The following is the Amended Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held November 13, 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).
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Publish November 3, 2013
Following are the minutes from the MPO Policy Committee (PC) meeting held on Wednesday, October 9, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. at City Hall, Council Chambers, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)  
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)  
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)  
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)  
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)  
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)  
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)  
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)

MEMBERS ABSENT:  
Mayor Pro Tem Sharon Thomas (CLC)

STAFF PRESENT:  
Tom Murphy (Las Cruces MPO)  
Andrew Wray (Las Cruces MPO)  
Chowdhury Siddiqui (Las Cruces MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT:  
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
Harold Love (NMDOT)  
Hilary Brinegar (Marron & Associates)

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll call was taken to establish quorum.

Murphy:  Commissioner Benavidez
Benavidez:  Here
Murphy:  Councillor Sorg
Sorg:  Here
Murphy:  Commissioner Garrett
Garrett:  Here
Murphy:  Trustee Bernal
Bernal:  Here
Quorum was established.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST – No conflict of interest

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

4. CONSENT AGENDA*

Councillor Sorg motioned to approve.
Commissioner Garret seconded.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez
Benavidez: Yes

Murphy: Councillor Sorg
Sorg: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Bernal
Bernal: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Flores
Flores: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Barraza
Motion passes, vote 8 – 0 (2 members absent)

5. *APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Approved under consent agenda vote

5.1 *September 11, 2013

6. OLD BUSINESS

6.1 Statewide MPO Summit review - Postponed

Mayor Barraza motioned postpone until the next regular scheduled meeting when Mayor Pro Tem Thomas is present.

Councillor Sorg seconded the motion.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez
Benavidez: Yes

Murphy: Councillor Sorg
Sorg: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Bernal
Bernal: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Flores
Flores: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Barraza
Barraza: Yes

Murphy: Madame Chair
Pedroza: Yes

Motion passes, vote 8 – 0 (2 members absent)

7. ACTIONS ITEMS

7.1 Resolution inviting Legislators as Ex-Officio members

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.

Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

Sorg: Have we moved this one.

Pedroza: Oh, I don’t think we have.

Sorg: We did.

Pedroza: I don’t think we have.

Sorg: Okay, I’ll do that. I’ll make a motion to approve this Resolution.

Barraza: Second.

Pedroza: The motion was made by Councillor Sorg and was seconded by Mayor Barraza. Is there any further discussion?

Sorg: Yes, I just have a simple question on this. Assuming we pass this Resolution today my question is how will this be carried out? Can you give us an idea how you proceed with it or how we will proceed with it, the steps and actions and who does what?

Murphy: We’ve done that when we wrote the Resolution as staff was directed to take appropriate legal actions to implement this Resolution that would be you authorizing me to contact each of the legislatures by letter offering them a position and send it off.

Sorg: Okay, then the second question I have is I am assuming that all of the senators and representatives that are within our MPO district is the list that you would be mailing too.

Murphy: Yes and I believe there were 13 of them. I think it was six senators and seven representatives that some portion of their district lies within our planning boundaries.
Sorg: So this is just going to be an invitee thing? We aren’t going to go anything further than say have rotation, okay, never mind, that’s all I have Madame Chair.

Flores: My concern is just the logistics of it. Where are we going to put them if they come? I mean I see we’ve got a lot of extra seats in the City Hall; how many seats are there in the County and are we going to put them in front of us and say they are free to comment, how is that going to work just logistically.

Murphy: Madame Chair, Trustee Flores, I don’t know. I think that the County, we accommodate the TAC at the County and we’ve got 15 members on that Board. Sometimes we’ve had to take them down to the tables there. That’s probably the best alternative and then we’d have to probably go on the assumption, one of them I believe just has a portion of Dona Ana County and their majority is in Luna County. I don’t believe that they would be really interested in participating but the logistics is something that we will have to figure out. We have the facilities that we have and we’ll have to figure out a way to make it work.

Pedroza: Tom, do you have any idea of how many are dying to come and be ex-officio?

Murphy: Madame Chair, no I do not. Know they won’t be here for the January meetings.

Garrett: Madame Chair, I think this is great and I completely support this. I don’t think we’re going to be overwhelmed with people and I think part of the intent is to get on the radar screen so to speak, not necessarily that we expect them to always be here but that they are aware we exist and that may give us a foot in the door when it comes to further conversations. I did wonder about the possibility of articulating that there was another alternative in a certain sense and that is simply that we invite these members of the legislature to always attend our meetings and I thought that perhaps what we could is to put that in the Whereas, just add a Whereas, State of New Mexico legislators are always welcome to attend meetings of the MPO, but then however we would in the interest greater participation we want to extend an ex-officio position, so I’m just wondering if that mucks it up. If it’s too complicated or and part of the idea is for this to go in the invitation or in the communication with the legislators.

Pedroza: Are you making that in the form of a motion to amend?

Garrett: First of all testing the waters.

Pedroza: Any questions or comments on this?

Flores: I don’t have a problem with that language. I think that is a good idea.
Sorg: Rather than put it as an amendment into the Resolution could we ask that the language be put in the letter to each legislator that they are always welcome to attend.

Garrett: And so we wouldn’t have to change the Resolution, we would simply add as direction to include in invitation to attend, that’s fine with me too.

Flores: My one issue with that is we’re going to be continually doing this as legislators change and so that might be left out in the future and this way it’s insured that when they get this they always know and so that’s my comment.

Pedroza: Okay thank you, any other questions or comments, comments from the audience? Okay then are we ready to vote on Resolution 13-10 without amendment.

Barraza: Madame Chair, for clarification is Commissioner Garrett going to include that as an amendment?

Garrett: I think I will because I think that Trustee Flores has a very good point just in terms of continuity.

Pedroza: Okay so would you state your amendment again and we’ll see if there is a second.

Garrett: Madame Chair, I would like to move an amendment to the motion to insert in the Resolution a statement to the affect that “Whereas, the State of New Mexico legislators are always welcome to attend meetings of the MPO;” and that this would be inserted as the second “Whereas”.

Pedroza: Is that the entire “Whereas”?

Garrett: Let me rephrase if I could the “Whereas”. “Whereas, State of New Mexico legislatures are always to attend meetings of the MPO but the MPO would like to encourage greater participation by legislatures.”

Pedroza: Is there a second?

Benavidez: Second.

Pedroza: Okay thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay then would you poll the Committee please.

Murphy: On the amendment, Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes
Murphy: Councillor Sorg.
Sorg: Yes
Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes
Murphy: Trustee Bernal
Bernal: Yes
Murphy: Trustee Flores
Flores: Yes
Murphy: Mayor Barraza
Barraza: Yes
Murphy: Madame Chair
Pedroza: Yes
Amendment motion passes, vote 8 – 0 (2 members absent)
Pedroza: Okay the amendment has passed. Now do we need a motion for the whole Resolution?
Murphy: We do have a motion on the floor.
Pedroza: Oh we do, okay.
Murphy: If discussion is closed.
Pedroza: And discussion is closed, so then would you poll the Committee again.
Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez
Benavidez: Yes
Murphy: Councillor Sorg
Sorg: Yes
Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Bernal

Bernal: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Flores

Flores: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Barraza

Barraza: Yes

Murphy: And Madame Chair

Pedroza: Yes

Motion for Resolution as amended passes, vote 8 – 0 (2 members absent)

Pedroza: Okay motion passes as amended and do we need to do a separate suggestion to Tom that in the letter that he sends we explain that this will be an ex-officio position and that we would probably want language to the effect that we want to work more closely with our legislators and also language to the effect we understand that they are not going to make all of the meetings but maybe we would appreciate an R.S.V.P.

Murphy: Okay.

Pedroza: Anything else, alright thank you.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 2014 MPO Calendar

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 a.m. or 1 p.m.
Second Wednesday of the Month at 1 p.m.
Second Friday of the Month at 9 a.m. or 1 p.m.

After consulting with the staffs of the jurisdictions, MPO Staff determined that meeting on the Second Friday of the Month at 1 p.m. 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 p.m. or the Second Friday at 9 a.m.

Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

Pedroza: We have a copy of the calendar with the darkened possible dates, is there any discussion, any conflicts.

Barraza: Madame Chair, I know we currently meet on the second Wednesday of the months so if we just move the time from 5:00 to 1:00 that would be workable for me.

Pedroza: Thank you, do you have any, 1:00 on the second Wednesday is not one of your suggested times.

Murphy: Yes, it is.

Pedroza: I'm sorry, yes it is, any other suggestions or questions.

Flores: My memory is that Mr. Doolittle stated that he'd already cleared Wednesday so I think that would be agreeable to him and it’s agreeable to me as well.

Pedroza: Okay and do you remember whether 1:00 was good for him.

Flores: I don’t remember that part and I didn’t bring a copy of the minutes that were sent with the email so it’s just my memory.

Pedroza: Okay any other conflicts or questions?

Sorg: Would this be 1 p.m. every month?

Murphy: Yes.

Pedroza: Is there a problem with that? No, okay.

Garrett: Thank you Madame Chair, we do have one or two months that we don’t meet.
Murphy: That’s correct, we do not meet in March because we’ve always run into a conflict with either the National League of Cities the second week of the month, the National League of Counties the third week of the month. We also do not meet in July, I think that is kind of a natural breaking point and I think there was one other month we didn’t meeting but sometimes we do.

Garrett: So the point is that when we meet in a month it would be at 1:00. Okay and have you checked to make sure about the availability of both this chamber and the County chambers?

Murphy: Yes we have.

Garrett: Okay that’s very good, thank you.

Pedroza: Any other questions or conflicts?

Benavidez: I have one question, yes and this will begin the first of the year or when will this start?

Murphy: This would start January.

Benavidez: Okay thank you.

Pedroza: I’m sorry Tom; I thought you said that we would do this for the next meeting.

Murphy: We would have a resolution for the next meeting.

Pedroza: Any other questions, conflicts or discussion? Members of the public, I think we only have one member of the public, okay, no, alright then are we ready to vote?

Murphy: We did not have this as an action item.

Garrett: Madame Chair, although this is not an action item I think that the idea was to get the concurrence of the Board in the sense that in fact the second Wednesday of the months when we meet at 1:00 would be what we would propose to vote on at the next meeting.

Pedroza: Okay, may I see some nodding heads, okay and we do have nodding heads so if you would go ahead and bring it to us at the next meeting.

8.2 Transport 2040 update

Murphy: Just for the record we have Mr. Doolittle and Commissioner Hancock have arrived at the meeting.
Staff is ready to start on the public involvement aspect of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan update. We adopted TRANSPORT 2040 in June of 2010 so by July 1, 2015 we are required to have an updated transportation plan. What I’ve got here to show you this evening is the slides that we intend to show out when we go to public, get you’re okay on them for us to bring this out. I’m just going to run through the slides rather quickly because I think most of you have seen this information before, I just want to show you what we were doing.

Tom gave a brief presentation.

Pedroza: I have a couple and you may have already answered this Tom, but this is not the first time that we’re doing these public meetings right?

Murphy: We did this method of public meetings for TRANSPORT 2040 so we did. The next slide will actually go into that.

Garrett: Tom you’ve attended some of the meetings of the empowerment congress group that’s been working on transportation and what’s your sense of the connectivity between what is being discussed there and this kind of planning effort?

Murphy: I think they are very connected. In fact after I think it was the 28th that they had their last meeting where they had invited, I think you probably go to all of them, but they invited me and El Paso MPO, view them as an important stakeholder group and in fact I spoke with some of the staff there about us coming back and having them be part of this process which I hate to keep repeating myself but the next slide actually goes into that.

Garrett: I’m asking that and what I’m interested in are sort of the edges if you will the sideboards for this effort. One thing that the Empowerment Congress has not taken up is the issue of rural roads and in particular unpaved county roads and the even larger number of private unpaved roads which for everyone who lives in those areas is increasing becoming an issue. I want to say it’s always probably been an issue but it tends to be something that is being raised more and more as a community issue, as a public issue, and one of the things that I think we haven’t done a good job is actually talking about what the system is and so when we talk about transportation how do we begin to shape policy that has to do with what the public should be engaged in taking care of and to what degree and those that are more in the public realm or the private realm rather and I think we need to be able to start having that as a conversation understanding that there are these kind of fuzzy gray areas where you are going to have school buses and they need to still pickup kids and you need to be out and have emergency vehicles get in but I don’t know that we actually articulated policies and it seems to me that when we start looking at transportation systems in the biggest sense it would help to at least include some consideration of that to say this what we’re talking about when we’re...
talking about public but we want you to understand this is, we’re not just cutting
it off we understand that these are still issues, these are still feeders in a way
that come into the other roads and highways.

Murphy: Madame Chair, Commissioner Garrett, we started down that road. We’ve
gotten those numbers crunched. I can’t remember off the top of my head, the
County essentially I think about 47% of your roadway mileage is unpaved.

Garrett: It’s more than that if I remember correctly.

Murphy: It might be the other, the flip side and I was leaning towards putting that on the
VMT Transportation Finance……because it becomes one, how do you pay for
getting certain roadways paved and then on-going how do you pay to maintain
them over their life and that’s all going to be part of the discussion. We have
Bohannon-Huston working on the Asset Management Plan for us and those are
the types of things that are under consideration and we need to put this
information out to these groups so that they can help us decide what are
priorities area and help us come to decisions on how we do our system but you
are absolutely correct these are important.

Garrett: My real point here is to encourage a view of transportation planning that goes
all the way down to the private roads as a part of the system not that we’re
going to be going in and doing anything there but except maybe help facilitate
different kinds of things that can be done, but we need to acknowledge that and
I think the only other thing and I’m hoping this isn’t on the next slide is that we
do have this on-going problem at least in some context in terms of
understanding the need for development of infrastructure at the border in terms
of support for economic activity in that area and because part of that is in the El
Paso MPO I just want to make sure that we’re not dropping things off between
the cracks. As far as I know the interim committee on transportation in terms of
the listing of 50 top projects did not have anything in Southern New Mexico and
I was very concerned about that so just those places that we seem to find gaps;
otherwise I’m intrigued with this and I’m glad that we’re moving into it, thank
you.

Sorg: I just want to agree with Commissioner Garrett that this is a real problem in our
whole area. It isn’t just in the County either, it’s in the City and you end up with
these roads and streets that are checkerboard as far as ownership goes and so
you have part private, part public and it really is a mess and so we need to
have some of that part of the conversation too.

Pedroza: Any other questions or comments? I’m wondering if I may be also jumping the
gun and you’re going to be addressing this later on but I think in terms of
education of the public – they are going I believe going to be coming to the
meetings with a number of – I think in Spanish they are called Nuevo’s – clouds
where there is no information and it needs to be filled in. For instance, people
should know who – what agencies are already discussing or have as their goal improving the transportation such as the El Paso MPO and us and then the SCRTD so I think that would be very valuable information to give people so that they begin to get the whole picture of what is happening and then they can say what needs to happen this and the other and I would also echo what Commissioner Garrett said that there should be some coordination, I think that’s what he said, coordination with for instance El Paso MPO and the first one that you began to ask about (Commissioner Garrett responded but could not hear what he said because microphone wasn’t on), yes, the empowerment conference, so I think it would make the meetings that much more valuable if you give you a full picture so that then people can say oh wow, I should get more involved, etc. Okay, I’m sorry for the interruptions, are there any other questions or comments.

Flores: Yeah I’m not sure that this is a suggestion but one thing that I liked about Viva Dona Ana is that people went out to the communities to grocery stores and I was wondering if maybe it might not be helpful, maybe a setup at the mall, to setup at post offices during lunch hour when people will actually come, they might not have enough time to actually look but that might be a good time to grab people’s attention and say if you’re interested this is where you can go to get information and participate.

Garrett: The reference was to the outreach that was done with Viva Dona Ana and it might be interesting to sort of talk to the consultants and the staff who have been involved with that because if we can build on and get certain kinds of things established as a way that we engage with the public we might be able to get greater participation and more informed participation which is part of the objectives.

Pedroza: Okay, you don’t have any problem with that? You would be okay, good. I just remembered my question and it is a little bit, not well thought out, would one of the stakeholders possibly be some of the water authorities in the area? Do you think they would have anything to add to transportation? I’m thinking of like the EBID or maybe the utilities. I’m just wondering whether water is not going to be an important factor in how and where things are built.

Murphy: Water is certainly an important factor when you are doing planning in New Mexico. We do have a position on our Technical Advisory Committee that EBID is on. Although I don’t recall presenting in front of the water board last go round, the invitation was extended to come ask us and we will come.

Pedroza: Okay thank you, are there any other questions or comments.

8.3 NMDOT updates

Trent Doolittle (NMDOT) gave updates.
• Avenida de Mesilla project – they closed the eastbound on- and off-ramps to allow for the removal and replacement of those ramps. Detours are in place. Public notice has been provided to get off either at University or Motel Blvd. They are a month ahead of schedule. Work will continue on the east side for several more months before they switch over and do the exact same thing on the west bound lanes.

• Paving preservation project – mill and inlay from the river west to Fairacres on Picacho. Currently preliminary work is being done (surveying) – the contractor is Morrow Enterprises – scheduled for 120 weather working days which comes out about six months of work. Notice to proceed was issued October 3; contractor is scheduled to start on October 16.

Barraza: I just want to say and commend the DOT for the notifications and keeping us to date abreast of what is going on. You guys have done a phenomenal job out there and I just can’t believe how fast that project is moving, every time I pass by there it is another big leap and I anticipate that to be finished way ahead of schedule. I do know there was an issue there with some of the hotels with people who were staying there overnight complaining the first night, I guess, that you had closed for the evening but I think that has been rectified so thank you all so very much.

Doolittle: Yeah, the only two real complaints that we had were the two nights. The first night where we demoed the bridge – a lot of jack hammering on the concrete deck and the second night where we ultimately dropped the steel beams onto Avenida de Mesilla – caused a little bit of noise as we removed those dropped as in figuratively we didn’t really drop the bridge but those were the only two nights I’ve heard any complaints but again I share with you if you have any suggestions or start hearing those we’ll do what we can to alleviate those as quickly as we can.

Sorg: I was asked this at one time and I was wondering what is DOT’s policy on night work versus day work – working hours?

Doolittle: At this point we don’t really have a policy. I do know that specifically the I-25 corridor and also the US 70 corridor we are proposing a lot of that work to take place at night just because of the heavy traffic. I-10 itself we don’t see a whole lot. We see a lot of steady traffic. We don’t see a lot of rush hour traffic so ultimately we’re not doing a lot of that work on I-10 at night. The big one on I-10 is closing Avenida de Mesilla impacting local traffic, that’s why we choose, actually we mandated that they drop those bridges at night rather than during the day but the only two corridors that we’ve talked at all about night work is I-25 and US 70.

Barraza: Madame Chair, one other comment to DOT is we are planning a meeting with our business owners later this month and one of the discussions we had amongst department heads was to invite NMDOT just to give a small presentation and an update as to what is going on with the project especially
now with the holidays coming across and that’s the busiest season, so if we could just share that information with our business owners. Someone from our office will be contacting DOT to let you know if that date is okay with you all.

Jolene Herrera gave updates on upcoming projects.

- North Main project from the intersection of Picacho and Main Street all the way to the intersection of Main Street and Solano – it is scheduled to let in December – construction should start in the spring. There will be a lot of utility work done by the City as part of this project and there will be plenty of public meetings to let everybody know what is going on.
- In 2014 we have the Missouri Avenue bridge reconstruction project that is coming up. That one probably won’t begin construction until next fall. It is scheduled for a November 2014 let date so late winter, early spring construction.
- Concrete wall barrier on US 70 from the interchange of I-25 all the way to where the cable barrier begins. It is scheduled to let in November so construction should start probably in January. Jolene is not sure about working hours because it is still being designed.

Garrett: I’d like an update on the Vado and Mesquite interchanges and when are we going to do a public meeting?

Herrera: That project is scheduled to let in November so we should see construction probably starting January/February. We won’t have public meetings until after it has been let and after a contractor has been chosen but we definitely know that you want to be the first to be informed of any activities on-going.

Garrett: If I could the reason that I’m concerned with this is that I’m not sure that the truck stops understand what is going to happen, you’ve got the only cotton gin in Dona Ana County that is off of there, you’ve got a lot of agricultural stuff that comes in and off those interchanges in addition to just the regular traffic and so what I’m particularly interested is getting any information that you all need to have in terms of potential interruptions to the contractor and so on and so forth so it’s up to you to figure out whether that’s better to have the information before you let the contract or afterwards, of course you’re going to have regular meetings afterwards I know that, but I don’t think anybody really understands what is going to be happening there and I’m worried about that so in addition to being worried I guess I’d like to do something about it and that’s where the idea of having a meeting to explain to people what is coming.

Pedroza: Will the gas stations be affected by ……

Herrera: Honestly I don’t know.

Doolittle: Madame Chair, if I may address both of those comments. I haven’t seen the actually final drawings. I did speak with a PDE about scheduling some sort of
public meeting to share that before the project actually goes to bid. I still plan on doing that. We’ve been caught up dealing with some additional design projects for money that fell from the sky over the past month so ultimately and Vado and Mesquite being one of those, but ultimately I agree with 100%, I think it’s worth a public meeting prior to just to share in general what the scope of the project is going to be. There won’t be a lot specifics tied to that one because we won’t have schedules or those types of things but I agree with you 100% and I did talk to the PDE and we still plan on doing that. It just probably won’t take place till the end of the month.

Pedroza: Sir, can you just enlighten us, what is a PDE?

Doolittle: I’m sorry, project development engineer, our designer.

Pedroza: And as Commissioner Garrett was also saying I don’t know the timing of the movement of the trucks from the cotton gins but those are big trucks and it may very well be fall, I don’t remember, so that might be another very stakeholder (inaudible).

Doolittle: If memory serves me correctly, all of the new construction will take place outside of the alignment of the current (inaudible – interrupted).

Pedroza: Oh, okay.

Doolittle: There will be some interference but I don’t expect there will be any closures. The interchange will be open at all times.

Garrett: That would be a great relief to everybody.

Doolittle: And I’ll clarify that with the designer. If I may Madame Chair, I did fail to mention one project. We do still have the cable barrier project on US 70. Last month’s meeting I shared with you all that we were working on negotiating to install a second run; we are still in very intense negotiations with the contractor on the price. Some correspondence went out this week and we’re hoping to have them start it within the next couple of weeks doing some initial survey but at this point we have not come to a negotiated price on that additional cable but it is still the expectation of the department to install that as part of this project not as a separate project.

Benavidez: At the last meeting I think I asked Mr. Doolittle or Jolene regarding the cul de sac in Chaparral especially the people who ride bicycles, I think there was a section of the cul de sac where they would come actually onto the road, is there like a bike path around the cul de sac, there was something that needed to some finishing on the construction of the cul de sac.
Doolittle: Madame Chair, when you talked about cul de sac you are talking about the roundabout.

Benavidez: I mean I’m sorry, not the cul de sac, the roundabout.

Doolittle: I don’t remember discussing the specific roundabout, I do remember seeing the email from the NM 404 – there were concerns on the shoulder, some of the failures of the pavement on the shoulder. We still have plans to address those. We’ve been dealing with a lot of the flooding issues and now that temperatures are starting to cool off I’ll have to check on, I would assume that the roundabout would be accessible to bicycles, I’ll have to check and give you a more specific answer on that one.

Benavidez: Okay, thank you.

Herrera: Commissioner, if I might ask, I believe at the last meeting you were going to send some information to Trent and to myself so that we could look into it more.

Benavidez: Right, I believe I sent you the email.

Herrera: Did you? Okay so Trent got that. Okay thank you.

Doolittle: That email, Jolene, specifically dealt with the initial drop off on the shoulders, partial paving the shoulders that we did several years ago and then ultimately tried to correct that with millings and then did some spot chip sealing on those and we’re having some failures in some of those locations at least that was the email that I was forwarded. The one that we’ll need to follow up on is bike access on the roundabout itself.

8.4 Advisory Committee updates

Murphy: Madame Chair, members of the Committee, we have one advisory committee update. Just special notice that the BPAC next week after their regular meeting they will be engaged in work session with the Park Ridge Development people to look at the bicycle and pedestrian access through the proposed development, just thought that everyone on this Committee would want to be aware of that.

Pedroza: Thank you and where is Park Ridge.

Murphy: Park Ridge is the old Las Cruces Country Club property.

9. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS

Murphy: We sent out an email yesterday announcing the New Mexico State Rail Plan and that meetings would be further notice, we’ve worked with them on that.
They will be presenting here at your regular meeting on December 11 and then they will be having a general public meeting on December 12 at the Railroad Museum in Mesilla and Las Cruces. I’m not sure if that starts at 5:00 or 6:00 yet but we got that worked out this afternoon.

Pedroza: Good, so we should be thinking about going to either one or both of those. Well, one is our regular meeting.

Murphy: I know everyone will be here for the December 11 but then there will also be a more open house style meeting on the rail plan at the museum the following evening.

Sorg: I’m just kind of curious, the actual plan is a draft and I read some place in it that we’re allowed to make comments on it. Are we expected to make these comments before the 11th or before December or what? Are we to make comments at all?

Murphy: We are to make comments. I’m trying to remember what their deadline dates for comments were.

Sorg: Okay, do we send these comments to you and you will forward them or what?

Murphy: You can or you can send them directly to the transit rail division. Staff is already beginning to review the document. We’ll have some staff level comments for it but you are certainly welcome to forward them through me or submit directly yourselves.

Sorg: If there is a section of it that we’d like to get into a little more deeper because it affects us here locally could we have some discussion at our Policy meeting sometime in the near future. Give a short presentation on any one particular area that I think, for example, commuter rail. Their part in this commuter rail from here to El Paso, I read where they discussed from El Paso to Denver which and rightly so they don’t give it much credits because of the population we have but it’s in there, it’s good but as far as (inaudible) I haven’t gotten that far into it and maybe we can discuss that at a meeting, Madame Chair, I don’t know.

Pedroza: It sounds like a good idea to me. What do the others think about that?

Sorg: Or other sections of it that are appropriate for our MPO.

Murphy: We can come up with a list that I can submit that asks them that they make sure that they cover it when they here on December 11.

Sorg: Okay, that sounds good too.
Garrett: As a follow up on that, does this include freight?

Murphy: Yes.

Garrett: And so that would also include the freight going south and north from the border?

Murphy: I believe so, I’ve only, like I said it was only released to me yesterday and I’ve only read a few pages.

Garrett: And it might be worthwhile just in terms sort of connecting the dots to talk with the folks that are working with the Viva Dona Ana about the projections for increased rail traffic. I remember that the truck traffic is anticipated to go from 80,000 trips a year to 150,000 trips within a couple of years and there is supposed to be a corresponding increase in terms of freight rail. I just think we need to get our hands around the scale of the stuff because it is going to have implications all the way up the system.

Murphy: Yeah, I’m still reading through it but they did have some discussion about the volumes of rail, rail freight. The part that I got to talked about the maximum load on the highways are increased that could divert some of the rail customers to truck traffic so they are balancing the overall decrease with the potential that they may some of their market but again I haven’t finished reading the entire document.

Garrett: If I could, have you sent this over to the Viva Dona Ana staff? I’m going to suggest that if you haven’t that you make sure that they have this and in particular that the consultants that are working on things like the Border Economic Study have this because….

Murphy: I believe that Javier had resent it already but I know that members, some of them are on our master mailing list and that is who got distributed this but we didn’t specifically send it to them but we may want to highlight it.

Pedroza: I would suggest possibly making it an item on the agenda on Viva Dona Ana. Just to make sure everybody is aware Tom and I did send out a letter as requested to the funding of the Safe Routes to School in two separate employees so I believe that everybody received a draft and then that was possible tweaked or not anymore and mailed out. Have we heard anything back?

Murphy: We have not heard anything back. Ms. Kozub is on training and I think she just got back from her training Monday so maybe she is working through her stuff.
10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Brinegar: Thank you Madame Chair, members of the Committee, good evening, I just had a brief announcement about a project that Jolene mentioned, the Missouri bridge replacement project and this will be in the papers tomorrow and I’m going to be doing some distribution …..

Pedroza: Can you tell us your name please.

Brinegar: Excuse me, for the record my name is Hillary Brinegar. I work for an environmental consulting firm called Marron and Associates here in Las Cruces and I’m a sub-consultant to the Missouri bridge project and one of my roles on the project is the public involvement and so we just planned our first public meeting for the project and like I said it will be distributed by email, newspaper and physical mailing starting this week. It’s October 24, that’s a Thursday evening 6:30 p.m. at the Solano DOT offices.

Pedroza: Would you please be sure to send a copy of that to Councillor Greg Smith and to myself because our two districts meet right there.

Brinegar: That’s right, you’re on my list and Tom will also have a copy of that flyer.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Commissioner Hancock motioned to adjourn. Mayor Barraza seconded the motion.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
2014 MPO Meeting Schedule

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of 2014 MPO Meeting Schedule

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2014 MPO Schedule of Meetings

DISCUSSION:
This is a request to recommend adoption of the 2014 MPO Meeting Schedule
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 13-11

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2014 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 2014 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 2014 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 13th day of November, 2013.
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 Pedroza  
Vice Chair Garrett  
Councilor Sorg  
Councilor Thomas  
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez  
Commissioner Hancock  
Mayor Barraza  
Trustee Bernal  
Trustee Flores  
Mr. Doolittle

ATTEST:  

__________________________  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________  
City Attorney
2014 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>8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>21\textsuperscript{st} (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>18\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{th} (If necessary for TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>14\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} (TIP)</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>11\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{th} (If necessary for TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>13\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td>19\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>21\textsuperscript{st} (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} (TIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>14\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Committee Meetings for January – June 2014 and January 2015**
Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

**Policy Committee Meetings for August – December 2014**
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 2014**
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 2014**
Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meetings 2014**
Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard
Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 A Resolution Adopting the 2013 List of Obligated Projects

ACTION REQUESTED:
Adopt 2013 List of Obligated Projects

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2013 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 2013 fiscal year.
A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2013 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 2013 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 13th day of November, 2013.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: 
Second By: 

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

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
Recording Secretary

__________________________
City Attorney
## 2013 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><strong>Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPO region Planning</td>
<td>$150,682</td>
<td>$25,679</td>
<td>$176,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPO region 5303 Funds</td>
<td>$15,298</td>
<td>$3,825</td>
<td>$19,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPO region Traffic Count Program</td>
<td>$28,833</td>
<td>$4,913</td>
<td>$33,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPO region SRTS Coordinator</td>
<td>$49,363</td>
<td>$49,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL MPO LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$244,176</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34,417</td>
<td>$229,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Mexico Department of Transportation Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87  G18A4  I-10  Mesquite &amp; Vado Interchanges  Bdg Repl &amp; Ramp Rehab/Recon</td>
<td>$8,794,492</td>
<td>$1,512,694</td>
<td>$10,307,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8  1100470  US 70  Main to Solano  Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td>$5,054,722</td>
<td>$1,166,963</td>
<td>$7,143,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69  LC00070  US 70  Rio Grande bridge to Morton Ln.  Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$1,339,120</td>
<td>$334,780</td>
<td>$1,673,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72  1100740  Lujan Hill Rd.  RR Crossing #019679L  Install Concrete &amp; Lights</td>
<td>$55,646</td>
<td>$4,421</td>
<td>$60,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71  LC00080  US 70  NASA Rd to Aguirre Spgs Rd  Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$3,072,747</td>
<td>$523,633</td>
<td>$3,596,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL NMDOT LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$18,316,727</td>
<td>$3,542,491</td>
<td>$1,143,942</td>
<td>$23,003,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Doña Ana County Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75  LC00110  DAC  El Camino Real Intersection  Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$39,604</td>
<td>$3,146</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DAC LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$39,604</td>
<td>$3,146</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Las Cruces Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76  W100080  CLC  Public Schools in Las Cruces  SRTS Infrastructure</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL CLC LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RoadRUNNER Transit Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18  TL00010  CLC  Operating Assistance</td>
<td>$1,249,095</td>
<td>$1,249,095</td>
<td>$2,498,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21  TL00013  CLC  Support Equipment/Facilities</td>
<td>$48,010</td>
<td>$12,003</td>
<td>$60,013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSIT LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$1,297,105</td>
<td>$1,261,098</td>
<td>$2,558,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Las Cruces Public Schools Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No federally-funded projects obligated in FY 2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LCPS LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Town of Mesilla Lead Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No federally-funded projects obligated in FY 2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL TOM LEAD PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$20,397,612</td>
<td>$3,545,637</td>
<td>$2,439,457</td>
<td>$26,333,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 13, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
6.3 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
FFY 2012 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Reports
Email from Mike Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL00012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>RoadRUNNER Transit</td>
<td>RideShare Program</td>
<td>Deleted from the TIP to reflect the ending of this project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
RESOLUTION NO. 13-13

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

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

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

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

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

(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.
(II)

THAT the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit “B”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved.

(III)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 13th day of November, 2013.

APPROVED:

____________________________________
Chair

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair Pedroza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Sorg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Barraza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Bernal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Doolittle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_________________________________________
Recording Secretary

_________________________________________
City Attorney
Resolution 13-13 Attachment “B”

MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

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


(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

(3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);


(5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities;

and

(6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR  Date

______________________________  __________________________

NMDOT  Date

______________________________  __________________________
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

| CN: TL00012 | Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 19 | NMDOT Dist.: 1 | County: Dona Ana | Municipality: City of Las Cruces |
| Fed ID: TL00012 | Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces | |
| RT: Proj | Rideshare | Est. Letting: |
| Fr: | To: | |
| Category: Transit | |
| Project Desc.: Rideshare Program | |
| Remarks: PROGRAM DELETED | |

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ-Mand</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- 2017: □
- 2018: □

TIP Amendment Pending? □

Friday, October 11, 2013
Andrew -

The City of Las Cruces is has not run a Rideshare program since fiscal year 2011 and has no plans to operate one in the future.  
TIP project TL00012 relating to the Rideshare project needs to be removed from the TIP.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Mike Bartholomew, CCTM  
RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator  
City of Las Cruces, NM

Phone: (575) 541-2500  
Fax:  (575) 541-2545  
TTY:  (575) 541-2541

*It is the mission of RoadRUNNER Transit to provide safe, dependable and convenient transportation services to the citizens of Las Cruces.*
AGENDA ITEM:
6.4 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
FFY 2014 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Reports
- Initial Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Urban and Regional Planner
- Update Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Urban and Regional Planner
- Spreadsheet from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Urban and Regional Planner detailing TIP amendment requests

DISCUSSION:
On May 8, 2013, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W100032</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Coordinator</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td>Deleted from the TIP to reflect the ending of this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100830</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Ramp E of University Ave Bridge &amp; Union Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation &amp; Addition of CCTV</td>
<td>Scope amended to include CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100620</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10 – Las Cruces to TX State Line</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation Project</td>
<td>Moved from FY 2015 to FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00100</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Missouri Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Reconstruction/Widening</td>
<td>$800K added for preliminary engineering,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Dona Ana County</td>
<td>El Camino Real and Dona Ana School Rd</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4M added for construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>Intersection of Spitz/Solano/Main</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added $1M per engineer’s estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>MVMPO</td>
<td>MPO Planning Funds-PL</td>
<td>Funding Amount Adjusted Slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10/MP 133-143.2</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2017</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)/Ave de Mesilla to Picacho, including intersections</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Project, $800K in FY 2014 for preliminary engineering, Construction in FY2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces Safe Routes to School TAP Project</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Las Cruces Public Schools</td>
<td>Las Cruces Public Schools Safe Routes to School TAP Project</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>Las Cruces Dam Trail</td>
<td>Improvements to the Las Cruces Dam Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>La Llorona Trail</td>
<td>Improvements to the La Llorona Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>South Central Regional Transit District</td>
<td>Bus stop improvement project</td>
<td>Bus Signs, Shelters, and Benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>MVMPO</td>
<td>Transportation Alternative Program Placeholder Project</td>
<td>Financial placeholder project for TAP Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
RESOLUTION NO. 13-14

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2014-2019 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

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

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

WHEREAS, the 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 adopted the FY 2014-2019 TIP on April 10, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2014-2019 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program 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’s Fiscal Year 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.
(II)

THAT the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit “B”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved.

(III)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 13th day of November, 2013.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

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

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________  ____________________________
Recording Secretary  City Attorney
Resolution 13-14 Attachment “B”

MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

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


(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

(3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);


(5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and

(6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR                                      Date
________________________________________________________________________________

NMDOT                            Date
________________________________________________________________________________
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  |  **Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization**  |  **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
---|---|---
**CN:** W100032  |  **Fed ID:** W100032  |  **NMDOT Dist.:** 1  
**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces MPO  |  **Length:** 0 Miles  
**County:** Dona Ana  |  **Municipality:** N/A not applicable

**RT:** Proj Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator  |  **Proj Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator**

**Category:** Miscellaneous

**Project Desc.:** SRTS Coordinator position at Las Cruces MPO

**Project Phases:** □ Environ. Document  □ Prel. Engr.  □ Design  □ Right-of-way  □ Construction  ■ Other

**Work Zone:** Routine

**Remarks:** (2-13-13) Add'l funding for FY 2013, 14 (10-08-13) All funding removed at DOT request to reflect the ending of this program

---

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Rts to Sch-Flex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $64,281  
**Est. Letting:**

TIP Amendment Pending? ■

---

Thursday, October 10, 2013
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  |  **Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization**  |  **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

| CN: 1100830 | Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 26 | NMDOT Dist.: 1 | County: Doña Ana | Municipality: City of Las Cruces |
| Fed ID: 1100830 |  | Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1 |  |  |
| RT: I00010 | Proj: Interstate 10 Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation & Addition of CCTV | Fr: MP 141 | To: MP 143 | Est. Letting: |
|  | Category: Highway & Bridge Preservation (4Rs) |  |  | TIP Amendment Pending? □ |
| Project Desc.: Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation Project on I-10 Bridges: University Ave. 7264, 7265 (Ramp E, MP 141.82) & Union Ave 7266, 7267 (MP 142.11) |  |  |  |
| Remarks: CN Change from 3961; change in funding sources; additional funds: $605,016 (9-12-12) New TIP Funding Sources; Moved from 2013 to 2014; (1-12-13) Admin Mod - Termini milepost change; added CCTV scope (10-31-13) |  |  |  |

| PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category | TIP Informational Years |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **FUND SOURCE** | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 4 Yr. TOTALS | 2018 | 2019 |
| State Match | | $1,107,290 | | | $1,107,290 | | |
| Local Match | | $0 | | | $0 | | |
| NHPP MAP-21 | $3,507,326 | | 11 | | $3,507,326 | | |
| STP-S | $2,990,400 | | 11 | | $2,990,400 | | |
| Totals | $7,605,016 | | | | $7,605,016 | | |

Thursday, October 31, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Desc.:</th>
<th>Mill and Inlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,310,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,310,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$2,009,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,009,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td>$11,107,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,107,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$13,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

| CN: LC00110 | Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 75 | NMDOT Dist.: 1 | County: Dona Ana | Municipality: N/A not applicable |
| Fed ID: LC00110 | Lead Agency: Dona Ana County | Length: 0 Miles |

**RT:** Proj Intersection Realignment  
**Fr:** El Camino Real Rd at Dona Ana School Rd  
**To:**

**Category:**

**Project Desc.:** Design and Construction for Intersection Realignment: El Camino Real Rd at Dona Ana School Rd

**Project Phases:**  
- □ Environ. Document  
- □ Prel. Engr.  
- ■ Design  
- □ Right-of-way  
- ■ Construction  
- □ Other

**Remarks:** Added to the TIP; New TIP Funding Sources; Admin Adjust: 10-25-12; Admin Adjust 08-21-13; has $42,750 obligated in FFY 2013

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$34,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (HSIP)</td>
<td>$439,591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$439,591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$474,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$474,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- **2018**
- **2019**

**Work Zone:**

- □ Safety (HSIP)

**TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐

---

Thursday, October 31, 2013
Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 81
CN: LC00120
Fed ID: LC00120
Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1
NMDOT Dist.: 1
County: Dona Ana
Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Length: 0 Miles
Est. Proj. Cost: $5,200,000
Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending?

Project Desc.: Redesigning the intersection of US 70 (Main Street), Spitz, Solano, and Three Crosses


Remarks: PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$902,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>$902,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,297,280</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>$5,297,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years:

□ TIP Amendment Pending?

Thursday, October 31, 2013
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area** | **Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization** | **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

**CN:** Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 82  |  **NMDOT Dist.:** 3  |  **County:** Dona Ana  |  **Municipality:** Various Multiple Jurisd.

**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces MPO  |  **Length:** 0 Miles

**RT:** MPO PL Funds  |  **Est. Proj. Cost:** $0

**Fr:** Las Cruces MPO  |  **Est. Letting:**

**To:** Las Cruces MPO  |  **TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐

**Category:**

**Project Desc.:** Ongoing MPO Planning funds

**Remarks:** Ongoing distribution of Planning Funds

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$148,249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$869,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$1,018,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 84</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj MPO TAP Funds</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

**Project Phases:**

- ☐ Environ. Document
- ☐ Prel. Engr.
- ☐ Design
- ☐ Right-of-way
- ☐ Construction
- ☐ Other

**Remarks:** Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

**Category:**

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, October 10, 2013

48
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**

**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 90</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 3</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj City of Las Cruces SRTS Position</td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.:</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program funding for a City of Las Cruces Safe Routes to School Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces Part Time Safe Routes to School Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$5,777</td>
<td>$5,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$33,898</td>
<td>$33,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tuesday, October 08, 2013*
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 91</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 3</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj Las Cruces Public Schools SRTS Position, TAP Funded</td>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.:</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program funding for a Las Cruces Public Schools Safe Routes to School Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces Part Time Safe Routes to School Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$5,112</td>
<td>$5,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wednesday, October 09, 2013
Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 92  |  NMDOT Dist.: 3  |  County: Dona Ana  |  Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:  |  Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces  |  Length: 0 Miles
RT: Proj Las Cruces Dam Trail  |  Est. Proj. Cost: $0  |  Est. Letting:
Fr:  |  TIP Amendment Pending? □
To:  |  Project Desc.: Transportation Alternative Program funding for improvements to the Las Cruces Dam Trail

| Remarks: | |

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIP Informational Years

- 2018
- 2019

Wednesday, October 09, 2013
Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 93  
NMDOT Dist.: 3  
County: Dona Ana  
Municipality: City of Las Cruces  
Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces  
Length: 0 Miles  
Est. Proj. Cost: $0  
Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? □

Project Desc.: Transportation Alternative Program funding for improvements to the Las Cruces La Llorona Trail

Remarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$56,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$332,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$388,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 94

NMDOT Dist.: 3  County: Dona Ana  Municipality Various Multiple Jurisd.

Lead Agency: South Central Transit Dist.  Length: 0 Miles

RT: Proj SCRTD Bus Signs, Shelters, and Benches
Fr: To:

Category:

Project Desc.: Transportation Alternative Program funds for the construction of bus signs, shelters, and benches

Project Phases:  
- □ Environ. Documen  
- □ Prel. Engr  
- □ Design  
- □ Right-of-way  
- □ Construction  
- ■ Other  

Work Zone:  

Remarks:  

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$4,260</td>
<td>$4,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

| CN: LC00150 | Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 95 | NMDOT Dist.: 1 | County: Dona Ana | Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd. |
| Fed ID: LC00150 | Lead Agency: NMDOT | Length: 10.2 Miles |
| RT: Proj I-10 Pavement Preservation | Fr: 133 | To: 143.2 |
| Category: Hwy & Brg Pres |
| Project Desc.: Pavement Preservation project on Interstate 10 |
| Est. Proj. Cost: $5,000,000 |
| Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? |

**Programmed Funds** - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Sm Urb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,563,200</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$2,563,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

- 2018
- 2019

- Work Zone:

Thursday, October 10, 2013
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization**  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00160</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 96</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LC00160</td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT</td>
<td>Length: 1.5 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RT:** Proj NM 188 (Valley Drive) Roadway Reconstruction  
Fr: Ave de Mesilla  
To: Picacho  

**Category:** Hwy & Brg Pres  

**Project Desc.:** Valley Drive Reconstruction from Ave de Mesilla north to Picacho including the intersections

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $7,800,000  
**Est. Letting:**

**Remarks:**

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$116,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,601,600</td>
<td>$1,718,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,408,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Sm Urb</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Andrew,

Please see the attached spreadsheet with the TIP Amendments that need to be made. Can you please put this on the BPAC, TAC, and PC agendas as an action item for October?

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7358
C: (575) 202-4698

Hi Jolene,

I just wanted to see if you had any feedback yet on the TIP bundle I sent last week.

Thanks.

Andrew Wray
Transportation Planner
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 20000
Las Cruces, NM 88004
(575) 528-3070
(575) 528-3155 (fax)
Hi Andrew,

Please see the attached excel spreadsheet that contains all the updates to the TIP Amendment I submitted for BPAC approval. Since BPAC met, D1 increased the scope and funding of a majority of the TIP projects in the MVMPO. Can you please include this email, the attached spreadsheet, and the updated TIP pages in the TAC and PC packets? Also, please add an action item to the agenda asking for approval of the TIP Amendments.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and I will be at both meetings to answer any questions the committees may have regarding the changes.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7358
C: (575) 202-4698
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Funds listed on TIP</th>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W100032</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Coordinator</td>
<td>$64,281</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Project deleted in new STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramp E of University Ave</td>
<td>Bridge &amp; Union Ave Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation &amp;</td>
<td>Addition of CCTV</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>Scope amended to include CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100830</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>Las Cruces to TX state line</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Moved from FY2015 to FY2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction/Widening &amp; Addition of Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$13,800,000</td>
<td>$4M added to construction, $800K for Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00100</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Missouri Bridge</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$517,265</td>
<td>$42,750 in FY2013 for Design, Added $275,015 for ROW &amp; Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td>Added $1M per Engineer's Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd</td>
<td>at Dona Ana School Rd</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>Funding Amount per year slightly changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>Intersection of Spitz/Solano/Main</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>No Change, CLC project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P114030</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MPO Planning Funds-PL</td>
<td>$250,486/year</td>
<td>$254,543/year</td>
<td>New HSIP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00130</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>El Paseo Rd</td>
<td>University to Main St</td>
<td>Safety Project</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>New project, $800K in FY2014 for Preliminary Engineering, Construction in FY2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100930</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>I-25 Interchange to Rinconada</td>
<td>Concrete Wall Barrier &amp; ITS installation</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>MP 133-143.2</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2014/2017</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)</td>
<td>City Limits to Avenida De Mesilla</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,800,000</td>
<td>New project, $800K in FY2014 for Preliminary Engineering, Construction in FY2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 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](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 fro 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?
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

- 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

- Increase transit services & thoroughfare 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 Next Steps

- 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


Generic Work Plan for Developing a TAMP

Q & A on Performance Management
[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qapm.cfm](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](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](http://www.mrcog-nm.gov) click “Transportation”
2040 Statewide Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan

Claude Morelli, AICP, PTP
New Mexico Department of Transportation
Transportation Planning & Safety Division

MPO/RTPO TRANSPORTATION SUMMIT
Saturday, September 14, 2013
Mid Region Council of Governments
809 Copper Avenue, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Presentation topics

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
  - 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)
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
Transportation planning process must be performance-based

* MAP-21 → “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](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/nhpp.cfm)
2. **HSIP**: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/hsip.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/hsip.cfm)
4. **Freight**: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/freight.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/freight.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](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:
  - outlining a future vision for multimodal transportation
  - 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
Committees, Boards & Working Groups

**Working Groups**

- **Statewide Working Groups**
  - Roles:
    1. Bring together subject matter experts to discuss different areas of the plan in depth.
    2. Submit ideas and recommendations to coordinating committees.

- **Regional Working Groups**
  - Roles:
    1. Develop Regional Transportation Plans (RTP).
    2. Submit RTP recommendations to coordinating committees.

**Plan Development**

- **Plenary Coordinating Committee**

**Plan Oversight**

- **NMDOT/MPO/RTPO Cooperative Roundtable (CRT)**
  - Roles:
    1. Provide general oversight of the planning process.
    2. Review draft recommendations of the coordinating committees and provide feedback.
    3. Present periodic updates to Executive Committee and MPO/RTPO Policy Boards to obtain feedback.
    4. Pass coordinating committee recommendations to Executive Committee and Policy Boards with comments.

**Plan Approval**

- **Executive Committee**
  - Transportation Commission
  - MPO and RTPO Policy Boards
  - Federal Highway Administration
  - Federal Transit Administration

Approval by: April 30, 2015

**Public Meetings**

P = Public Meetings
Questions?

Email: claudemorelli@state.nm.us
Cell: 505.660.3146
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.”
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.
2013 APPROVED WORK PLAN AND MEETINGSCHEDULE 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 and Regional Working Groups
2040 Statewide Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan

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>

### MAP-21 Highway Programs

- **National Highway Performance Program (NHPP):** $21.8 billion
- **Surface Transportation Program (STP):** $16 billion
- **Transportation Alternatives:** $5 billion
- **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ):** $8.2 billion
- **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP):** $2.4 billion
- **TIFIA Loan Program:** $1 billion
# 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 8: Bridge repair funding levels versus needs estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal estimates to eliminate backlog</th>
<th>Actual highway bridge program appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$48 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$4.6 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$51.6 billion</td>
<td>$5.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$61.4 billion</td>
<td>$5.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$70.9 billion</td>
<td>$5.2 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bridge Repair Funding

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

Find Bridges  State Data

Bridges within 10 miles of: Las Cruces, NM, USA

Structurally deficient
MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Funding Process

- Transportation Enhancements: $897 million
- Safe Routes to School: $168 million
- Recreational Trails: $78.8 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
Active Transportation and Safety

MAP-21 represents performance measures transition.
DOT establishes measures by March 2014.
State and MPO targets in 2015.
No penalties for not meeting targets.

Performance Measures
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

![Performance Measures Diagram](Transportation For America)

**Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Travel Time Index</th>
<th>Average Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>57.4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>35.6 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra rush hour delay:
- Atlanta: 14.8 mins
- Chicago: 10.7 minutes

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

**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
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 13, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 Transportation Asset Management Presentation

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
None

DISCUSSION:
The Policy Committee will host a presentation regarding Asset Management by Denise Weston of Bohannan-Huston.