The Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations was officially formed in July 2008 through adoption of bylaws. The 15 member Board of Directors is made up of a designated representative from each of the 15 MPOs in the State of Georgia.
General Membership is provided to the professional staff of each metropolitan planning organization within the State of Georgia.
http://www.gampo.org/index.htm

**Illinois Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council**
The MPO Advisory Council provides a forum for the sharing of information and best practices, policy and programming recommendations regarding transportation issues, and research intended to improve transportation planning and programming in Illinois. The Illinois Metropolitan Planning Advisory Council is an affiliate of the Illinois Association of Regional Councils.
http://ilmpo.blogspot.com/

**New York State Association of MPOs (NYSAMPO)**
The New York State Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (NYSAMPOs) is a coalition of the fourteen MPOs in New York State, which have committed to work together toward common goals. We are a diverse group of organizations, representing very large, urban areas like New York City as well as small, urban areas like Elmira. Nevertheless, we have common interests and believe that working together on planning and research initiatives can help our organizations provide high quality transportation planning expertise to the public throughout the State.

**What Does NYSAMPO Do?**
The Association exists as an information sharing organization. The directors of all thirteen MPOs in the state meet regularly throughout the year, and are joined by planning staff from New York State DOT (NYSDOT), and the Federal Highway
and Federal Transit Administrations. By convening, the association enables each individual MPO to better serve its own region, and to develop and maintain a close working relationship with state and federal partners. In addition, working groups on topics such as safety, bicycle/pedestrian issues, climate change, freight, and transit meet periodically to facilitate sharing of practice and networking among staff of the MPOs and NYSDOT. Training offered through this program varies from technical to policy topics, such as performance-based planning, public involvement techniques, and GIS. Through information sharing, research and training programs, the Association helps each MPO address state and federal policies and programs.

**Working Groups**

NYSAMPO has six working groups that provide topical forums for technical staff of New York’s 13 MPOs, New York State DOT, and FHWA and FTA. In some cases, other state agencies like the Governor’s Traffic Safety Committee and New York State Police are involved. These groups meet on a schedule designed to meet the needs of their members, some as frequently as monthly and others quarterly or twice a year. They facilitate the sharing of best practices from within New York, as well as from other MPOs and state DOTs. There are often presentations from members or guests. The working groups have also identified research needs that have been progressed either by members or with consultant support.

http://nysmpos.org/wordpress/

**North Carolina Association of MPOs (NCAMPO)**

According to The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 areas considered by the Federal Census to be urban in nature and have a population of at least 50,000, in order to receive funding from the federal government, must have a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive ("3C") transportation planning process. In the state of North Carolina, this process is carried out by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). Members from each of the MPOs make up the North Carolina Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (NCAMPO).

Currently, there are 17 MPOs in North Carolina. In addition, one new urbanized area (UZA) has been identified based on the 2010 Census, and one existing UZA is extending into North Carolina. After approval by the state, these areas will be represented in North Carolina by MPOs as well. Members are directors, planners, coordinators, etc. All staff.

The current North Carolina MPOs are:
- Burlington-Graham
- Cabarrus-Rowan
- Capital Area
- Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro
- Fayetteville
French Broad River  
Gastonia  
Greater Hickory  
Goldsboro  
Greensboro  
Greenville  
High Point  
Jacksonville  
Mecklenburg-Union  
Rocky Mount  
Wilmington  
Winston-Salem

A potential new North Carolina MPO will be based on this urbanized area:  
New Bern

An existing MPO that will potentially include areas in North Carolina is:  
Myrtle Beach-Socastee

MPO Quick Facts 2012

The mission of NCAMPO is to positively affect policies and decision-making, to serve as a forum for communication, and to provide leadership in transportation planning.

Oregon MPO Consortium

Welcome to the Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium (OMPOC) website. This site provides information on OMPOC meetings, the Consortium’s Bylaws, information on each of the member agencies, and products developed by the Consortium in pursuit of its mission:

- To provide a forum for Oregon’s MPOs to address common needs, issues and solutions to transportation and land use challenges facing Oregon’s metropolitan regions and surrounding areas.
- To provide recommendations for individual action of Oregon MPOs on issues of common interest.
- To advocate for Oregon MPO policy, regulatory and funding interests at the state and federal level.

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

a. Members and alternates from the designated Oregon MPOs shall be current voting members of the respective MPO policy boards.

b. Voting at Consortium meetings is limited to elected and appointed officials of respective MPO policy boards.

- **MPO staff and MPO member-agency staff are not eligible** for appointment as members or alternates to OMPOC.
- MPO Directors and designed Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) and League of Oregon Cities (LOC) staff shall serve as non-voting ex-officio members of the Consortium.
- Members shall serve as liaisons to their respective MPO boards and be responsible for communication between the Consortium and their boards.
The Principles of Reauthorization for the Illinois MPO Advisory Council

The landscape of Illinois varies from its northern to southern extremes. It displays diversity on its western boundary where the Mississippi River provides transportation access to agricultural commodities in our great state.

The northeastern border pulses with the thriving urban centers of Chicago and Cook County, surrounded by the business and tourism found on Lake Michigan. Likewise, there are vast differences between all 14 MPOs in this State, including the varying size of their populations.

The MPO Advisory Council recommends five principles for reauthorization.

The next federal transportation bill should include a national complete streets policy, address challenges in smaller MPOs, and increase the integration of safety and security in the transportation planning process. Furthermore, the bill should consider additional technical resources to MPOs, as well as a comprehensive approach to address transportation financing to sustain funding levels for the next 10 years.

The first principle supports the development of a national complete streets policy. It is imperative the next reauthorization bill meets the mobility needs at the interregional, intercity, and rural levels by making certain all residents have access to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. MPOs also need more support to plan better for our growing aging population. The principle presented here works to promote efforts to advance health and wellness through community planning and design, thereby creating a more livable and ideally more holistic approach. This recommendation encourages transit-oriented development and mixed-use projects that address critical infrastructure needs to revitalize century communities.

In order to meet the needs of the State, the second principle delineates the necessity to maintain the current threshold of MPO size at a 50,000-population level. As state DOTs address the intricacy and scale of intercity, interstate, and interregional travel demands, the equally important needs of small towns and rural areas often go unnoticed. Moreover, transportation investments in rural communities are smaller in scale and scope. These inequitable investments in rural areas lead to inadequate funding, delays in project selection, or the enforcement of single-mode solutions to confront complex transportation issues. Further, this principle supports the formation and implementation of Rural Planning Organizations in part because rural residents are often overlooked in the transportation planning process.

The third principle endorsed by the Advisory Council is to increase the integration of safety and security in the metropolitan planning processes. This principle fully supports the federal collection of safety data and the subsequent dissemination.
of those data among states and regions. This also implies a funding provision for the regions, which would allow the collection and utilization of the data. Finally, there is also a need to upgrade data collection on both the national and regional levels to make the data more useful in the planning development.

**The fourth principle is aimed at providing additional technical resources to MPOs.** The GAO previously advised DOT and the US Congress that evaluating and measuring various programs’ successes are aided greatly by adopting performance measures and goals, which then lead to better decisions involving transportation investments. Additionally, the Advisory Council supports the development of improved modeling approaches, including such applications as multimodal investment analysis, environmental assessments, evaluations of a wide range of policy alternatives, and meeting federal and state regulatory requirements. TRB has made various recommendations for improvements, including increasing DOT support and funding for development, demonstration, and implementation of advanced modeling approaches. Equally important is the reduction of the number of highway and transit programs, thus, allowing states and MPOs the flexibility with which they can meet their needs. Furthering the multi-modal approach, there must be a continuation of allowing the flexing of highway and transit funds to each other.

**The fifth and final principle is to consider all options for transportation financing reform.** Creative financing will generate the needed revenues to address our aging infrastructure across the state. A major first step is to strengthen the language of National Infrastructure Banks. We support legislation to create Regional Infrastructure Improvement Zones (RIIZ). RIIZ encourage private-sector involvement in infrastructure, e.g. road building, by offering tax-deductible contributions from corporations or individuals as well as a streamlined approval processes. Moreover, MPOs control any proposed RIIZ by establishing eligibility requirements and providing final approval for the project. A similarly productive funding option is the idea of Public Private Partnerships that bring the private sector into the infrastructure conversation again. The Advisory Council also supports the increase of the federal motor fuel tax, if such an increase is indexed to inflation. Likewise, this fifth principle encourages the development of new tax policies and legislation that severely reduce greenhouse gas emissions and their harmful effects on communities throughout the state and nation.
MAP-21
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century

General Information
- signed into law July 6, 2012
- 2 year authorization FFY 2013 & 2014
- consolidated programs 90 to 30
- funding remains steady with some extra for inflation
  - performance measures
  - expedite project delivery
**MAP-21**

Key Funding Category Changes

- Interstate Maintenance: NHPP
- Equity Bonus: NHPP
- NHS Nat. Hwy. Sys.: NHPP
- Bridge Program: NHPP
- FTA 5316: incl. in FTA 5307
- FTA 5317: incl. in FTA 5310

**MAP-21**

Key Funding Category Changes

- STP-Enhancements now replaced with Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
  - eliminates landscaping as a “stand alone” project
  - includes SRTS program activities
  - includes recreational trails program
  - State DOTs no longer eligible
MAP-21

Key Funding Category Changes

- Expanded roadways eligible for NHPP
- Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) is replaced with Tribal Transportation Program

MAP-21

Establishes national performance goals in:

- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition
- Congestion Reduction
- System Reliability
- Freight Movement & Economic Viability
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays
MAP-21
Performance Management

- USDOT (FHWA) is to establish national performance measures for:
  - pavement conditions & performance for the Interstate & NHS system
  - bridge conditions
  - injuries & fatalities
  - traffic congestion

MAP-21
Performance Management
- on-road mobile source emissions
- freight movement on Interstates
MAP-21

Performance Management
- State DOTs & MPOs must set *performance targets* to support the national performance measures
- State & metropolitan plans must describe how program & project selection will achieve the targets
- States & MPOs will report on progress in achieving the targets

MAP-21

Asset Management
- State DOTs must develop a Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) that contains:
  - Summary of pavement & bridge assets on the NHS including a description of the condition of those assets
MAP-21

TAMP requirements:
- Asset Management Objectives & Measures
- Performance Gap Identification
- Lifecycle Cost & Risk Management Analysis
- Financial Plan
- Investment Strategies

MAP-21

Performance Targets for MPOs
- Develop Long-Range Plans & a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) through performance driven, outcome based approach to planning
- MPO to establish Performance Targets 180 days after the state establishes theirs
Perf. Target Examples
Mid-Region MPO Performance Targets in the 2035 Metro. Transportation Plan

- **Performance Targets** directly link to the goals & objective statements in the MTP and consider the transportation system as a whole. Primarily qualitative.

---

Perf. Target Examples
Mid-Region MPO Performance Targets in the 2035 Metro. Transportation Plan

- **Action Items** are qualitative objectives identified to measure progress toward the MTP goals. These are task oriented and derived from commitments made in the MTP.
Perf. Target Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Targets with 2 year progress indicators

- Maintain VMT per capita at or below 2008 levels ▲
- Reduce fatal & injury crashes by 2.3% per year ▼
- Improve bridge & pavement conditions compared to 2008 levels ▲

Perf. Target Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Targets with 2 year progress indicators

- Increase accessibility to transit for environmental justice areas —
- Increase non-SOV trips to 25% by 2025 and 30% by 2035 ▼
- Implement high priority Congestion Management Process strategies ▲
Perf. Target Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Targets
with 2 year progress indicators

- Increase transit mode share at river crossing to 10% by 2025 & 20% by 2035
- Target transportation investments that improve connectivity & mobility for all modes within high activity density areas

Perf. Target Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Targets
with 2 year progress indicators

- Increase transit services & thorough-fare connections to locally-designated activity centers and rail stations
- Reduce the average household combined cost of housing & transportation compared to costs in 2010
Action Item Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Action Items with 2 year progress indicators

- Support incorporation of transit oriented development principles into local development plans & policies ▲
- Assist local governments in reviewing truck restrictions & policies to allow for more efficient movement of goods ▼

Action Item Examples

2035 Metro. Transportation Plan Action Items with 2 year progress indicators

- Analyze levels of people movement rather than vehicle traffic alone to better understand how people are traveling along a corridor ▲
- Assist local governments in reviewing truck restrictions & policies to allow for more efficient movement of goods ▼
MAP-21 Next Steps

- USDOT issues performance measures (18 months after enactment)
- NMDOT established performance targets (1 yr after USDOT perf. meas.)
- MPOs establish or revise performance targets to augment those established by NMDOT (180 days)

MAP-21 expires on Sept. 30, 2014

Congress must pass either a continuing resolution or extension of the transportation bill by Sept. 30, 2014
Further Information

MAP-21 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21

Generic Work Plan for Developing a TAMP

Q & A on Performance Management
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qapm.cfm

Q & A on Tribal Transportation Program (TTP)
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qatribal.cfm

Thank You

Dave Pennella
Transportation Program Manager
Mid-Region MPO
email: dpennella@mrcog-nm.gov
www.mrcog-nm.gov click “Transportation”
Statewide MPO Associations

In 2006, at a workshop put on by the Florida Advisory MPO Council, I first learned about statewide MPO associations. Later, when I was elected to the city council in Las Cruces and became a member of the Las Cruces MPO Policy Committee, I was surprised that such an organization does not exist in New Mexico. Since that time, I have tried to learn more about such organizations because I think a statewide MPO association in New Mexico could be very beneficial.

Currently, according the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO), there are such organizations in Texas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, and Oregon.

In Oregon and Florida, membership in the statewide associations is limited to elected officials. MPO staff members are not eligible for membership. Members of the Texas, Georgia, New York, and North Carolina organizations are all staff members from the various MPOs in the state. Information is not available for the Illinois MPO Advisory Council.

Of the seven organizations, four (Texas, Florida, North Carolina, and Oregon) explicitly state on their websites that they are engaged in efforts to “positively affect policies and decision-making,” that they “advocate for Oregon MPO policy, regulatory and funding interests at the state and federal levels,” “coordinate participation in state and federal policy development,” and “work “to augment the role of individual MPOs in the cooperative transportation planning process.”
The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) is organizing its 2040 Statewide Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan (SLRP) around nine focus areas. These generally correspond to National Transportation Goals established under federal transportation law and to issues of special significance to New Mexico.

NMDOT will organize a Statewide Working Group (SWG) to address each of the nine focus areas. The SWGs will play an important role in the plan development process. Each will include subject matter experts from a variety of disciplines and agencies (i.e., NMDOT, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Transportation, other public agencies, and private organizations). The intent is to bring together knowledgeable individuals who can productively work through issues, opportunities, and potential plan elements in depth. The groups will meet approximately monthly. They will submit ideas and recommendations to the plan’s Coordinating Committees for review and comment.

**SWG-1: Public health, safety and security**
- **Role:** Help ensure that the SLRP addresses the public health, safety and security needs of all New Mexicans.
- **Subject matter:** Traffic crashes, air quality, noise/vibration, transportation / physical activity nexus, access to emergency services, emergency evacuation, access to health care, etc.

  *Note: Work products and recommendations of this group are expected to supplement, but not replace, those developed during the NMDOT Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan development process.*

**SWG-2: State of good repair**
- **Role:** Help ensure consistency between the SLRP and state-of-good-repair management processes underway at NMDOT.
- **Subject matter:** Pavement, bridges, public transportation, information needs, inventory of system elements

**SWG-3: Access, mobility, and connectivity**
- **Role:** Help ensure that the plan addresses the access, mobility and connectivity needs of all travel modes and all transportation system users in New Mexico.
- **Subject matter:** Roadway congestion, public transit, sidewalk design/ connectivity, ADA compliance, bicycle design/connectivity, parking (both auto and bicycle), connectivity between modes (e.g., auto to rail, bus to rail, bike to bus, bus to air, etc.), traveler information, transportation system management, travel demand management, impacts of advanced technology on travel, etc.

  *Note: Issues related to access, mobility and connectivity for freight movement will generally be addressed by SWG-4.*

**SWG-4: Economic vitality -- freight movement**
- **Role:** Help ensure that the plan addresses the safety and efficiency of freight movements in New Mexico and help ensure that the state meets the national freight goals established by 23 USC 167.
Subject matter: Prioritization of freight projects, formulation of strategies to address freight mobility issues including use of intelligent transportation systems to improve freight movement, assessment of potential for impacts of heavy vehicles (including mining, agricultural, energy cargo or equipment, and timber vehicles) on roadway conditions, evaluate intermodal connectivity (between rail, truck, and air), etc.

SWG-5: Economic vitality -- regional development, border considerations, rural/urban equity, and environmental justice

Role: Help ensure that the SLRP contributes to economic well-being for all New Mexicans and in all parts of the state.

Subject matter: Environmental justice, housing + travel cost affordability, interregional transfers of resources, return on investment in transportation projects and programs, New Mexico Main Street program, border development / trade issues, ability of local governments to provide matching funds, transportation / quality of life nexus, performance measurement of equity, etc.

SWG-6: Visitor travel, recreation and tourism

Role: Help ensure that the SLRP meets the needs of the wide array of visitors, recreational travelers, and tourists who use New Mexico’s transportation system.

Subject matter: Scenic byways, visitor travel information, rest areas, control of outdoor advertising, impacts of roadway design/development on viewsheds/traveler experience, bicycle tourism, tourism by rail, bus tourism, auto touring, business travel, travel with kids, travel by seniors, access to State and National Parks and Monuments, travel demand management for special events, achieving balance between need to address travel demand and quality of visitor experience, etc.

SWG-7: Federal, state, and tribal lands

Role: Help ensure consistency between the SLRP and transportation development and management priorities of federal, tribal, and other state agencies.

Subject matter: Any issues related to transportation on federal, state, and tribal lands.

SWG-8: Cultural resources, historic resources, landscapes, and natural environment

Role: Help ensure that the SLRP helps protect and preserve New Mexico’s cultural resources, historic resources, landscapes, and natural environment.

Subject matter: Any issues related to the preservation and protection of New Mexico’s cultural resources, historic resources, landscapes and natural environment. Review of any NEPA issues.

SWG-9: Plan implementation and project delivery

Role: Help develop an implementation strategy for the SLRP and help speed project delivery.

Subject matter: Integration of SLRP recommendations into day-to-day business practices, revenue estimating, cost estimating, long-term financial sustainability of New Mexico’s transportation system, speed / ease of project delivery, transparency in decision-making, predictability of project timing, integration of environmental review and planning processes, etc.
Regional Working Groups

Regional Working Groups (RWGs) will be organized individually by each Regional Transportation Planning Organization with NMDOT assistance. The role of each RWG will be to develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). There will be seven RWGs organized to correspond to each of New Mexico’s seven RTPOs:

- RWG-1: Mid Region Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-2: Northeast Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-3: Northern Pueblos Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-4: Northwest Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-5: South Central Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-6: Southeast Regional Transportation Plan
- RWG-7: Southwest Regional Transportation Plan

Similar to the SWGs, these working groups will be interdisciplinary teams; however, each will have a membership derived only from the most directly affected NMDOT Divisions, NMDOT District(s), other public agencies, private organizations, and the RTPO itself.

For more information on the 2040 Statewide Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan, please contact: Claude Morelli, AICP, PTP, NMDOT Transportation Planning & Safety Division, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Cell: 505.660.3146. Email: claude.morelli@state.nm.us.
T4America: A Broad, Growing Coalition

- Began May 2008
- 600+ coalition members, including: AARP, National Association of Realtors, IL Chamber of Commerce, Center for Rural Strategies, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, American Public Health Association, Institute for Transportation Engineers

MAP-21: What happened?

- Federal Highway Trust Fund broke
- Eliminates set-asides and earmarks
- Level funding
- Program consolidation
- Increased “flexibility” for states
- Performance measures and targets
- Expansion of TIFIA loans and tolling
New Mexico Highway Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP-21 Highway Programs</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>214,011,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>98,438,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>23,517,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality</td>
<td>10,986,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives</td>
<td>7,220,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Mexico Highway Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP-21 Highway Programs</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY12 Funding for program responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>$214</td>
<td>$210 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>$98 M</td>
<td>$105 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>$23 M</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
<td>$11 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives</td>
<td>$7 M</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Implications

- More than 250 structurally deficient bridges cannot be fixed with former bridge repair funds
  - strains local transportation funding
- 60% of funds in NM focused on larger roads
- No requirement to fix roads or bridges
- Significant (~30%) cut to walking and biking funding
Road and Bridge Repair

Figure 3: Bridge repair funding levels versus needs estimate

- Federal estimates to eliminate backlog
- Actual highway bridge program appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$48 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$51.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$61.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$70.9 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bridge Repair Funding

The Fix We're In For: The State of Our Bridges

Bridges within ten miles of: Las Cruces, NM, USA

Map data & ©2013 Google
MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Funding Process

- Transportation Enhancements: $897 million
- Safe Routes to School: $168 million
- Recreational Trails: $78.6 million

Transportation Alternatives - $000 million

- 50% distributed by population share
- 50% for anywhere (may be transferred)
- Rec. Trails set-aside (unless opted out)
- Directly given to MPOs > 200,000
- State DOT for local grant program

Local communities apply and receive grant awards

Active Transportation and Safety

Transportation For America
Active Transportation and Safety

MAP-21 represents performance measures.

DOT establishes measures by March 2014.

State and MPO targets in 2015.

No penalties for not meeting targets.
Performance Measures

- Interstate performance
- NHS performance
- Interstate pavement condition
- NHS pavement condition
- NHS bridge condition
- Fatalities and injuries/VMT
- Fatalities and injuries overall
- Mobile source emissions
- Metro congestion
- Freight movement on Interstate highways
- Metro congestion
- Freight movement on Interstate highways

---

**Performance Measures**

**Atlanta**

- Travel Time Index: 1.35
- Average travel time: 57.4 minutes

**Chicago**

- Travel Time Index: 1.43
- Average travel time: 35.6 minutes

(extra rush hour delay: 14.8 mins, travel time without traffic: 42.5 mins)

(extra rush hour delay: 10.7 mins, travel time without traffic: 24.9 mins)

Though Atlanta has a much lower (better) Travel Time Index (TTI), Chicago commuters spend 20 minutes less per peak period trip.

---

Transportation For America
Performance Measures

**Denver 1982**
- Travel Time Index: 1.09
- 50.6 minutes
- 46.4 mins
- 4.2 mins

**Denver 2007**
- Travel Time Index: 1.31
- 49.6 minutes
- 37.9 minutes
- Extra rush hour delay: 11.7 minutes

---

TIFIA Loan Program

Total TIFIA Assistance: $9.2 Billion
Total Project Investment: $36.4 Billion
**TIFIA: $1 billion funds $17B in projects**

- Rural areas: smaller threshold ($25M) and half the interest rate
- Amount of money available for loans multiplied eight-fold
- TIFIA projects no longer be chosen through a competitive; first come, first served basis
- Technical changes will make TIFIA financing more accessible for projects supported by sales, property, or income taxes.

**MAP-21: going forward**

- Federal Highway Trust Fund broke
- Funding is insufficient for needs
- Increased “flexibility” cuts both ways
- Loss of focus on repair, local roads, transit, biking and walking is troubling
- Expansion of TIFIA loans and tolling
1. Long range plan requirements under MAP-21
2. MAP-21 requirements for performance management
3. Relationship between performance management and long range transportation plan
4. NMDOT’s 2040 Statewide Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan (SLRP):
   • Purpose and intent
   • Overview of development process
Long range plan requirements under MAP-21
MAP-21 requires long-range plan

* Federal transportation law (MAP-21) → Requires states to develop long range plans
  
  o **Must provide for** development, implementation, and “integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) that will function as an intermodal transportation system for the State and an integral part of an intermodal transportation system for the United States.” (23 USC 135)
Responsibility within NMDOT for developing long range plan

* Within NMDOT, responsibility for developing plan → Transportation Planning & Safety Division (PSD)
Long Range Plan must have → minimum 20-year forecast period

 Horizon year for this update of NMDOT plan → 2040
  - Thus, slightly longer time horizon than 20-year minimum

 Completion / adoption → by April 30, 2015
  - Plan adoption date consistent with final adoption of performance measures at national level
Required coordination with RTPO/MPO plans

- **Coordination with RTPO planning** → RTPOs to develop Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) as part of SLRP development process

- **Coordination with MPO planning** → MPOs to develop Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) concurrently with SLRP using same horizon year (2040), demographic assumptions, etc.
MAP-21 requirements for performance management
What is performance management?

Transportation Performance Management → A “strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals.” – FHWA

- Applied systematically
- Regular, ongoing process
- Based on data and objective information
- Helps decision-makers understand consequences of investment decisions
- Improves communications between decision makers, stakeholders and traveling public

Source: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/tpm.cfm
The statewide transportation planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decisionmaking to support the national goals described in” 23 USC 150 (b) and 49 USC 5301 (c).

Source: 23 USC 135(d)(2)(A)
MAP-21 ➔ national performance goals for federal highway programs:

1. **Safety** ➔ Significantly reduce traffic fatalities + serious injuries on all public roads
2. **Infrastructure Condition** ➔ Maintain infrastructure in state of good repair
3. **Congestion Reduction** ➔ Significantly reduce congestion on National Highway System
4. **System Reliability** ➔ Improve efficiency of surface transportation system
5. **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** ➔ Improve national freight network, strengthen ability of rural communities to access national / international trade markets, support regional economic development
6. **Environmental Sustainability** ➔ Enhance performance of transportation system while protecting/enhancing natural environment
7. **Project Delivery** ➔ Accelerate project completion to reduce project costs, promote jobs / economy, expedite the movement of people/goods by eliminating delays in the project development / delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens + improving agencies' work practices

* For more information, visit: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/goals.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/goals.cfm)
Performance Measures ➔ USDOT must promulgate performance measures within 18 months following enactment of MAP-21:

1. NHPP: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/nhpp.cfm
2. HSIP: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/hsip.cfm
3. CMAQ: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/cmaq.cfm

Performance Targets ➔ “States will invest resources in projects to achieve individual targets that collectively will make progress toward national goals.” -- FHWA
Maturity level of performance measures varies greatly among legislated categories
- Some more “ready for rulemaking” than others

FHWA has put together a chart illustrating the twelve measure categories, classified into three groups (Status I through III) depending on readiness level:

1. Status I -- recommended measures are complete and elements are in place to issue Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)
2. Status II – there are recommended measures, but additional work is needed to develop supporting elements
3. Status III -- measure still being considered

There will be one effective date for all measures approximately spring 2015

See: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/schedule.cfm
Relationship between performance management and long range transportation plan
How long range plan fits into performance management

Source: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/index.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/index.cfm) and 23 USC 134 and 23 USC 135
SLRP Purpose and Intent
Purpose of the Plan

* Provide a visionary, transparent, predictable, performance-based, and strategic framework to guide decision-making at all levels within the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and by New Mexico’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs).
* Ensure that New Mexico’s transportation system supports the well-being of all of the state’s citizens and visitors, and that transportation projects, programs, and policies are rational, fiscally responsible, environmentally sustainable, and accountable to taxpayers and system users.
The SLRP will...

...help create / strengthen livable communities by:
  o outlining a future vision for multimodal transportation
  o defining a realistic path to achieve that vision

...address movement of both people and goods throughout the state.

...integrate, harmonize, build upon and refine existing studies, plans and policies from NMDOT, MPO, RTPO, and other agencies.
A realistic and fiscally constrained implementation strategy will be an important product of this planning process.
SLRP Development process
Focus Areas of the Plan

* Focus areas generally correspond to...

  ... National transportation goals established in MAP-21
  ... Topics of special significance to New Mexico
SLRP organized around nine Focus Areas:

1. Public health, safety and security
2. State of good repair
3. Access, mobility, and connectivity
4. Economic vitality -- freight movement
5. Economic vitality -- regional development, border considerations, rural/urban equity, and environmental justice
6. Visitor travel, recreation and tourism
7. Federal, state, and tribal lands
8. Cultural resources, historic resources, landscapes, and the natural environment
9. Plan implementation and project delivery
MAP-21...

...encourages each state to develop comprehensive State Freight Plan (SFP)

...allows SFP to be either stand-alone document or incorporated into SLRP

NMDOT has determined incorporating SFP into SLRP will best serve New Mexico’s interests
Roles and Responsibilities of NMDOT, MPOs and RTPOs

* MAP-21 → Requires NMDOT, MPOs and RTPOs to cooperate during planning process

* Cooperation means “working together to achieve common goals and objectives”

* MPOs and RTPOs to be involved at every stage of plan development process

* Roles and responsibilities → clearly defined
Participation by NMDOT staff, MPOs, RTPOs, other public agencies, and interested parties → organized around committees, boards, and working groups
Questions?

Email: claude.morelli@state.nm.us
Cell: 505.660.3146
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 9, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 Ex Officio Resolution

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of the Resolution

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Resolution 13-10 Inviting New Mexico State Legislators to serve on the Mesilla Valley Policy Committee as Ex-Officio Members.

DISCUSSION:
At the September meeting, the Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee directed MPO staff to draft a resolution inviting New Mexico State Legislators to serve on the MPO Policy Committee as Ex-Officio members.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 13-10

A RESOLUTION INVITING SITTING MEMBERS OF THE NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MESILLA VALLEY MPO’S PLANNING PROCESS AS EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE.

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

WHEREAS, the MPO is the designated body to carry out the national policy of a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive multimodal transportation planning process outlined in C.F.R. 23 § 450.300; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Powers Agreement between the City of Las Cruces, Doña Ana County, and the Town of Mesilla for the governance of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization permits the Policy Committee to establish appropriate ex-officio (non-voting) members by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the nature of current planning issues require closer coordination with State of New Mexico officials; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution inviting Ex-Officio members to be approved.

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

(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization offers Ex-Officio positions to State of New Mexico legislators that have any portion of their district within the MPO’s planning boundaries.
THAT staff is directed to take appropriate and legal actions to implement this Resolution.

DONE and APPROVED this 11th day of September, 2013.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: 
Second By: 

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

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________________
Recording Secretary

____________________________________
City Attorney
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 9, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
8.1 2014 MPO Calendar Discussion

ACTION REQUESTED:
None

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Sample Calendar of Meetings with proposed alternate meeting days shaded in grey.

DISCUSSION:
At the September meeting, the Policy Committee directed MPO Staff to research scheduling conflicts for several alternate meeting times for review at the October meeting. The proposed times are as follows:

First Wednesday of the Month at 9 AM or 1 PM
Second Wednesday of the Month at 1 PM
Second Friday of the Month at 9 AM or 1 PM

After consulting with the staffs of the jurisdictions, MPO Staff determined that meeting on the Second Friday of the Month at 1 PM would not be possible due to the El Camino Real Consortium meeting at the same time. There are no standing scheduling conflicts with the other proposed meeting times.

MPO Staff opposes adopting either of the meeting times on the First Wednesday of the Month due to that date creating ongoing logistical conflicts with the Transportation Improvement Program amendment cycle. If the Policy Committee elects to meet on the First Wednesday of the Month, the meeting times of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will have to be changed to different times of the month.

MPO Staff endorses either the Second Wednesday at 1 PM or the Second Friday at 9 AM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PM - 5 PM Las Cruces City Council</td>
<td>6 PM - 8 PM Town of Mesilla Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>1 PM - 5 PM Las Cruces City Council</td>
<td>4 PM MPO Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>9 AM El Paso MPO Policy Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PM - 5 PM Las Cruces City Council</td>
<td>6 PM - 8 PM Town of Mesilla Board of Trustees</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Mesilla Valley Regional Dispatch Authority</td>
<td>5 PM - 7 PM Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Animal Service Center Board of Directors</td>
<td>1 PM - 4 PM El Camino Real Consortium Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PM - 5 PM Las Cruces City Council</td>
<td>6 PM - 8 PM Town of Mesilla Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>5:30 PM - 8 PM ETZ Authority</td>
<td>12:30 PM - 2 PM Airport Advisory Board</td>
<td>6 PM - 9 PM South Central Solid Waste Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PM - 5 PM Las Cruces City Council</td>
<td>6 PM - 8 PM Town of Mesilla Board of Trustees</td>
<td>9 AM - 11 AM Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>MPO Quarterly Staff Unavailable</td>
<td>3 PM - 4 PM Library Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>