



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **June 5, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. May 1, 2014 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Transportation Improvement Program 2014-2019 Amendment _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. FY 2015 - FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program Adoption _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.3. Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Arroyo Road/National Monument Impact Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are the minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of
5 the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held May 1,
6 2014 at 4:00 p.m. at the Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 N. Motel Blvd.,
7 Las Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
10 Larry Altamirano (LCPS)
11 Jennifer Montoya (proxy for Bill Childress - BLM)
12 Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works)
13 John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)
14 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
15 John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)
16 Harold Love (NMDOT)
17 Luis Marmolejo (DAC)
18 Willie Roman (CLC Transportation)
19 Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
20 Greg Walke (NMSU)

21
22 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Debbie Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
23 Rene Molina (DAC Engineering)
24 Jesus Morales (EBID)
25 Bill Childress (BLM)

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

31
32 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Zachary Libbin (EBID)

33
34 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

35
36 Meeting called to order at 4:01 p.m.

37
38 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

39
40 Valencia: Does anyone have any discussion items with regard to the agenda? Can we
41 have a motion to approve it?

42
43 Bartholomew: So moved.

44
45 Walke: Second.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Valencia: No discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 April 3, 2014

Walke: One correction on the "Other's Present" I think Zach Libbin's name is misspelled.

Valencia: Any other corrections or comments. If not, the chair will accept a motion.

Walke: So moved.

Valencia: Is there a second?

Altamirano Second

Valencia: Any further discussion? If not all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

Valencia: And that was the minutes, and I unfortunately took out of numerical order the approval of the agenda.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM UPDATE DISCUSSION

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to reference..... staff handed you out a new copy, it was different from the UPWP draft that was in your packet. The difference being is there were some.....some of the items added to it that were not in the draft copy. What we are doing is under the State Planning and Procedures Manual, on May 1st we need to have a public hearing and open the comment period for development of our next UPWP. This UPWP is to cover federal fiscal years 2015 and federal fiscal year 2016, so that will extend from October 1, 2014 thru September 30, 2016. We will.....during the comment period, we anticipate continuing to make changes, including getting budget numbers and allotting those from New Mexico DOT, appendix A so far is blank. What we are developing, our

1 new format that's the same across all MPO's in the State, to have the
2 same UPWP format. I'd like to, I guess begin going through this
3 document, the table of contents, who's numbered it'd be page three but
4 just flip the first one. So basically divided into three main parts, the
5 introduction, the work program tasks, and the appendices. The
6 introduction is background and laws governing the operation of the MPO.
7 The main body of the UPWP falls under the item two work program tasks,
8 which we'll discuss in greater detail and then the appendices essentially
9 cover the format budget summary. Our planning area map, we have a
10 status report from our Federal Highway Certification that was done in 2012
11 and they'd like to have continued progress monitored that through the
12 UPWP. Appendix D will be filled out once the policy committee actually
13 adopts a resolution on it, and then Appendix E is a listing of our three year
14 cycle of traffic counts. So, at this point I'd like to end the document, skip
15 to section 2, Work Program Tasks. Page that looks like this. Under the
16 format, task 1, task 2, task 3, task 4, task 5 are general categories, those
17 are the same across all MPO's within the state, and then the sub task
18 under each of those, can change depending upon the MPO, but a lot of
19 them are the same across all of them. Just in case you ever wanted to
20 look at somebody else's UPWP to find out things on there. Task 1....and
21 it's probably going to end up being one of the bigger budgetary ones when
22 we fill in that number, about the same through all the MPO areas and it's
23 pretty consistent with what we had under general administration under our
24 last UPWP. The main concern I guess with this committee, is your
25 activities are covered under this program, and then we've just kind
26 of.....have a chart of your meeting. I'll kind of go through that a bit little
27 more. Task 2 is devoted entirely to the Transportation Improvement
28 Program and we have the work tasks associated with that development
29 management and the annual listing and obligation report. Task 3 and
30 Task 4 are generally where the day to day transportation planning
31 activities of MPO staff fall under. You can go ahead and read through
32 those items. Probably one of the big things that we'll have, is by next
33 month next year, we will be looking at adopting the updated Metropolitan
34 Transportation plans, so that will be a big work item over the next 12
35 months. Task 5 we have a special plans projects and programs and these
36 are work items that MPO staff is working on assisting with, that really
37 deserve special call out either because of the effort involved with them or
38 that incase of three of them are contracting those out to outside parties.
39 I'd like to continue through the body of the document.....I'd like to fly over
40 task 1 since its really routine stuff, unless anybody has any questions over
41 any of the sub tasks within that section. Of course you do have a month
42 to review this with only discussion item, we won't ask for any action until
43 next month's meeting.

44 Knopp: Just one little thing, on 1.4 committee meetings, the TAC meeting
45

1 schedule is incomplete there, on the chart at the bottom of the page.
2
3 Murphy: Okay thank you. That's definitely.....thanks for pointing that out, I'm sure
4 some of you'd like to cut down to three meetings over two year. We'll
5 correct that. It should show meetings pretty much every month except in
6 the month of July.
7
8 Herrera: Mr. Chair?
9
10 Valencia: Mrs. Herrera.
11
12 Herrera: Tom. For the task 1.6 or sub task 1.6, I guess the staff training and
13 professional development. We'll probably need to talk more about that
14 and I just want to let the whole committee know that it's something that the
15 planning division at NMDOT has been working on with the MPO's and the
16 RTPO's as well, is we're trying to get a more robust training program for
17 our MPO staff members as well as our RTPO planners and even our
18 NMDOT planners, so this will probably change before next month when
19 you see it again for approval and it'll probably get a lot bigger, because we
20 want everyone to be trained and professionally developed and that is kind
21 of the same with the board member training. I think there's some basic
22 things in there that we want all of the boards to be trained on yearly or
23 every other year, but just wanted to let the committee know that those
24 things will definitely be changing.
25
26 Murphy: Seeing no other comments. I'll move on to task 2, handle the
27 transportation improvement program. This fiscal year, we'll be beginning
28 the TIP development, including the call for projects around October.
29 Ultimate ranking projects through this committee and then adoption
30 through the Policy Committee by approximately April. FY-16, it'll just be
31 amendment or well that goes under 2.2 TIP amendments and adjustments
32 as needed, based on a quarterly...and then 2.3, we have the annually
33 listing of projects that we produce each year. Any questions on that task?
34
35 Valencia: Continue.
36
37 Murphy: Continuing on. Task 3 is general development and data collection and
38 analysis. Under this we have our Traffic Count Program. One of
39 the.....this will change a little bit too under the table, down at the bottom
40 of that sub-section, want to put out with.....beginning some efforts into
41 non-motorized collection and some turning movement with some new
42 equipment that we've gotten and I just need to think out how to frame out
43 what those work products will be and what their schedule for delivery is.
44 Population land use collection is pretty much an ongoing item. We
45 continually take in new information....keep up population estimates within

1 the region. That kind of work will continue.

2
3 Valencia: Tom, on that one, and I have it highlighted on task 4 also under 4.5, where
4 you have land use transportation integration, and I know in task 5 you
5 have Viva Dona Ana. Are you taking any of the information from the
6 eventual comprehensive plan land use planning all of the kinds of
7 documents that are being created in the Viva Dona Ana incorporating any
8 or components of, you know those studies into this document?
9

10 Murphy: That's a good question. The short answer is yes. Certainly, I think for the
11 most part, the products that we expect to see out of Viva Dona Ana, are
12 heavily going to inform the MTP update, and then the.....carry out the
13 MTP.....will be how we further some of the tasks that they MPO may
14 need to do under, you know that come out of Viva Dona Ana. That's sort
15 of related. I mean it's listed separately, but that regional planning effort
16 really kind of weeds away into just about every other task that the MPO
17 does, so it will probably some.....working in that task, but we're also
18 accomplishing things in other tasks when we do that, and we do expect it
19 to be a County adopted policies and any adopted policies by any of our
20 jurisdiction become things that we must consider in our transportation
21 planning process.
22

23 Valencia: Go ahead.

24
25 Murphy: Ok, 3.3 Travel Demand Model, as many of you know we maintain a travel
26 demand model, and we conduct runs as requested. On there, it's pretty
27 much continual to maintain that item. 3.4 We have a, what I describe as a
28 holding category for software updates. We don't envision any at this time,
29 but when we do, it's usually a big enough dollar amount that it needs to be
30 called out. 3.5 is functional classification view and update, as you recall,
31 last month we had that...the recommendation for that and the policy
32 committee is voting on that this month. So, in the upcoming....next two
33 fiscal years, we will be expecting only to work on that if there were a
34 request for a change in designation from any our jurisdictions. 3.6 GIS's
35 data development, it's an ongoing data management activity that's done.
36 Development review, as many, many of you are involved with. The MPO
37 reviews plans, make sure that their conformed to the Metropolitan
38 Transportation Plan. Also, you know work to see the access management
39 guidelines that were passed by this Committee and the Policy Committee
40 a year and a half ago get implemented. Planning consultation and local
41 transportation assistance we provide any assistance that we can with your
42 local jurisdictions and while you're developing your capital projects, you
43 need traffic projections, you need traffic counts, things of that nature. Are
44 there any questions under task 3?
45

1 Valencia: Go ahead and continue with task 4
2
3 Murphy: Task 4-Transportation planning, this is the higher level macro planning.
4 This is where the Metropolitan Transportation Plan is included. As I said
5 earlier, the big task on this is the update of the MTP, which is due next
6 June, so we'll be working frantically, consistently to get that to everybody
7 here to look at. Once that is concluded, we'll probably come in with an
8 amendment for some sub-tasks to do FY 16 of the important projects that
9 come out of the MTP update. 4.2 Safety (inaudible) and planning, we
10 endeavor to produce an annual crash report as we get the crash numbers
11 for Dona Ana County from UNM and we hope to make that an annual
12 report and publication of that. 4.3 we'll continue our roll in assisting safe
13 routes to school. I think one of the things we'll probably want to
14 change.....the projects or the timeline slightly, is in the last coalition
15 meeting, we talked about updating the action plan that was adopted by the
16 MPO as the infrastructure projects that were funded under the first go
17 round of that are.....have been bid out and I think a bid's been accepted,
18 and work will commence on that this summer, so it's time to start looking
19 at what the next needs are. 4.4 Intelligent Transportation System, the
20 State is currently in the process of updating the state ITS architecture.
21 Along with that the MPO area will be.....the State will aide us in updating
22 the MPO regional architecture.....related project with that. The City of
23 Las Cruces has submitted a Tiger Grant application for development of a
24 traffic management system plan that heavily involves ITS improvements
25 within the City of Las Cruces. It handles, I believe there's three signals
26 that are in the Town on Mesilla that will be operated on the system, couple
27 of DOT signals, and a County signal, so it will truly be a regional effort,
28 and so the MPO with be involved with that. Also I think failing,
29 failing.....receiving a Tiger Grant, I think that will also go out and look for
30 other sources of funding to implement, or to begin that work. If that isn't
31 happening. 4.5 Land use Transportation Integration, this is one of the
32 work products that's come out of transport 24. The development of the
33 mobility zones where we look at essentially the intersection of
34 transportation and land use, and we develop metrics to help measure that.
35 We look at things like street con activity, we look at job housing balance
36 type of thing and what we would do is perform that analysis under that
37 work item, and these would eventually go into feed performance measures
38 that the USDOT is going to be requiring of MPO's in the near future. That
39 handles task 4. I'll pause for any questions about specifics.
40
41 Walke: I have a question. If there's nothing in here, does that just mean that you
42 haven't filled it out yet? The schedule?
43
44 Murphy: Yes, I haven't come to.....
45

1 Walke: But it will happen?
2
3 Murphy: Right, I haven't sat down with the calendar, looked at when's the best time
4 to commence those activities, but by the time we come back next month,
5 all those will be filled out. In the case of 4.5, I anticipate a lot of those will
6 happen after the MTP is adopted so that we have balance of work items.
7
8 Walke: Thank you.
9
10 Valencia: Additional questions? Go on to task 5
11
12 Murphy: Task 5 covers the special studies, miscellaneous activities, 5.1 is the
13 continued MPO participation in Viva Dona Ana, I believe that that work is
14 due to wrap up in March of 2015, although there's the regional leadership
15 committee is working to find a way to keep that initiative going. If they do
16 find a way, we would amend this to fill out that timeline. 5.2
17 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan Performance Measure
18 Implementation, as you recall from last month, Bohannon-Huston gave a
19 presentation on the asset and safety management plan, what we intend
20 for that document really to do is also to help us guide also development of
21 performance measures that are less land use related more transportation
22 system to better augment our total performance measures throughout the
23 MPO. Under this we will.....the work products will eventually become
24 the recommendation that come out of that final report, which is still being
25 drafted by Bohannon-Huston. 5.3, 5.4 are some phase A study corridors
26 that we are currently working though the bid process for those and I
27 anticipate both of those items to wrap up shortly in the beginning of next
28 fiscal year, so they're listed here.
29
30 Valencia: I have a question on each one of those just real quick. On the University
31 Corridor, you're talking about from Main Street going down past Zia Junior
32 High, all the way to Highway 28, that's the corridor study?
33
34 Murphy: That's correct.
35
36 Valencia: Okay.
37
38 Murphy: Last Tip project cycle, the Town of Mesilla request a project for adding of
39 bike lanes along that corridor. It was the second rated project by the
40 policy committee, and so we decided that we were.....we had some PO
41 funds that we were able to use towards this for the phase A, so that's how
42 that got onto there.....
43
44 Valencia: So it's kind of bicycle bike path oriented only not because there isn't
45 sufficient right-of-way in that corridor?

1
2 Murphy: That's going to be part of what's studied and established as part of this
3 report, and then to continue on, Missouri was the top tanked project that
4 came out of the last cycle and this would look at the purpose and need of
5 connecting Missouri east of Sonoma Ranch in the vicinity of Centennial
6 High School.
7
8 Valencia: In the vicinity of Centennial High School?
9
10 Murphy: I believe just to the North of it, but.....
11
12 Valencia: So you're not talking about creating a roadway through the Telshor
13 housing area on to Sonoma Ranch, or is that what the....part of one of the
14 options of contemplation would be and then obviously when you
15 potentially come in with what the cost associated with the.....
16
17 Murphy: That's what the.....so far the problem is.....or the problem description is
18 and it is where Missouri currently terminates in that area where it's.....I
19 believe we have it.....
20
21 Valencia: Imperial Ridge area?
22
23
24 Murphy:on the peripheral plan as a either a minor (inaudible) I can't recall at
25 this point, but I would be looking at.....do we need to extend that to
26 provide better connectivity to Centennial High and if we did, what should
27 that look like.
28
29 Valencia: Okay, thank you.
30
31 Murphy: Of course the no-build is always an option in the reports. 5.5 is Short
32 Range Transit Plan, this is another project that we have currently under
33 way. Its, I believe a city purchasing advertised it yesterday. We expect to
34 go through the RFP process on that and then commence work, but that
35 work also would not finish by end of fiscal year.
36
37 Valencia: And this is MPO monies, not City of Las Cruces monies?
38
39 Murphy: That's correct. These are 5303 FTA planning money.
40
41 Valencia: Thank you.
42
43 Murphy: Thank concludes my presentation. So, if you have any specific questions
44 on task 5 or the document in total.
45

1 Altamirano: Mr. Chair
2
3 Valencia: Larry.
4
5 Altamirano: I do have a question. I'm sorry to go back to 5.3, the University Corridor
6 Study. With that study for biking they would also look at pedestrian as
7 well in that or does it just pertain to the biking? Because if they're going to
8 take away.....I guess my question is, is as narrow as that road is
9 especially in front of the middle school, and further west, if they're putting
10 in bike lane they're going to cut off whatever little walking area that they'll
11 have.....I just want to make sure that they'll look at all issues involved.
12
13 Murphy: Mr. Altamirano, The answer to that is they'll look at all forms of
14 transportation. So, automobiles and pedestrians will be included in that as
15 well. It's just that, I guess we tend to frame it in the.....we tend to frame
16 it as bicycle project because that's how it was submitted by the Town of
17 Mesilla but really when we look at something we have to look at
18 everything.
19
20 Montoya: Mr. Chair, I have a question. I'm Jennifer Montoya with BLM, and we have
21 been participating in the City of Las Cruces Arroyo Plan process and it
22 seems like that could, if adopted, could be a factor in terms of road
23 placement and design. So just wanted to comment that that's out there
24 and being developed.
25
26 Murphy: We are aware that the cities work on the Arroyo Plan and; of course, when
27 we do our quarter, we have to look at all the plans that are out there and
28 see how they affect whatever recommendations that we make.
29
30 Valencia: Additional questions for comments.
31
32 Marmolejo: Mr. Chair, nn 5.1, under responsibilities, you need to include New Mexico
33 State University, The City of Las Cruces and obviously Mesilla Valley
34 MPO. I believe that City of Sunland Park is questionable at this time.
35
36 Murphy: Okay so, add NMSU and.....
37
38 Marmolejo: NMSU, CLC, obviously Mesilla Valley MPO and I'm not sure about the
39 City of Sunland Park as of yet. I think they lack a couple of documents or
40 something like that.
41
42 Valencia: It's pending because we didn't have two-thirds majority at the last meeting
43 to accept their request for participation.
44
45 Murphy: Yep, that's right yes I was there.....I anticipate by the time we get this

1 document approved though, they will be in there.

2
3 Marmolejo: We can roll that in there.

4
5 Murphy: But if not, we'll take it out.

6
7 Valencia: Any additional comments to the plan?

8
9 Murphy: Thank you.

10
11 **5.2 STATEWIDE LONG RANGE PLAN PRESENTATION**

12
13 Valencia: That brings us to item 5.2, the SLRP, the Statewide Long Range Plan
14 presentation. Ms. Herrera?

15
16 Herrera: I'm going to start out by apologizing because I just found out recently that I
17 was to give this presentation. I've heard Claude give it a couple of times,
18 he's wonderful at it. I'm probably not so wonderful at it, so we'll just take it
19 as it goes and if there's any questions during the presentation please feel
20 free to stop me at any time and ask. Okay, so what we're going to talk
21 about today is the long range plan requirements under MAP 21. We'll give
22 you a brief overview of what the SLRP is. SLRP stands for State Long
23 Range Plan, but we like to say SLRP because it's fun. So I'll be saying
24 that a lot today. Also something else that's really cool and that's been
25 added recently to this presentation is some of the results from our
26 meetings that we've been having around the state. Our State working
27 groups and regional working groups, we've got some really kind of good
28 feedback from those, and so I'll be sharing some of that stuff with you.
29 Also we'll go over some key things for a future vision and some of the
30 challenges and opportunities, and a brief summary of everything that
31 we've kind of heard so far.

32
33 So the requirements of under MAP 21 for state long range plans, there's
34 six key points under that, the State has to develop a long range plan, it is
35 part of the law, but besides that, it's always a good idea to do planning
36 before you start building things so you know where it is you're headed.
37 The minimum forecast period for State long range plans were 20 years.
38 We're going a little further than that, our horizon year is 2040 and that
39 actually matches up perfectly with the two MPO's in this area that are also
40 using the horizon year of 2040. So we're all kind of meshing together.
41 The plan must be multi-modals, so we're no longer the highway
42 department, we're the department of transportation. That includes cars,
43 bikes, buses, pedestrians, equestrians, airports, kind of everything has to
44 be in there and we are taking a look at all of those modes in our State
45 Long Range Plan. Another big important thing is we have to include the

1 entire state, so we're not just going to focus on Albuquerque and Las
2 Cruces, we're going to look at all the rural areas....how everything kind of
3 ties together. The plan must be coordinated, so we have to work with the
4 MPO's, with the RTPO's, with any other kind of plans that there are, State
5 implementation for air quality issues, so that'll be the kind of the southern
6 part of the County. We have to look at all of those kinds of things,
7 economic development plan, we'll consider all that stuff in our plan.
8 Obviously, with any federal funding the planning process must be
9 continuing, cooperative and comprehensive. So we're making sure to
10 have some kind of checks in there so that we know that we're doing all of
11 those things. Also, a new big thing under MAP 21 is that the plan must be
12 performance-based and it's actually.....the performance measures are
13 going to be based on seven transportation goals that are specified in the
14 law. They are actually listed here, so these are what the feds are going to
15 be mandating that we have to set performance measures on. That's
16 something that we will be looking at and dealing with in the State Long
17 Range Plan, so an overview of the SLRP. The purpose of this plan is to
18 provide a visionary, transparent, predictable, performance-based and
19 strategic frame work. I can tell you a lot of thought and time went into
20 those words specifically to come up with that kind of vision statement. It's
21 ultimately going to be adopted by the MPO and RPO boards and so we
22 wanted to make sure to put some of that language in there too. That this
23 is not just a department of transportation document, it's meant to be
24 shared with the public. We want to be cooperative in this planning
25 process. So the intent of the plan is to ensure that New Mexico's
26 transportation system supports the well-being of all the State's citizens
27 and visitors and that last parts really important, especially for New Mexico
28 because tourism is a large part of our economy, so we have to make sure
29 that we're taking of the needs of our tourist population as well as the
30 people who live here on a day to day basis. So like I said the horizon year
31 for our plan is 2040. We expect to have the entire process completed by
32 April 30th and that should be consistent with all of the federal performance
33 measures coming out, so hopefully it'll coincide with that. Of course you
34 never know what's going to happen with the feds. So this is a really big
35 project, we have a pretty big state, it's pretty rural, there's a lot of very
36 different places in the state, so what we did is we broke this project into
37 four specific phases. We ask these four kinds of questions. Where are
38 we now? Where do we want to go? How will we get there? What will it
39 take? Right now we're still kind of in the first, where are we now? The
40 consultant, Cambridge Systematics, has been hired and they're doing a
41 really good job of collecting all the data that we need and looking for short
42 falls of where could we be collecting data that we're not currently. They're
43 supposed to have a report just on the existing conditions of the State.
44 Probably in a month or two and so it'll be interesting to see what comes
45 out of that. After that we'll start getting into some of these other questions

1 and it'll...we'll talk about different scenarios, so when you do a State Long
2 Range Plan you like to assume something is going to happen, but if that
3 doesn't then we like to have maybe some other things that we've looked
4 at, in case this plan doesn't work we have a backup plan already in place.
5 Okay, so how will the plan be developed? There's obviously NMDOT
6 planning staff and then the consulting team were kind of the meat and
7 bones of it, but we also have a lot of different committees that are giving
8 input into this plan. We did a public survey of New Mexico residents and
9 visitors, we also have State working groups, there's nine of them and they
10 focus mostly on the seven national goals plus some. We also have
11 regional working groups. There's seven of them around the State, they
12 coincide with RTPO areas and then we have these other coordinating
13 committees. I'm not going to go into all the details but just know that
14 there's a lot of people working on this plan. So we're not doing it in a back
15 room, in vacuum or anything. We're getting input from all different kinds of
16 people and stakeholders and then kind of over all of these other working
17 groups we have the DCC, which stands for Departmental Coordinating
18 Committee, so that's all of our kind of upper management but then also
19 equivalent to that, we have the MRCC....so that's the MPO and RTPO
20 coordinating committee, so we're kind of working hand in hand with them
21 and everything that the consultant develops we run by that coordinating
22 committee so that they can make sure to keep us in check. That we're
23 doing everything that we should. As I mentioned before, the final plan will
24 be approved by NMDOT, but it'll also be approved by the RPO's and
25 MPO's as well. Okay so now for kind of the fun stuff. Some of the input
26 that we received so far so, I mentioned that we have working groups.
27 Here's a list of the regional working groups that coincide with the RTPO's
28 and some of our other statewide ones. You can see that they somewhat
29 fit in with the seven national goals. We've added a couple of them, they're
30 not all listed here but.....and these are all the questions that we're going
31 to be asking of the working groups. Right now the last set of meetings
32 that we had around the State we focused on these three questions, so
33 primarily where do we want to see the State going in the next 25 years?
34 And then what are some of the challenges to us getting to that vision and
35 what data do we need to see if we can make it there or not? So to help
36 answer those questions, what the Cambridge folks came up with, was a
37 State-wide public survey, so they gave this to 625 people. Primarily, well
38 they took a sample of the state and so a lot of the people that responded
39 to that particular survey were in the more urban areas, just because that's
40 how our state stakes up. Most of our population is in Albuquerque and so
41 they did kind of a percentage based distribution on that survey. But then
42 the other 114 respondents, they handed those surveys out at the regional
43 working groups so that was in the more rural areas with RTPO's and we'll
44 go over some of the stuff they found in that. So asked them the same
45 questions with the exception of ports of entry, that one didn't get asked to

1 our regional working groups, that was just to the public and in case any of
2 you can't see it, the dark blue is public survey and the light blue is the
3 regional working groups and we called them informed stake holders.
4 That's kind of what terminally Claude came up for them. As you can see
5 roads and bridges are pretty high up there, but something that was really
6 kind of interesting was the pedestrian facilities and how highly the stake-
7 holders kind of rated that as a feature that needs improvement. That's
8 interesting because we didn't have a whole lot of advocacy groups at
9 these meeting, we had people like the Pot Ash Industry, we have the
10 Mining Industry, we had Agricultural Industry and we had health people,
11 it's a whole bunch of different people, and to see that kind of big number
12 on there, it really says something to us. The same thing with the bicycle
13 facilities, obviously we need to be more multi-modal and that's coming
14 through loud and clear in these surveys. So this is a bit interesting, this
15 was just a survey of the regional working group numbers and they ask
16 how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. So, if
17 you strongly agree you'd rank to the 5, if you strongly disagree to 1 and
18 then accordingly between the scales up there at the top. Highway traffic
19 noise is a problem. Obviously, that didn't rank really high because we
20 were in the more rural areas, so they don't have a whole lot of traffic in
21 their towns. Likewise with the second one, most of the time I can get
22 where I need to go quickly. Again if you're in the more rural area, you
23 probably don't have much congestion as Albuquerque or Las Cruces
24 does. But again to kind of reinforce the multi-modalism is the very bottom
25 one. The transportation system should allow people to make healthy
26 lifestyle choices, provide opportunities to walk or bike and so that ranked
27 at a 4.32 out of 5 among regional working groups. So it's becoming clear
28 that there's a like through transportation and health and I think that we're
29 starting to see some of that with these kinds of surveys. Okay, so this
30 question was, what are the three most significant transportation
31 challenges that New Mexico will face over the next 25 years? So they
32 were asked to choose only three. You can see most of the numbers are
33 kind of similar, with the exception of the increase in traffic congestion and
34 the public score higher on that, but like I said they were mostly in the
35 urban areas, so that's probably why that kind of worked out that way. But
36 funding obviously is on everybody's mind. The DOT as well as just
37 everybody I guess. Funding is an issue, we all know that. Aging and
38 deteriorating infrastructure, a lot of our interstates are 50 years old, the
39 bridges are at their max life span. They need to be replaced, it's really
40 expensive to replace a bridge. I think people are kind of understanding
41 that as well. Balancing urban and rural needs that, came through mostly
42 with the RTPO working groups as you can imaging, they're in the more
43 rural areas. The urban areas kind of say, well we collect all the taxes, so
44 why should we be giving money to the rural areas, but also the rural areas
45 don't have the tax base, so they need some help. That was actually

1 discussed quite a bit and we will be looking into that in more detail. Okay,
2 so this question was. What are New Mexico's top three priorities? And
3 again they were asked to choose only three and the majority of the people
4 say that we need to maintain what we already have and that came through
5 the informed stakeholders and the public survey. I think people are
6 realizing that, yeah it would be nice to have a four lane facility in between
7 every single town, but we really need to just focus on maintaining what we
8 have. Again, the traffic congestion, the public survey numbers are really
9 high, but they were in the urban areas, so that kind of makes sense.
10 Transit was something that was discussed quite a bit and it came through
11 really loud and clear (inaudible)...you can see that the numbers are pretty
12 similar between the stakeholders and the public. Everyone thinks that
13 providing more public transit is really important. So, that was kind of
14 interesting. So out of all of the input and all of those surveys, this is
15 basically a summary of kind of what we've heard so far as far as what our
16 vision should be, so we should be providing multi-modal transportation
17 options. We should also be supporting the needs of all system users,
18 maintaining these existing system, improving coordination and leveraging
19 partnerships, and I think a lot of the discussion around that was with the
20 anti-donation clause, and some of the issues that that's maybe causing in
21 doing partnerships between public and private industry. We talked a lot
22 about that and in the regional working groups. And then the last one is to
23 identify a sustainable equitable transportation funding option, so we all
24 realize the gas tax isn't working, we need to kind of think outside of the
25 box on how we're going to fund our transportation and future. Some of the
26 challenges.....funding, I mean that's the big thing, I just hit on it the gas
27 taxes losing purchasing power. Cars are getting more fuel efficient,
28 people are driving less, there's just a whole lot of things happening. We
29 have the debt service, which won't be paid off until 2027. We need to
30 come up with, with interesting ways to fund our transportation system and
31 then I also touched on it earlier, the rural versus the urban. How do you
32 balance the competing priorities there when you have a small town with
33 maybe only ten people living in it? How do you justify to the rest of the tax
34 payers that you need to spend \$5M to upgrade a road to get to those
35 people? So those are some of the things that people identified as
36 challenges for this plan. Also, notice there the modal issues, so the fact
37 that we need to look at more than just to be a (inaudible) in the road, we
38 need to look at everybody and then responding to changing
39 demographics. That came up quite a bit, an interesting fact, so by 2040
40 New Mexico will be the fourth highest state with people over the age of 65
41 in it, so how do we prepare for that. That's definitely a challenge. More
42 challenges.....there's a lot of challenges

43
44 Valencia: Which was that year estimate was again? Please.
45

1 Herrera: By 2040.
2
3 Valencia: Okay.
4
5 Herrera: So improving rural accessibility, the more rural towns that don't have as
6 many options for healthcare, for shopping.....how do we get people from
7 where they live to where they need to go? I think that speaks a lot to the
8 transit kind of aspect of the plan and then the main thing that we need to
9 do is, we need to come back with business as usual, approach that...I
10 think the DOT has formally had. We're becoming a more multi-modal
11 department and we hope to move that way in the future. This is kind of
12 interesting, it's just a quick graphic of what some of the regional priorities
13 are, so this came out of each one of the regional working groups and
14 interestingly enough you'll see in there for Southwest public transportation
15 rural connectivity, the same for South Central so, so transit for the rural
16 communities, is a really....it's a priority for people and I don't think that,
17 that it's something we can ignore anymore. We need to figure out how to
18 make that happen for them, so our overall priorities or what our overall
19 priorities should be according to all of these working groups, there's seven
20 of them, we should preserve and maintain what we have, we should
21 improve public transportation we should also do that by supporting
22 economic development. Address public health and safety needs, so
23 again, this goes back the models split, provide access and mobility for
24 everyone everywhere, so not just to the people live in the state, but our
25 recreational travelers as well. We need to support freight movement and
26 protect and preserve what makes New Mexico special and unique. We
27 have a lot of different cultures here, we have a lot of history here, kind of
28 unique to the Southwest specifically and so we need to make sure that
29 we're preserving that as we move forward as well and Claude Morelli is
30 the project manager for this. He is with NMDOT planning division and
31 there's his contact information, so if you have any questions you can ask
32 me but I might not be able to answer them, so Claude can probably help
33 you better than I can and that's all I have.
34
35 Valencia: Thank you Jolene. Committee have any comments or questions
36 regarding this? I know many of us participated in the actual formal
37 presentation at City Hall last week and we had a good crowd and I think
38 there were a lot of stakeholders that were impressed with the opportunity
39 to provide input and have an effect on the plan, so thank you very much.
40
41 Herrera: Sure.
42
43 Valencia: Anyone? If not, thank you.
44
45 Herrera: Thanks

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Valencia: Tom you want to lead off and maybe get some interaction here?

Murphy: Okay, I do not have any staff comments.

Valencia: Okay. We don't let Andrew talk, so we're alright, so any committee comments? None, okay, thank you.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Harold Love motioned to adjourn.

Greg Walke seconds the motion.

Chair



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

TIP Amendment Spreadsheet
 Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner
 Email from Angie Guerrero, Doña Ana County

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:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00100	2014	NMDOT	I-25 Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved Section of Both Roadways	Road Reconstruction – Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000 in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for construction, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for construction, \$828,000 County Contribution

LC00140	2017	US 70	Intersection with 17 th St.	New Traffic Signals and intersection improvements	New Project
LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (east of Dona Ana Rd, north of Las Cruces)	Design and Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$220,000 in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (west of intersection with Berino Rd)	Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$290,000 in FY2015 for construction

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

CN	FY	Route	Termini	Scope	Funds listed on TIP	Project total	Change
LC00100	2014	I-25	Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	\$13,800,000	\$13,800,000	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon & Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved section of both roadways	Roadway Reconstruction-Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000	\$9,780,000	\$610K in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for const, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for const, \$828,000 County contribution
LC00140	2017	US 70	At intersection with 17th St.	New traffic signal and intersection improvements	\$0	\$750,000	New project
LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (East of Dona Ana Road, North of LC)	Design & Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$0	\$250,000	\$30K in FY2014 for design, \$220K in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (West of int with Berino Rd)	Deisgn and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$0	\$320,000	\$30K in FY2014 for design, \$290K in FY2015 for construction

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Subject: TIP Amendments
Attachments: FY2014 TIP Amendment 4.xls

Good morning Andrew,

Can you please include a TIP Amendment as an action item on the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meetings? You can include this email and the attached spreadsheet as backup documentation.

I am requesting this out of cycle TIP Amendment to add the construction funds to the Central Federal Lands project. The NMDOT Rail Bureau also just released the list of RR crossings they will be working on in FY2014 and FY2015; 2 of these projects are in the MVMPO boundaries and cannot move forward until they are amended into the TIP.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

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

From: Angie Guerrero <angieg@donaanacounty.org>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 10:25 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Robert Armijo; Tom Murphy
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Yes, I apologize for not getting this information to you yesterday. The non-federal match at this time is coming from capital outlay funds.

The following is the breakdown of the funds for the Baylor Canyon/Dripping Springs project:

13-1836 \$250,000 for Baylor Canyon.
13-1838 \$100,000 for Dripping Springs
14-2054 \$828,000 for the whole project

This is a total of \$1,178,000 going towards the required 14.6% non-federal match. I don't have the total project amount but I can get it to you on Tuesday when I am back at the office. If you need it sooner I can probably call and get it to you today if you have a deadline.

Let me know.
Angie

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: [Andrew Wray](#)
Sent: 5/23/2014 10:12 AM
To: [Angie Guerrero](#)
Cc: [Robert Armijo](#); [Tom Murphy](#)
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Ms. Guerrero,

I just wanted to follow up with you regarding the financial information for the County's portion of the Dripping Springs project.

Thanks.

From: Robert Armijo [<mailto:robertar@donaanacounty.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:59 AM
To: Angie Guerrero
Cc: Andrew Wray
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Angie,

Please coordinate with Andrew and get him the information he needs.

Thanks,
Robert

From: Andrew Wray [<mailto:awray@las-cruces.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:37 AM
To: Robert Armijo
Cc: Tom Murphy; Albert Casillas
Subject: Dripping Springs Rd
Importance: High

Hi Robert,

At the BPAC meeting last night, it was brought to the attention of staff that there is a Doña Ana County portion to the Dripping Springs paving project lead by Central Federal Lands.

We need to have the information for the county portion of the project as soon as possible for us to include in our TIP. What we specifically need is the financial information regarding this project.

Thanks.

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



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 2015-2016 Unified Planning Work Program

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation of approval to the Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Draft copy of the proposed 2015-2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) will be provided at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

The UPWP is a biannual document that outlines transportation planning activities to be conducted by MPO Staff as well as processes that MPO Staff will participate in, but not oversee. The UPWP also includes a budget, allocation of staff time and money toward accomplishing the tasks. The UPWP must be in compliance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.3 Transportation Safety and Asset Management Plan

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation of Approval to the Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Updated draft will be distributed at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

Mesilla Valley MPO's Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan (TASM Plan) represents one of the management plans recommended by the MPO's current Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). It is designed as the first step in implementation of coordinated asset management for transportation infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the following agencies: New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), New Mexico State University (NMSU), Doña Ana County, City of Las Cruces and Town of Mesilla.

The overall purpose of this Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan is to develop strategies, projects and tasks for implementation of a management approach to regionalized decision making related to transportation system improvement, maintenance and replacement. This plan has been developed under the framework of MAP-21- Moving Ahead of Progress in the 21st Century Act. MAP-21 is a performance-based program; therefore, a broader purpose of this Plan is to develop a data collection and prioritization process that can be used to evaluate the performance of the transportation planning efforts as they align with the criteria used in MAP-21.

Bohannan Huston, Inc. is currently preparing this Plan for Mesilla Valley MPO.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Arroyo Road/National Monument Impact Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

In light of the recent creation of the Organ Mountains National Monument, concern has been expressed regarding potential impacts to the MPO Thoroughfare network. This item is intended to discuss potential impacts to Arroyo Road, the closest MPO thoroughfare to the national monument.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

7.0 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications

ACTION REQUESTED:

None, this item is for informational purposes only.

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

TIP Amendment Report

Email from Michael Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

DISCUSSION:

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

The following administrative modifications have been performed:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
TL00010	2014-2019	RoadRUNNER Transit	RoadRUNNER Transit Operations	Operating Assistance	Increase in apportionment to \$1,920,435

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

CN: TL00010 **MVMPO - Rec Num:** 18 **NMDOT Dist.:** 1 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** City of Las Cruces
Fed ID: TL00010 **Lead Agency:** City of Las Cruces **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: Proj RoadRUNNER Transit Operations **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$0
Fr: **To:** **Est. Letting:**
Category: Transit TIP Amendment Pending?

Project Desc.: Operating Assistance

Project Phases: Environ. Document Prel. Engr. Design Right-of-way Construction Other **Work Zone:** Exempt

Remarks: Admin mod 5/28/14,

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	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Local Match	\$1,920,435		\$1,920,435		\$1,920,435		\$1,920,435		\$7,681,740		
FTA 5307 (Sm Urb Oper)	\$1,920,435	23	\$1,920,435	23	\$1,920,435	23	\$1,920,435	23	\$7,681,740		
Totals	\$3,840,870		\$3,840,870		\$3,840,870		\$3,840,870		\$15,363,480		

From: Michael Bartholomew
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2014 3:06 PM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy; Lisa Murphy
Subject: FW: FY14 FTA apportionments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Andrew, we will need an adjustment (administrative, I hope) for our FY14 Section 5307 funding in the STIP (TL00010). We use this apportionment in the City's FY15. There is currently an amount of \$1,801,298 in the STIP

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

*Phone: (575) 541-2500
Fax: (575) 541-2733*

It is the mission of RoadRUNNER Transit to provide safe, dependable and convenient transportation services to the citizens of Las Cruces.

From: Alpert, Dan (Heinrich) [mailto:Dan_Alpert@heinrich.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 7:59 AM
To: Michael Bartholomew
Subject: FY14 FTA apportionments

Mike:

Just in case you haven't already seen your FY14 transit apportionments, here's what I saw for Road Runner:

5307 \$1,920,435

These two are managed by NMDOT for the four cities over 50,000 population:

5310/urban \$541,277

5339/urban \$478,827

Please let us know if we can be of assistance.

regards,

dan alpert

p.s., did you see the NOFA for DOT's FY14 TIGER VI grants was released last week? Please let us know if you decide to apply.

