MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held November 12, 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 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 ____________________________________________
   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. *October 8, 2014 ____________________________________________________ Chair
6. ACTION ITEMS ____________________________________________________________
   6.1. *Resolution 14-15: A Resolution Adopting the 2015 Mesilla Valley MPO Meeting Calendar ________________________________ MPO Staff
   6.2. *Resolution 14-16: A Resolution Adopting the 2014 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects ________________________________ MPO Staff
7. WORK SESSION __________________________________________________________
   7.1. Discussion of coordination with El Paso MPO - EPMPO members invited ____________ Chair
8. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS ____________________________________________ Chair
9. PUBLIC COMMENT ________________________________________________________ Chair
10. ADJOURNMENT ____________________________________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee (PC) meeting which was held October 8, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at City Hall, Council Chambers, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC) arrived 1:08
Councillor Nathan Small (CLC)
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC) departed 2:25

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Orlando Fierro (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Harold Love (NMDOT)
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Garrett: 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.

No member had a conflict of interest.

Garrett: Thank you.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment
Garrett: Public comment, do we have anyone who would like to speak to the committee? Thank you.

### 4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Garrett: Could I have a motion to approve the consent agenda?

Flores: I motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Sorg: I’ll second it.

Garrett: Motion was made by Member Flores, seconded by Member Sorg. Any, is that right? Who, did you do it?

Doolittle: No, it was Mr. Sorg.

Garrett: Okay

Doolittle: Yes, or, Member Sorg.

Garrett: Right, so Member Sorg was the second.

Doolittle: Right.

Garrett: Okay. All in favor, well will you poll the Board?

Wray: Mr. Chair?

Garrett: Yes?

Doolittle: I, I do have a few changes I think that need to be made to the minutes.

Garrett: Okay.

Doolittle: On page 4, line numbers 27-30, line number 38, 43, and 44 all list numbers, because that’s basically what we were discussing but in all reality those are dollar amounts. So I think for clarity’s purpose it’s worth putting a dollar sign in front of those numbers. On page number 32, line number 34 and page number 33, line number 6, we have Bridget Spedalieri’s name spelled wrong. It’s B-R-I-D-G-E-T, if we could make that modification. It’s page 32, line number 34 and page 33, line number 6.

### SOME ELSE SPEAKING, NOT ON THE MICROPHONE.

Doolittle: G-E-T, one T.
Garrett: And is there an E on the end?

Wray: There is not.

Garrett: There is not, so it’s just, okay, any other corrections or additions to that?

Wray: No, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Garrett: Thank you very much. Would you then poll the Committee? Those in favor say “yes,” those opposed “no.”

Murphy: Okay, this, this is for the, the Consent Agenda with the minutes amended. Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Small.

Small: Yes.

Garrett: Thank you.
Motion passes 8 – 0 (2 members absent).

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APPROVED UNDER THE CONSENT AGENDA VOTE

5.1 *September 10, 2014

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution 14-09: A Resolution Approving Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO in Planning Responsibilities in Certain Areas of Dona Ana County

Garrett: We'll move on now to action items. Resolution 14-09, a Resolution approving Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO in planning responsibilities in certain areas of Dona Ana County. Since this is on as an action item, could I go ahead and get an, a motion to approve and second?

Flores: So moved.

Doolittle: Second.

Garrett: Alright, so the motion was made by Member Flores and then seconded by Member Doolittle. Thank you. Would you proceed with the presentation?

Tom Murphy gave a presentation.

Garrett: Very good. Thank you. Yes, Member Doolittle?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I did indeed meet with Mr. Medina as a member of the executive committee. Also, in El Paso I've met with a few of, of those representatives. I think what you have before you is, is kind of a compromise between what we were asking of, of both staffs and ultimately what, what needed to be covered to address the issues with both of the staffs in, in Mesilla Valley and the El Paso MPOs. So I, I again support what's written here. Again I don't think it covers all of the things that we covered a few months ago, but I think it's a good, a good MOA that addresses the issues and outlines who is responsible for what. One of the things I would like to share with you is during my conversations with Mr. Medina and with Mr. Murphy, they'll continue as a staff to coordinate, and then if there's anything specific going on with the El Paso MPO that needs to be addressed with this Board, Tom and his staff will come forward and present that to us. But again I think this is a, a, a pretty solid and good
Garrett: Thank you. Yes, Member Pedroza?

Pedroza: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm a little tiny bit hesitant because I've been reading in the paper that Sunland Park is considering annexing Santa Teresa and that I think is going to change an awful lot of the relationships, and it's something that we need to pay close attention to. I also think that and I'd like to ask Tom, you know what the status is of our invitation to the New Mexico members of the El Paso MPO because I think that's also going to need to get considered and I don't know what our special interests are there but I believe that there probably are some. Santa Teresa is certainly a very important economic and industrial or in the future will be, it is already. And so I think that before we agree to a, an MOA which says, “You guys do up to Berino and El Paso you do the whole rest of it,” we need to think a little bit more carefully about it.

Garrett: Mr. Murphy?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Pedroza, to respond to the, the status of the invitation to the, to the New Mexico delegation, we do have a draft letter that we were going to, to pass out during staff comments. We’re aiming for an invitation to those members for the November 12th meeting. If you like I could have, have that letter passed out at this point, but we do have, we do have one ready for, for comment and you know final revision before it'd be sent out by the Chair’s signature.

Pedroza: Thank you that would be fine and I would invite comment, you know, one thing at a time. Certainly we can look at the letter first or, or second but are there any other members of the MPO Policy Committee that feel that we need to study the question of just what would we be giving up if we agree to only go as far as Berino when, when Santa Teresa, the rising star, is just on the ascent?

Garrett: Mr. Doolittle?

Doolittle: I guess I do have a couple of questions. One is, or a couple of comments. One, I did speak directly with Dr. Garcia and Sunland Park Mayor Perea, letting them know that the invitation to attend our meetings would be coming. I strongly encouraged them to attend. Representatives from Anthony, I have not been able to, to meet with them yet, but I think we'll, we will have at least a turnout from representatives from the El Paso MPO at that meeting. The other thing I just wanted to share is this, this MOA, more specifically is dealing with Berino as you mentioned; if Sunland Park annexes any portion or all of Santa Teresa, ultimately that is part of the El
Paso urbanized area. So I agree with you that we need to stay in tune on, with what’s going on in the southern border area, but ultimately the El Paso MPO regardless of what happens with Sunland Park and the annexation will still be involved and be responsible for any planning and modeling issues tied to that area. So I agree with you we need to coordinate, but I don’t know that it changes anything with the way the MPO staffs would be working.

Pedroza: Okay, that, that makes sense to me.

Garrett: Anyone else want to comment on that? I would, I would just, in a sense echo what Mr. Doolittle has said. I … there are bound to be changes that are going to happen in terms of jurisdictions in the south. I think that what this document does is to record the fact that we in fact have already started a process in a sense of enhanced coordination because I don’t want to have anybody think that there wasn’t some degree of coordination in the past. But I think we’re, we’re clearly expressing that this is something that we’re interested in and I think that there’s plenty of room in here for us to, to have those enhanced discussions about what’s going on in the south and how that relates to the rest of Dona Ana County. There are other planning entities, the Viva Dona Ana, just as a, the primary one that I think does encompass the entire area, and if anything, that helps underscore why it’s important to keep that kind of an initiative going, because we have both the El Paso and the Mesilla Valley MPOs as members of the consortium. So we’re, you know, our, our challenge in a way is how to deal with the fragmentation but I think as long as we are, are clarifying roles and, and we’re not reinforcing silos; I mean it’s one thing to say that different entities have different kinds of responsibilities, but it’s a whole another thing to, I guess what we’re trying to do is to informally influence those, those, that sense of responsibility in those different areas. Cause one way or another there’s still going to be an El Paso MPO that we’re going to have to be dealing with in terms of the, of the border; others, other thoughts? Mr. Bernal?

Bernal: Yes, yes, Mr. Chair. By my experience and I’m pretty sure you remember this from when we annexed Raasaf Hills that was a huge, huge experience to the Town of Mesilla and your concern Mr. Chairman, it is a concern. It is a huge concern that there’s people that think it’s a good idea that they should annex, but the process and if they don’t cross their Ts, dot their Is, then they’re going to be going through the same situation as, as the Town of Mesilla, so it’s, yes it’s great to grow but if you don’t know what the expectations of what you’re going to be coming in, getting into, well that’s them that are going to go through that, but it is a concern and I see your view and your understanding. But it’s, it’s good that we get involved ourselves as the MPO.
Garrett: Thank you. Member Pedroza?

Pedroza: Thank you. I, I agree and I think, you know I’m not saying something like, “Let’s stop all communication,” but just so that we realize that, just how important communication at this point and in the future is going to be in coordination and communication disagreements and agreements, hopefully more agreements than disagreements so that everybody can benefit. Thank you.

Garrett: I would just add two, two points. One, one is that in the recent round of planning sessions that we had with Viva Dona Ana, something that was stressed again and again in terms of transportation in, and in the whole south and we are not talking about just Santa Teresa, we’re talking about the area that basically goes from Anthony to the, to the east to, to Chaparral and then around that whole connection that goes down to Sunland Park and, and, and, and, Santa Teresa. We’re, we’re behind in terms of planning for that area. We’re behind in terms of development of the systems and it’s you know this isn’t to, to fault anyone. It’s just that our system is not set up to move very quickly and we’ve got a lot of fragmented authorities and areas of responsibility. So I think more and more people are, are starting to figure, to say, “How do we figure out how to work better together in order to, to address the, the challenges that we have there and to, to maximize the benefits we can get out of, out of the right kind of development?” So that, that sort of leads to the fact that in terms of getting this approved, it would seem to me that this is a, this is a framework and the important thing is to, is to get it to work, which means essentially that we had talked about looking at the, the 404 spur and that whole connection at Anthony Gap as well as the West Mesa road. I think that, that moving as quickly as we can to have some briefings about that, because that really is, right now that, that takes us right to the heart of what’s going on as well as there are other studies that I know that NMDOT is working on that have to do with connections of Santa Teresa to the east and to El Paso and I-10. I think it would be helpful to move forward on briefings so that we’re able to understand what’s, what’s in the works, and then from that we can actually have, figure out what we need to have a conversation about with the El Paso MPO. So if that makes sense to you, you know, I, I’m, I’m inclined to say, let’s, we’ve got this, this negotiated as far as we can. Right now, the issue is, is putting it in, into practice. And, I think we’ve got a, a number of questions before us that are important to, to move forward on. So yes, Member Pedroza?

Pedroza: Thank you, just one last thing. I, I recall that at the last meeting, we kind of asked for graphics. How soon are the, are we going to get a briefing like that that shows where exactly the west highway ...

Garrett: Mesa, West Mesa.
Pedroza: West Mesa highway is going to be, how it will impact 404, etc. etc. so that I can understand it better?

Garrett: Yes, Mr. Doolittle, yes.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, as part of the DOT, as part of my portion on the DOT updates, I'll give you a, a quick update on the West Mesa funding issue and study that we talked about last month.

Garrett: Very good. So are there any other comments that bear directly on the Resolution before us? In that case I'd ask you to, to poll the Committee and those in favor say “yes,” those opposed say “no.”

Murphy: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Small.

Small: Yes.
Garrett: The motion passes by unanimous vote.

Motion passes 8 – 0 (2 members absent).

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 2015 Meeting Calendar

Garrett: Discussion items, the 2015 Meeting Calendar. Mr. Murphy.

Tom Murphy gave a presentation. The November meeting for the 2015 calendar year is cancelled due to Veterans' Day.

Garrett: Okay. So, in terms of the chart we have on page 47 and the, the change there would simply be that we would have a gray box that would fill in for November under the Policy ...

Murphy: That is correct.

Garrett: Okay, is anyone concerned with eliminating the November meeting? Okay, so we don't have to vote on this, but you have our concurrence to move ahead and put a gray box there.

Murphy: Alright, thank you.

7.2 Transportation Improvement Program Briefing

Garrett: The next item has to do with the TIP procedures briefing.

Andrew Wray gave a presentation.

Garrett: Any questions? If you wouldn't mind, could you send us all an electronic copy of the presentation?

Wray: Yes, I, thank you Mr. Chair, and I, I meant to mention, I believe the STIP/TIP procedures were e-mailed to you in June but I intend to e-mail those again after this meeting today just cause it's been several months and it's probably been deleted by your automatic archive service so I want to make sure everyone has access to this document. So I will e-mail both of them.

Garrett: Yeah, thank you. This was a, a good summary, anything else on, on this? Let me just ask what happens in terms of projects that are outside of, of our particular jurisdictional area that we still might have an interest in? How do we address that?
Wray: It could not be done through our MPO process. It would have to be done through the, the, the process of either the, the MPO or the RTPO. I don’t know whether would the MPO as a body be able to send in any sort of letter of support or any kind of comment regarding at least some sort of, of letter of interest or letter of support could be sent in, but it, it, it does need to be emphasized that, that anything that is not within the jurisdiction of the Mesilla Valley MPO would have to be handled through the process of whatever jurisdiction the project was taking place in.

Garrett: So does the, the RPO handle things in the same sequence, the same time frame, same deadlines?

Wray: Generally speaking I believe so. There’s been, we’ve wanted to synch, we’ve, we’ve wanted, there’s been a move by DOT over the past couple of years to sort of synch up the RTPO and the MPO processes so that they look broadly similar. I’m, I’m not intimately familiar with all the processes at the RTPOs, but broadly the DOT has wished to kind of make them similar.

Garrett: Okay. I’m thinking here about the Upham exit in terms of its connection to the southern road and the need to get progress going in terms of the interchange there so and the County did approve a resolution supporting full vehicular access including an interchange modification there so it might be something that we’d be interested in taking a look at. Yep.

Flores: Would that fit in the, the earlier language that she had (inaudible) it was one of the first slides that you had where it defined regionally important projects such as access to?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Trustee Flores, the, that definition though is very specific to projects within, again it’s, you have to go through the process within that specific jurisdiction. Whether or not an outside entity wished to make a, some kind of vocalization of support, that wouldn’t necessarily serve as a justification for doing so. I, I would say that the interest of the entity in question would be enough of a, of a justification if they wanted to pursue making their voices heard in the process.

Garrett: So, if I, if I’m understanding you correctly, the, the language here is intended to apply to projects within our jurisdictional boundary even if the project has, and, and particularly for those projects that have greater significance outside the boundary as well as inside the boundary.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Garrett: Okay.
Wray: Again, as alluded to in the earlier item, obviously coordination would hopefully be taking place between the, the jurisdictions in that case.

Garrett: Sure, okay, anything else? Yes Commissioner Flores do you have anything or, or Member Flores?

Flores: No, I’m just looking at the words.

Garrett: Okay, alright. Yes, Member Pedroza?

Pedroza: I wonder if you could answer a question for me. I’m not clear at all about this. Recently there have also been references in the newspaper to some roads in southern Dona Ana County which is not part of our, even, even with the new MOA, part of our jurisdiction. So how, what’s the process for, say for instance the construction of those roads that they were, everybody was complaining about, Airport Road and I can’t remember.

Garrett: Industrial.

Pedroza: Yes, thank you. Is it handled by DOT, New Mexico DOT, USDOT, Texas DOT, the MPOs, or, or who exactly is responsible for making those decisions?

Wray: Mr. Chair, specifically those two roads are Dona Ana County roads. I know that they’ve been coordinating with the Department on some funding for design but ultimately those are two County facilities.

Pedroza: The County? I thought they were not, that they did not, they had not been dedicated to the County, so the County was saying that they did not have...

Garrett: No, I think they are County roads.

Pedroza: They are?

Garrett: Yes, but, but there’s not money to do the repairs, so we’ve been looking for money from the State Legislature and anyone else that wants to give us money, so ...

Pedroza: Thank you.

Garrett: Certainly, any other comments or questions? Thank you very much for this presentation.

7.3 NMDOT Updates

Garrett: NMDOT updates. Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll give you a real brief construction update. Vado/Mesquite interchange, we do still currently have the eastbound on and off ramps closed. We're currently placing hot mix on those shoulders and those ramps, trying to get those open, painting the abutment and the beams on the bridges, looking at trying to get traffic switched over in the next couple of weeks so we can basically do the same thing on the other side. So again we got off to a little bit of a slow start; we're, we're making some good progress now that we've got some good weather and got through the initial, initial hump of getting started, so it's good to see some progress out there.

We also have a drainage project a little bit outside of this MPO's boundary but we have a drainage project down in Anthony working on excavating for some ponds, actually started contract time last week so we're in the very early stages of that project. More specifically here in town, we are finishing up the concrete barrier project out on US 70, just got a few little things to do with some painting and cleanup. We should be finished with that one here real quickly. I know I keep saying that, but we had some weather issues and, and whatnot but we are making progress and I, I hope that we can get that one closed up pretty quick. That is US 70, correct?

The other one that we have in town is the reconstruction project on North Main. We continue to make really good progress on that one. Contractor, we had, we did have a few design issues on that one tied to slopes and grades of the roadway. Ultimately we've worked through that but again we're making some really good progress on that project. Again the delays on that one seem to be very minimal, surprisingly, you know when you're impacting downtown traffic with no signals and it being a fairly short project, traffic seems to flow very well through that project.

The other thing that you've probably seen around town is we're doing some deck sealing on a lot of our bridges, a lot of the older bridges that we've got that we haven't replaced recently, we're sealing the deck, doing some concrete repair, basically just bridge maintenance on them. We are about finished with that. That was some additional Federal funding, I mean I'm sorry, some additional State funding that we have to have spent by October 15th, so you'll, you won't see any more impacts on those bridge projects, at least the maintenance portion as of next week.

That's, that's currently all of our ongoing construction projects in the area. I do want to give some brief updates on some upcoming projects: Our Missouri bridge, which is a full replacement of that project is scheduled to go to bid October 17th. My expectation is it will take about two months for us to award the contract so that's you know December or so. We'll probably have a 60- to a 90-day ramp-up time on that one, so you can expect to see some work on Missouri sometime in the spring. But as we get closer we'll do with all of our other urban projects, we will have some public meetings before we ever get started so everybody's aware of
the schedule and I’ll be able to provide you more specific details after we get a contractor on board.

The other one that is going to affect your travels on the interstate, we are going to do some work at what we call “Ramp E,” it’s basically the Union/I-10 interchange. That’s the, kind of the awkward interchange there at South Main/Valley/University. We’re doing some bridge rehabilitation there. We’re widening it out to make the on ramp, the acceleration ramp, a lot safer. Right now you come up on the interstate and you really can’t get up to speed because of the grade so we’re going to extend that ramp. Ultimately, the initial part of that project was to address bridge issues but we’re going to make the whole interchange a little bit safer. That project is currently scheduled to be bid in February, so that one you can expect to see some construction in the summer. I was talking to Councillor Sorg, once we get those two finished hopefully we’re finished with bridge projects in downtown Las Cruces. That should buy us about 50 years so, so hopefully we can, we can get out of the way at least when it comes to the bridge issues. Wanted to provide an update on the West Mesa Phase 1B. I know it came up earlier. The General Office has indeed moved that funding, so currently there is no funding for the Phase 1B. As an update, Phase 1A study there was a request at the last Policy Board meeting to get a copy of that and I believe that Jolene sent that out shortly after that meeting so everybody should have a copy. If you don’t feel free to let me or Jolene know and we can get you one. The one thing that I will share with you is there was a request to have a presentation to provide an update and a kind of a summary of the Phase 1A, ultimately because that funding was moved, the consultant that was on board to prepare Phase 1A, there isn’t a mechanism for us to pay them, so we’re trying to work through another, another mechanism either internally or a, an amendment to a contract or some small type funding so that we, you can have a formal presentation. But at this point there is no, no funding for a 1B or a presentation itself.

Sorg: Could I as a question as long as we’re touching upon that Phase?

Garrett: Yes.

Sorg: Could you describe very briefly, what a 1B Phase would be, involve? Very briefly, anything?

Doolittle: I’ll have to ask either Jolene or Harold maybe to come explain the specifics of a 1B study.

Herrera: I’m Jolene Herrera, NMDOT. So the Phase 1B looks at the alternatives that were laid out in Phase 1A and narrows them down to a preferable alternative.
Sorg: If I may repeat what you just said cause I had my microphone on and I didn’t hear, hear very well. In other words all the alternatives in 1A would be evaluated and you’d pick one of them?

Herrera: Basically yes.

Sorg: Okay, thank you.

Garrett: Let me just follow up on that one, that question. What, what’s the assumption in terms of the significance of completion of 1B? I mean these are standard 1A, 1B, these are, these are traditional pieces, steps you go through to move into eventually construction of, of something. So what’s the assumption in terms of once you finish a 1B study?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, are you talking about once we develop a, an alignment how do we move forward with construction?

Garrett: What, what’s, in other words when, when you get to the point where you’ve got a preferred alternative, at that point you can also, is there a cost estimate that goes with that?

Doolittle: We actually have Mr. Chair, preliminary costs tied to alignments in the Phase 1A, but we would be able to tie down a more specific estimate. One benefit of these studies and again this is why we’re pursuing additional studies in the border area tied to 136, you know a study for New Mexico 404 over the Anthony Gap, is once we have these types of studies, it provides more data for us to pursue a TIGER application, for instance. But at this point you know I think the point was made last month is anything that is approved or, or considered as part of the West Mesa, there is no funding at this point for construction.

Garrett: But, the assumption is that once you finish a 1B study that the next step would actually be to look for money to, to start you know acquisition of right-of-way and, and, and moving forward on that, right?

Doolittle: Yes.

Garrett: Okay. So I, I’m still comfortable with where we are because we still have the option once we get additional information about the 404 option to say, “Okay now maybe we can have a comparison and look at the larger implications of this and then move forward as, as appropriate.” But, very good. I have a question, I think at a couple of our meetings we’ve talked about having champagne celebrations, ribbon cuttings, balloons, you know on some of these projects, you know Avenida de Mesilla and I-10, we need mariachis out there. The, the important work that was done on, on US 70 with the concrete barriers, is there, I’m, I’m pulling your leg a
little bit, but I think the idea of celebrating these accomplishments because these are major changes for the community, it’s important to recognize that they’re finished and, and give a chance to explain why they were done and to recognize those that were involved. So any thoughts to some ribbon cuttings?

Doolittle: Absolutely. I did actually talk to Bridget Spedalieri a little bit earlier to get her input. She thought it was a good idea, but honestly we haven’t got into the details. We’ve been dealing with some flooding issues you know elsewhere in the district. You know I apologize for not making it a priority, but that is certainly something that we tend to overlook because they either are small, small dollar amounts or you know low-impact, those types of things, but I, I think we agree with you, it’s just a matter of tying down the details and getting those scheduled.

Garrett: Okay and I would just say that I, I think that the, the County and the City, you know have capacity to help with, with events. I’m not going to make any commitments for Mesilla. You, you know I don’t know what situation you’re all in but I’m, you want to add?

Flores: I was just going to ask if you were doing something for Avenida de Mesilla that you’d coordinate with Irene Parra so that she might invite some business owners to come out, so ...

Garrett: Okay, and I would, I’m, I’m sort of extending the idea that if, if you want some help from the County, you know Bridget could talk to Jess Williams and you know, so I, I just think we can all work together on this.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, the one thing I will tell you is we, we throw a good party down here.

Garrett: Oh, okay.

Doolittle: So once we do that, it, it, it truly is a low cost, you know Bridget has her contacts through the media to get the word out. We have all of the tents and PA systems ultimately to have the event. Typically what we’re looking for are volunteers for, you know a band for national anthem or entertainment type of deal, and then snacks and refreshments are typically you know the only cost. So I appreciate the offer and we will certainly be contacting the entities if we, if we move forward.

Bernal: Mr. Chair. Yeah Mr. Doolittle, Bridget talked to me a couple days ago saying the extra expenses were going to come out of you. Is it true?

Doolittle: She must have the checkbook this month.
Garrett: Member Benavidez?

Benavidez: Mr. Chair, thank you. One of the things that you might want to consider is to have a, a high school's band or orchestra, I, I, I'm, I'm thinking that the bands would, maybe they would be willing to you know participate because they're always looking for you know PR work like that. So Las Cruces High School and Mayfield High School I guess are in that area, so, and any high schools in that area that would be willing to participate too.

Thank you.

Garrett: Yeah and Onate for, for US 70, yeah. Okay, anything else in terms of updates?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I do have one more that I wanted to share with you all. We recently provided some funding to the El Paso MPO, $425,000 to do traffic modeling and, and I bring that up because once we get that data, more specifically to Dona Ana County, that kind of information will be available for southern Dona Ana County, the towns of Anthony, Sunland Park, those types of things, so again that's an opportunity, $425,000 seems like a fairly substantial amount, but in all reality compared to what TEXDOT and the other entities provide for that same type of activity it's another, another example of we're going to get a large benefit out of a fairly small amount of funding, so I share that with you. As, as a Dona Ana County Commissioner we'll have another option for some data for the County.

Garrett: I very much appreciate that. Thank you. Anything else, any questions, comments? Thank you for the, for the briefing.

7.4 Advisory Committee Updates

Garrett: Advisory Committee updates.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, one announcement for Advisory Committee updates, the, the October meeting for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Advisory Committee has been moved one hour forward. It'll be, it'll be taking place at, at 4:00 p.m. and I believe that's, I believe the date's October 21st. I forgot to check. It's the third Tuesday of the month.

Wray: It is the 21st.

Murphy: Thanks and the reason for that was there is a, a, the County set up meeting on some of the improvements being made on, on Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Road. That is starting at 6:00 and we figured that there were, there were people that were interested in both meetings, so we moved ours up in order to facilitate people wanting to attend both. That concludes my Advisory Committee update.
Garrett: Any questions by the Committee? Thank you.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Garrett: Committee and staff comments. Mr. Sorg.

Sorg: I’ll be brief. I’d just like to, because the Safe Routes to School Program really was started here in the MPO staff and so forth, now it’s been taken over by the schools and New Mexico Health Department. I just wanted to comment on the fact that it’s really going well. There’s over 280 students that walked to school this morning to Jornada Elementary School. The staff has gotten out so many celebrities to join in this walk and bike to school. For example the cheerleaders and a small group of cheerleaders from NMSU including Pistol Pete was there. Miss, Miss Las Cruces was there and finally as the students got to the school, Mickey Mouse even greeted them as they came to the school. Anyway it’s a very good success and I’m really pleased that the program is progressing so well. A big thanks to the whole staff at, at the schools and the Health Department. Thank you.

Garrett: Thank you, other comments? Just a, more of a question, have the staff been having some meetings regarding the map, the, the transport 2040 map or am I confusing that with something else?

Murphy: That, that is correct. We had some meetings and I was going to, to go over that.

Garrett: Okay. Go ahead.

Murphy: Okay. Alright I will start with that one, last week and the week before we had five meetings around the MPO area. We had, we had two meetings at the Farmers’ Market, one on Wednesday and one on Saturday, get, get both types of crowds. We also had a meeting in Radium Springs, down at the Del Cerro/Vado Community Center, and one at the Dona Ana Branch East Mesa Campus. The turnout was, was, we’re, staff was disappointed in the turnout. We did get some, some folks out there. We did get Channel 22 News on one of the days, so hopefully that’s going to you know spread the word. We’ve invited people to you know to ask, ask us to come to their individual group if they desire. We pointed the, you know, we have all the information on the website and we’ll be continuing to, to take comments throughout, throughout the winter and as we begin work on writing the draft plan which we plan on rolling out, rolling out sometime February for, for June, June adoption, and we’ll have another round of public meetings once we do have that draft document ready for release.
Garrett: Thank you, any comments or questions about that? Just one and, and that is: How is our process of updating that map going to be coordinated with the development of the preferred or the recommended scenario out of Viva Dona Ana?

Murphy: We will have to have a, have a meeting with, with County staff, as, as, as, as the Viva Dona Ana map takes form. Ours we really haven't even started to look at what, what adjustments are. We're right now in the process of just taking in comment, so any changes, any changes that that process wishes to, to recommend we're fully capable of taking that input bringing it before our committee structure and then amending that if the committees would agree with that.

Garrett: Let me suggest that the MPO staff talk with the staff that are working on the Viva Dona Ana. We may want to try to do something like a, a workshop that's a public meeting because as we've gotten further and further into the, the regional planning it's, it's very obvious that where we have roads and what kind of roads we have is going to have a huge impact in terms of the future development pattern for the entire area and, and I think that that, evaluating what our current structure looks like compared to one that maybe optimizes support for the direction that we're getting from the public would be helpful. So I, I just would say that as we move further along and of course that's being done with some consulting folks and, and we'd have to figure out how they can be incorporated in this but does that make sense generally to the, to the committee? Okay.

Murphy: So I think, I think that'd be great and staff would love to participate in, in such a workshop. Reminder you that the, that the MTP is also, also policy-oriented and we want to get, we want to get input on policies as well.

Garrett: Absolutely, yep. And the other thing is, is simply that you might be able to, we might be able to piggyback on the, the work that's been done by Viva Dona Ana in terms of engaging the public in some of the meetings. We've had some pretty good participation in some of those sessions so. And I, I'd want to recognize Harold and thank you for, I was at a meeting the other day that has to do with some concerns that have been raised about traffic at Fairacres Elementary School on Picacho and I just some, some concerns about the fact that it gets congested and dangerous at times when you've got a lot of people being dropped off and a lot of people leaving so, appreciate your, your involvement in that, that effort. Any other, anybody have any thoughts, remembered anything you want to bring to our attention? Do we have a new staff member? Do we have, staff, do you have anything else you want to announce?
Murphy: Just as mentioned earlier in the meeting I’m, I’m sending around now the draft letter we have to send to the other, to the members, the New Mexico members of the El Paso Board. If everybody is good with this we will, we will put the proper names on the top of it and route it for the, for the Chair’s signature or you know take recommendations for how to amend it.

Garrett: Let me just ask you this, do you want to just take a minute to, to, to scan this quickly so we can get this taken care of?

Small: Mr. Chair.

Garrett: Yes, Member Small.

Small: Always the, the suggestion of the tilde over the or the ñ.

Murphy: That yeah I, I noticed that, at the, I have to, when I do it on my computer, I have to open up a special thing so as always, that always occurs in final edit.

Small: That’s a, and I always, I always just copy and paste from the internet, so you’re, you’re two steps ahead of where I am.

Garrett: Yeah and Viva Dona Ana also has an exclamation point at the end of it. Great and it’s always Billy G. Garrett.

Murphy: Trying to save myself on some ink and I have one, one last staff comment.

Garrett: Just before we leave on, anything else on the letter? Yes Member Pedroza?

Pedroza: It’s not so much on the letter but would it be possible and not too much work to send us either at the same time that you send this out or at least before they come, the names of all of the New Mexico members? Who is it going to be addressed to, because I’d, I’d like to, I know Dr. Garcia is, but I can’t remember the rest of the people, so I would love to know ahead of time.

Murphy: Absolutely. In fact, I, I think we’ll, we’ll cc the rest of the Committee on this letter.

Garrett: Okay.

Pedroza: Thank you.

Garrett: Yes, Member Flores.
Flores: On the last paragraph it says, “Please inform staff of your availability.” I’m assuming that you mean our staff and maybe it would be helpful to have a particular person’s name.

Garrett: Yeah, maybe a name and a telephone number.

Murphy: I will put my name in there.

Garrett: And if you will provide me with, well, I’ll get the, the names, I’ll follow up and, and make a call to each of the people to make sure that they know that they’re, this isn’t just a paper exercise so, okay? Yes, Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I, I, I understand that we’re inviting them to the MPO Policy Board but I, I wonder what the intent is. Are we going to have some sort of tentative agenda, I mean what is the, what are we going to focus on as part of the study? Is it, is it enough that a work session is more feasible as opposed to them attending the TPB? You know I, I don’t really know. I understand it’s important to improve communication but I don’t know what the intent or the focus is going to be if they’re here and kind of what the, what the process is going to be for us to have that kind of open discussion with them.

Garrett: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: I certainly agree and I think that it may be necessary to have a, a meeting before the November 12th in order to set the agenda so that they don’t just come in and watch us discuss our ordinary business. And possibly making November 12th dedicated to discussing some issues and who’s going to present, etc. etc. So, yeah, I think that it’d be really really important to decide on an agenda for the meeting.

Garrett: Member Flores.

Flores: I, if we’re going to do that, I would like to add something so that they could maybe present an agenda item or feel free to add what’s important to them or something.

Garrett: Okay. So, we can add some language that let, let me, let me, let me take this in two bites. The first thing is, could I have two other people volunteer to work with me on the agenda for that particular session and with Tom, and, and what I’m, what I’m thinking is, this is really about where we have the overlaps and you know Member Pedroza you’re involved with Viva Dona Ana also, and you know, you want to be involved, Member Flores? Okay. And, actually I’m just going to say Mr. Doolittle if you’ve got any insights you want to share with us that would be good. Cause what I think partly we want to do is, is to make the case for having this be a, that, that
we need for them to be aware of what we’re working on and, and where there’s this overlap, and talk about how to make sure that our interests in the South Valley are then conveyed to the El Paso MPO cause they’re you know other than, than, well, Trent’s part of that, but, but it’s basically, we’re looking for that sort of group to carry forward our message in that larger discussion. Does that make sense Mr. Doolittle?

Doolittle: Yes and, and one thing I would like to add now, I did talk to, again Mayor Perea and Dr. Garcia, and one of the things I asked them to start thinking about is what they felt Dona Ana County and New Mexico benefited from the El Paso MPO both financially and, and, you know support what we get from them. So I, I’ve asked them to do a little bit of homework and thought process on their end to come prepared a little bit as well.

Garrett: Very good. Yes, Mayor, Member ...

Pedroza: And past, no ...

Garrett: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Possibly also on the, on the opposite side, what they would see, what they would like to see is a result of communications, what problems they see that might be, that might be susceptible to our planning, etc.

Garrett: Very good. We straight?

Murphy: I think, I think we got it. Just to kind of, I checked with, I checked with Jolene, I, I, at this moment I don't think we're anticipating any, any TIP amendments coming up so we can devote the entire agenda to, to joint issues, we can work on some presentations on, on what we’re doing. I would probably, probably ask that we see if we can get a good presentation on Viva Dona Ana to you know to, to give, you know, give them a well-rounded update or summary of what’s going on with that and, and we could you know, essentially turn the next regular meeting date into, you know into a work session.

Garrett: Great. That okay with everybody? Great, okay, so I will be back in touch with Members Flores and Pedroza, we'll set up a time and then my suggestion is that unless Mr. Doolittle has time, that what we do is we’ll work on something and then get in touch with you and and sort of fold you in or if you want to send me any ideas in advance.

Doolittle: Sure and when you schedule the meeting if you let me know I will certainly be willing to attend.

Garrett: Okay, very good.
Murphy: One last staff ...

Garrett: I beg your pardon?

Murphy: I have one last staff ...

Garrett: One last staff, okay.

Murphy: I’d like to introduce to you our, our new Associate Transportation Planner, Michael McAdams. He began with us on, on September 22nd. He brings with him many of years of transportation planning experience. He has, he has taught transportation planning at several universities and has also worked in the public transit industry. If, if, Michael you’d like to introduce yourself.

McAdams: Just briefly. Good to meet you today and I’m just saying I’m very pleased to be here and getting started. I’ll primarily be doing transit work but other modeling as well, so anything I can do to serve this committee please let me know.

Garrett: Thank you and welcome and congratulations on your job, anything else, Mr. Murphy?

Murphy: No.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Garrett: Okay. Going to go and ask one more time if there’s any public comment? Okay. In that case, without objection, we’ve completed the agenda, so we are adjourned.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.
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MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:
2015 MPO Meeting Schedule

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of 2015 MPO Meeting Schedule

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2015 MPO Schedule of Meetings

DISCUSSION:
This item is to adopt the 2015 MPO Meeting Schedule.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 14-15

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2015 MEETING SCHEDULE

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Policy Committee has the authority to adopt and amend the MPO’s schedule of meetings as it deems appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the MPO’s Bylaws and Open Meetings Resolution have identified the guidelines for regular, special and emergency meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the 2015 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO Committees to be APPROVED.

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

(I)

THAT the proposed 2015 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO committees, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made part of this resolution, be APPROVED.

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 12th day of November, 2014.


**APPROVED:**


__________________________
Chair


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion By:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second By:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**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
## Exhibit “A” 2015 Schedule of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Policy Committee</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>BPAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (if necessary for TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (if necessary for TIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (TIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE

ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 12, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 A Resolution Adopting the 2014 List of Obligated Projects

ACTION REQUESTED:
Adopt 2014 List of Obligated Projects

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2014 List of Obligated Projects

DISCUSSION:
According to United States Code 23 § 450.332, the MPO is required to publish a list of projects that had funds obligated during the preceding fiscal year. The projects accompanying this action form were obligated during the 2014 fiscal year.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 14-16

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2014 LIST OF OBLIGATED PROJECTS

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee adopts a new TIP every two years and TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications as needed; and

WHEREAS, various stakeholders and citizens participate in the TIP process; and

WHEREAS, U.S.C. 23 § 450.324 requires the MPO to annually approve the list of projects obligated during the previous federal fiscal year; and

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

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's Federal Fiscal Year 2014 List of Obligated Projects is adopted as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 12th day of November, 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: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________
Recording Secretary

__________________________________
City Attorney
## Exhibit "A" 2014 Obligated Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO #</th>
<th>Control #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO region</td>
<td>Planning Funds</td>
<td>$218,614</td>
<td>$37,254</td>
<td>$255,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO region</td>
<td>5303 Funds</td>
<td>$34,033</td>
<td>$8,508</td>
<td>$42,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO region</td>
<td>Traffic Count Program</td>
<td>$20,550</td>
<td>$3,502</td>
<td>$24,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MPO LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$273,197</td>
<td>$49,264</td>
<td>$322,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Mexico Department of Transportation Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>LC00100</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Missouri Ave Bridge, MP .8-3.5</td>
<td>Bdg Repl &amp; Ramp Rehab/Recon</td>
<td>$13,671,178</td>
<td>$2,329,733</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$16,750,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1100930</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 150.3-161.5</td>
<td>Concrete Wall Barrier &amp; Board</td>
<td>$2,037,710</td>
<td>$161,891</td>
<td>$2,199,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>Intersection of Solano &amp; Spitz</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$640,800</td>
<td>$109,200</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>E100110</td>
<td>NM 28</td>
<td>TX line to Calle del Norte</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>NM 188</td>
<td>Picacho to Avenida de Mesilla</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction &amp; ADA</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>$116,480</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>G100030</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td>$427,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$427,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NMDOT LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,460,408</td>
<td>$3,917,304</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$22,127,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doña Ana County Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>G100030</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td>$828,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$828,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DAC LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$828,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$828,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Las Cruces Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>LC00130</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>El Paseo HSIP Project</td>
<td>Install Signs, raised medians, and crosswalks</td>
<td>$28,255</td>
<td>$2,245</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>LC00180</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Las Cruces La Llorona Trail</td>
<td>TAP Funded Project</td>
<td>$384,480</td>
<td>$65,520</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CLC LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$412,735</td>
<td>$2,245</td>
<td>$480,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RoadRUNNER Transit Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TL00010</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Operating Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,554,775</td>
<td>$1,554,775</td>
<td>$3,109,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TL00011</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Capital Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td>$278,050</td>
<td>$56,950</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL00013</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Support Equipment/Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$365,660</td>
<td>$76,521</td>
<td>$442,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSIT LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,198,485</td>
<td>$1,688,246</td>
<td>$3,886,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las Cruces Public Schools Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>LC00170</td>
<td>LCPS</td>
<td>SRTS, TAP Funded</td>
<td>SRTS Administration</td>
<td>$25,632</td>
<td>$4,368</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LCPS LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,632</td>
<td>$4,368</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Mesilla Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No federally-funded projects obligated in FY 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TOM LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,198,457</td>
<td>$3,923,917</td>
<td>$2,553,030</td>
<td>$27,675,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
WORK SESSION FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 Work Session discussing Coordination with El Paso MPO

DISCUSSION:
The New Mexico delegation of the El Paso MPO Transportation Policy Board is invited to participate in a work session with the Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee regarding coordination issues between the two adjoining MPOs.
To: Mesilla Valley MPO Staff  
From: Michael McAdams  
RE: Report on New Mexico-Chihuahua Border Master Plan Policy Advisory and Technical Working Group Kick-off Meeting held on October 14, 2014-1:30-3:30 P.M. at Gadsden School District Administration Offices, Sunland Park, New Mexico  
Date: October 15, 2014

The meeting was well attended by about thirty various technical representatives who have interest in the border area of southeastern New Mexico and northeastern Chihuahua including officials from the FHWA, NMDOT, MPOs, border guard officers, representatives from Ciudad Juárez, officials from the United Mexican States and others. The meeting was coordinated by the consulting firm of Stantec. A coordinating official from the FHWA was in attendance and co-officiated the meeting.

The New Mexico-Chihuahua Border Master Plan is the last conducted by the Federal Government, with the FHWA being the lead agency, for all border areas. The planning process is stipulated to be a continuing process guiding infrastructure along both sides of the border; mostly involving the establishment of coordinated infrastructure on both sides of the border to facilitate trade between the two countries. One of the first areas to do a Master Border Plan was the San Diego/Baja California area. They are in the process of updating their plan. The Master Plan for the El Paso area has already been completed and will be kept separate from this one. However, there will be obvious interaction and integration between the two. The plan is to be divided into short, medium and long-range proposed project with the horizon year being 2040. Completed border master plans can be found at an FHWA webpage devoted to Master Border Plans at: http://www.borderplanning.fhwa.dot.gov/mexico.asp

The Master Plan will have two geographic concentrations: a buffer zone delineated as 10 miles on either side of the border (See Figure 1); and a general study area encompassing most of lower southeastern New Mexico and a significant part of the northern portion of the State of Chihuahua (see Figure 2.) The study area’s northern fuzzy boundaries are defined by Interstate-10. The extent of this area might be slightly altered according to suggestions by those attending.

The planning process will organized around various general meetings and focus groups from both states in U.S. and México. After each meeting, a technical memorandum will be developed and distributed to stakeholders. The end result will be a final plan, targeted for completion and adoption by the Policy Advisory Committee in June 2015. One of the products will be a webpage which will contain the technical memoranda etc., and a GIS for the suggested projects with their delineation (i.e. short, middle,
The webpage will be listed on the Border Plan website at: http://www.borderplanning.fhwa.dot.gov/mexico.asp. The NMDOT will also have a link directing to this webpage. The process will be overseen by a Policy Committee, composed of key elected officials, and a Technical Committee drawn from representatives from various stakeholders; apparently mostly from the public sector.

There were several discussions concerning the process. One item mentioned by several at the meeting were the implications of the Plan, since there would be a Policy Advisory Committee who would approve it. A representative from the FHWA stated although this plan is important and should be taken into account by various agencies; it does not imply that the projects be incorporated into TIPs, the STIP of New Mexico or long-range transportation plans. The Federal coordinator concurred with this. There were also discussion about the boundaries of the study area including the importance of El Paso to Santa Teresa and adjacent area, a less strict boundaries for the immediate impact zone (specified as 10 miles from the border) and a focus on corridors. One of the Mexican officials mentioned the importance of this Plan. In addition, one representative from Ciudad Juarez stated that the growth is occurring in the west toward the area of the border crossing of Santa Teresa.

Later after the meeting, I met with one of the consultants, William R. Ferris, Jr., to discuss the implications of freight traffic in the study area. I asked will there be any freight modeling involved in the project. He said that there would not be specifically. I mentioned that NMDOT was doing freight modeling and about the possibility of this being incorporated into the Plan. I mentioned that one of the attending NMDOT representatives, Paul Sittig, attending was specifically involved with freight modeling in New Mexico. I also stated that the concern of the Mesilla Valley MPO would be the impact of freight traffic on I-10 and I-25 and possible additional development around interchanges in the urbanized area such as more motels, restaurants and service facilities catering to trucks. (This would mean that there would be addition congestion around some of the interchanges.)

Overall, this is an interesting planning process because of the involvement of Mexico. The Mexican officials did not discuss much about their contribution, since the discussion seem to be devoted primarily to concerns on the U.S. side. Some items such as the security of transport within Mexico was not mentioned by any party, although there have been cases of trucks hijacked in northern México by the drug cartels. Also, of importance is the condition of roads on the Mexican side leading to the border crossing. In essence, there should be more emphasis on the design of roads on both sides of the border to be designed to accommodate trucks. Also, there should be more emphasis on inter-modalism, particularly increasing the amount of freight being carried by rails in Mexico or the transfer to rail at the new Santa Teresa intermodal facilities of the Union Pacific.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 12, 2014 from 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M at the Gadsden School District Administrative Offices in Sunland Park New Mexico.
Figure 1: High Impact Zone/Focus Area of Border Master Plan
Figure 2: Border Master Plan Study Area