



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the amended agenda for the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **May 2, 2013 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Las Cruces MPO website](#).

The Las Cruces 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 Las Cruces MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Las Cruces MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 528-3016 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 528-3016 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1 March 7, 2013 _____ **Chair**
 - 3.2 April 4, 2013 _____ **Chair**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Amendment to the FY 2012 - 2017 Transportation Improvement Program ___ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1 Las Cruces Country Club Road Alignment _____ **Zia Engineering**
 - 6.2 ITS Presentation _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 Larry stated that there are some corrections to the minutes. The first one is on page 2, line 30,
2 person didn't state name regarding correction to minutes.

3
4 Luis Grijalva stated he made that comment.

5
6 Larry stated the next correction is on page 3, line 11, it was Henry Corneles. Page 6, line 12,
7 Bill Childress made the comment. Page 8, line 35, will remain as is because no one
8 remembered who made comment.

9
10 Luis Grijalva stated under member absent that Willie Roman is with CLC Transportation
11 Department.

12
13 Luis Marmolejo joined the meeting.

14
15 Bill Childress motioned to approve the minutes as corrected.

16 Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.

17 All in favor. Vote 11-0 (4 members absent).

18 19 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

20 21 **5.1 Discussion regarding Adjusting the Urbanized Area Boundary**

22
23 Last month the TAC began the discussion of adjusting the UZA for the Las Cruces Urbanized
24 Area. While the adjusted UZA is due to FHWA in June 2014, the NMDOT is undergoing a
25 Functional Classification update and has requested that the MPO complete its adjustment by
26 May 2013.

27
28 Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

- 29
- 30 • Adding Onate High School and other land abutting US 70 from Sonoma Ranch to Porter
 - 31 • Using proposed Mesa Grande alignment to proposed Lohman extension to square off
 - 32 UZA boundary south of US 70
 - 33 • Using Desert Wind/ Arroyo Rd. from I25 to Sonoma Ranch extension to square off
 - 34 boundary north of US 70.
 - 35 • Include the Las Cruces International Airport and the West Mesa Industrial Park.

36
37 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

38
39 Larry asked if this would be coming back in April.

40
41 Tom replied that is correct.

42
43 Harold Love asked about the line going south paralleling Interstate I-10. He asked what it
44 encompasses, Main Street.

1 Tom stated that he thought it was NM 478 and for some reason the Census Bureau decided to
2 link that little area of the ETZ within the urbanized area and have it connected by that
3 transportation route. He stated he did not have an explanation for why they did that.
4

5 Luis Grijalva asked if a portion of Sierra Norte would be included in that, up by Red Hawk Golf
6 Course, where the arrow is on the map.
7

8 Tom stated he had given that thought and also noticed that the University Golf Course wasn't
9 included in the urbanized area. He stated that the argument could be whether or not that is a
10 significant traffic generator. Tom stated he would like to hear the Committee's input. Tom
11 stated he doesn't have a position on it either way.
12

13 John Gwynne asked if there was already an approved subdivision around the Red Hawk Golf
14 Course or is that already included in the City limits?
15

16 Tom stated that there is a subdivision around the Red Hawk Golf Course and it is within the
17 City limits and that would leave credence to adjusting the boundary to include that. Tom stated
18 that if the Committee feels that the boundary should be adjusted, staff would do that.
19

20 John Gwynne stated that right now there is probably not a large amount of traffic from the
21 subdivision but he anticipated that relatively soon there would be as it develops.
22

23 Larry Altamirano stated that if Engler Road was extended that would be quicker because
24 Thurman Road is there and if they extended Engler west that might increase the traffic
25 because it would also help with cutting through to the other side. Is that Engler Road that goes
26 under the underpass?
27

28 Tom replied that it is Engler that underpass has been constructed. He stated that lies quite a
29 bit south and that will contained within the urbanized area. He stated that he believes it is also
30 contained with the Census defined urbanized area currently.
31

32 Lisa Murphy asked if it would last for 10 years once the urbanized area boundaries are
33 established.
34

35 Tom stated that it would last for 10 years, although the FHW guidelines do not actually
36 prescribe that and theoretically we could adjust it at any time. The funding is only established
37 on the U.S. Census one and that is only updated every 10 years, so it could be done but it
38 wouldn't really be worth the exercise.
39

40 Lisa asked if it could last for ten years.
41

42 Tom replied that was correct.
43

44 Lisa asked if this created any additional obligation on the part of anybody to expand this urban
45 area boundary.
46

1 Tom replied that it does not change the obligation on anyone. He stated what it does do it
2 changes whether things are reported as rural or if they are reported as urban.

3
4 John Gwynne asked about the area out by Picacho. He stated it looks like the area north of 70
5 is not included.

6
7 Tom stated that he did not include that. One of the guidelines was that the boundaries follow
8 identifiable landmarks. It could be included; we would just have to decide what an identifiable
9 boundary for it would be. Tom stated that staff could look into any possibilities or anything that
10 can allow the expansion north of that. Tom stated the reporting really does hinge upon the
11 roadway itself, so the properties are adjacent to an urban roadway even though they not within
12 the urbanized area.

13
14 Larry asked Tom to point to where the Town of Mesilla is on the map.

15
16 Tom indicated where the Town of Mesilla was. He stated that there are portions of the Mesilla
17 downtown, the plaza area, that are within the urbanized area but as you move away from the
18 original town site, those areas are rural. Staff did not expand the boundaries to include that
19 because they believe the Mesilla Town Plan anticipates those areas staying with the rural
20 character.

21
22 Luis Grijalva recommended that the area around Red Hawk/Sierra Norte subdivision.

23
24 **5.2 Transportation Asset Management Presentation**

25
26 The Las Cruces MPO has retained Bohanan-Huston Inc. to develop the Transportation Asset
27 and Safety Management Plan. Denise Weston, Senior Planner, from BH Inc. will present the
28 schedule, process, and goals for the development. She will also solicit input from Committee
29 members on the direction for the plan development.

30
31 Tom gave a brief update.

32
33 Denise Weston from Bohanan-Huston gave an overview on the development of the
34 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan.

35
36 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

37
38 Tom Murphy introduced the new MPO Transportation Planner, Chowdhury Siddiqui. Tom
39 stated that Mr. Siddiqui comes from the North Dakota Department of Transportation and he
40 has a doctorate in transportation engineering from the University of Central Florida.

41
42 Bill Childress stated the Bureau of Land Management is about ready to publish its Tri-County
43 Resource Management Plan, which includes land management decisions in three counties in
44 our district, Sierra, Otero, and Dona Ana County. Sometime in April it will be released for
45 public review. If you are interested in obtaining a copy of the plan you can contact Bill
46 Childress or the District Office in Las Cruces.

1 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comment.

2

3 **8. ADJOURNMENT**

4

5 Harold Love motioned to adjourn.

6 Luis Grijalva seconded the motion.

7

8 Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

9

10

11

12 _____
Chair

13

14

1 **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING**
3

4 Following are the minutes from the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting
5 held on Thursday, April 4, 2013 at 4:00 p.m. at Dona Ana County Government Bldg.,
6 Commission Chambers, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
9 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
10 John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)
11 David Wallace (proxy for Bill Childress - BLM)
12 John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)
13 Willie Roman (CLC Transportation)
14 Harold Love (NMDOT)
15 Albert Casillas (proxy for Luis Marmolejo – DAC)
16

17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jesus Morales (EBID)
18 Greg Walke (NMSU)
19 Jack Valencia (SCRDT)
20 Henry K. Corneles (DAC Engineering)
21 Larry Altamirano (LCPS)
22 Debbie Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
23 Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works)
24 Luis Marmolejo (DAC)
25

26 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
27 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
28 Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO staff)
29

30 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

31
32 Meeting was called to order at 4:22 p.m. Committee members introduced themselves for the
33 record.
34

35 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

36
37 John Knopp motioned to approve the agenda.
38 Harold Love seconded the motion.
39 All in favor.
40

41 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**
42

43 **4. ACTION ITEMS**

44
45 **4.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program**
46

1 Every two years, the Las Cruces MPO is required to develop a Transportation Improvement
2 Program (TIP). The TIP outlines the 6-year program for funding of various transportation
3 projects that receive federal or selected state funds for their completion. Through the TIP
4 process, the MPO can also request federal funding for transportation construction projects.

5
6 Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

7
8 John Gwynne stated he notice that the project costs estimates don't match the totals.

9
10 Andrew Wray stated that is because of a database error. He stated the database shell that
11 they are using is old and it was not something that was constructed in-house. It was
12 constructed by the Albuquerque MPO and staff is still waiting for the Albuquerque MPO to
13 send the most recent functional copy of the database and one of the things that they are trying
14 to fix are some of the incorrect population of field errors that are persistent and chronic.
15 Andrew stated that staff has already exercised the limit of their ability to obtain the functional
16 copy of the database.

17
18 John asked if it would be correct for them to look at the project cost and then look at the years
19 that they report to have the projects done. Would that be the scope of what they are looking
20 for?

21
22 Andrew replied yes.

23
24 Mike Bartholomew clarified that where the totals are for the four year total are what should be
25 populating in the estimated project.

26
27 Andrew replied yes.

28
29 Harold Love motioned to recommend to the MPO Policy Committee.

30 Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.

31 All in favor. Vote 7 – 0 (1 abstention, 8 members absent), motion passes.

32 33 **4.2 Urbanized Area Boundary Adjustment**

34
35 After each Census MPOs may adjust their Urbanized Area (UZA) based on projected
36 conditions. In January TAC began the discussion of adjusting the UZA for the Las Cruces
37 Urbanized Area. While the adjusted UZA is due to FHWA in June 2014, the NMDOT is
38 undergoing a Functional Classification update and has requested that the MPO complete its
39 adjustment by May 2013.

40
41 Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

- 42
43
- 44 • Adding Onate High School and other land abutting US 70 from Sonoma Ranch to Porter.
 - 45 • Using proposed Mesa Grande alignment to proposed Lohman extension to square off UZA
46 boundary south of US 70.

1 • Using Desert Wind/ Arroyo Rd. from I25 to Sonoma Ranch extension to square off
2 boundary north of US 70.

3
4 • Include the Las Cruces International Airport and the West Mesa Industrial Park.

5
6 • Include Red Hawk Golf Club and NMSU Golf Course Clubhouse.

7
8 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

9
10 Mike Bartholomew asked if when the recommendation gets approved by the Policy Committee,
11 would it then be incorporated as the UZA or is that just a recommendation to the Feds?

12
13 Tom Murphy stated that it does need final NMDOT and FHWA approval, so essentially it is a
14 recommendation from the Policy Committee to the Federal Highway Administration.

15
16 John Knopp motioned to recommend to the MPO Policy Committee.

17 John Gwynne seconded the motion.

18 All in favor. Vote 7 - 0 (1 abstention, 8 members absent), motion passes.

19
20 **5. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

21
22 Jolene Herrera stated that the second phase of the safety project on US 70, the concrete wall
23 barrier between where the cable barrier ends and the interchange with I-25, was funded. They
24 received confirmation a couple of days ago. She will be taking it through the MPO for a formal
25 TIP amendment next month but that has been funded for \$3M. They are currently designing
26 and it should be let sometime in the winter of this year.

27
28 John Knopp commented as someone who drives through the I-25/I-10 interchange about 10
29 times a week that he thought they had done a great job.

30
31 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comment.

32
33 **7. ADJOURNMENT**

34
35 Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:50 p.m.

36
37 John Gwynne motioned to adjourn.

38 John Knopp seconded the motion.

39 All in favor.

40

41

42

43 _____
Chair

44

45



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 2, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

FY2014 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Report

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:

Control Number	Project Year	Route	Project	Proposed Change(s)
1100930	2014	US 70	Concrete Barrier Installation	This is a new project for \$3,010,000

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

CN: **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** **NMDOT Dist.:** 3 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** City of Las Cruces
Fed ID: 1100930 **Lead Agency:** NMDOT D-1 **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$3,010,000
 Est. Letting:
Category: Safety **TIP Amendment Pending?**

Project Desc.: Installation of concrete barriers in US 70 between I-25 Interchange and Rinconada

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

Work Zone:

Remarks: New project as of 4/11/13

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2012	2013	2014	2015	4 Yr. TOTALS	2016	2017
State Match			\$0		\$0		
Local Match			\$221,536		\$221,536		
HSIP MAP-21			\$2,788,464	01	\$2,788,464		
Totals			\$3,010,000		\$3,010,000		



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 2, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Las Cruces Country Club Road Alignment

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

Zia Engineering will give a presentation regarding their proposals for the redevelopment of the Las Cruces Country Club.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 2, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Intelligent Transportation System Presentation

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

A forum was sponsored by Intelligent Transportation System New Mexico (ITS NM) on April 18, 2013 on preparing a unified highway infrastructure geo-dataset for the forthcoming MAP-21 transportation bill monitoring and reporting requirements. This was the first primary meeting on the topic and was broad in scope with the intent of identifying a pragmatic path forward that considers all entity responsibilities.

The participants included representatives from FHWA, NMDOT, every MPO in New Mexico, along with vendors of geo-dataset analysis tools and other interested ITS NM members. A unified geo-dataset is important because it is a requirement of MAP-21 and is the groundwork upon which other mandated elements, such as an Asset Management program, will be implemented. The forum was an initial step in bringing together and educating essential entities identifying next steps and a path forward toward implementing this important project.