MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
                     Larry Altamirano (LCPS)
                     Bill Childress (BLM)
                     Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works)
                     John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)
                     Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
                     John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)
                     Harold Love (NMDOT)
                     Luis Marmolejo (DAC)
                     Rene Molina (DAC Engineering)
                     Willie Roman (CLC Transportation)
                     Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
                     Greg Walke (NMSU)

MEMBERS ABSENT:     Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
                     Jesus Morales (EBID)

STAFF PRESENT:      Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO staff)
                     Orlando Fierro (MPO staff)
                     Tom Murphy (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT:     Denise Westin, Bohannon-Huston
                     Jennifer Hill, Bohannon-Huston
                     Anna Lauren de la Mora
                     Paul Pompeo, Southwest Engineering
                     Dara Parker, Senator Heinrich’s Office

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Valencia: I would like to call the meeting to order and look at Item number 2, Approval of the Agenda. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the agenda? If so the Chair will entertain a motion for approval.

Walke: So moved.
Bartholomew: Second

Valencia: It's been moved and seconded, any amendments to the agenda? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 May 1, 2014

Valencia: We have a sign-in sheet for the members that have, of the TAC that are here, so we do have a quorum? I want to state that and anyone who makes comments with regard, from the TAC that we introduce ourselves for minute purposes so that the minute taker will have the ability to differentiate who is speaking. That brings us to Item 3, Approval of Minutes, May 1, 2014. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes?

Walke: I have a couple of really tiny corrections. On page 4, line 32-33, it says "one of the things it will have is by next months, next year...". I don't remember which it is, I think they meant by next month, we'll be looking at adopting the updated Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Do you know, Tom, whether that was next month or next year?

Murphy: We will be updating the MTP next year.

Walke: Next year.

Murphy: We've started some public outreach activities sooner but the plan itself will be updated next year, so we'll change that to next year.

Walke: So that should probably say "next year" and then at the top of Page 9, the third line, Missouri was the top "ranked" project, not "tanked".

Valencia: Well, it hasn't tanked yet but there's still an opportunity.

Walke: That's all I had.

Valencia: Any other corrections to the minutes, if not the Chair will entertain a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Walke: So moved.

Bartholomew: Second.
Valencia: Moved and seconded, any other comments, questions or amendments? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Transportation Improvement Program 2014-2019 Amendment

Valencia: Under 5.1 Transportation Improvement Program 2014-2019 Amendment, Mr. Murphy.

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>LC00100</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-25 Missouri Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Reconstruction/Widening &amp; Addition of Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$610,000 in FY2014 for design,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,950,000 in FY2015 for construction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,220,000 in FY2016 for construction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$828,000 County Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G100030</td>
<td>2015 &amp; 2016</td>
<td>Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs Roads</td>
<td>Unpaved Section of Both Roadways</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction – Pave unpaved sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00140</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>Intersection with 17th St.</td>
<td>New Traffic Signals and intersection improvements</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00210</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2015</td>
<td>Goathill Rd</td>
<td>At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (east of Dona Ana Rd, north of Las Cruces)</td>
<td>Design and install new lights and gates at crossing</td>
<td>$30,000 in FY2014 for design, $220,000 in FY2015 for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00220</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2015</td>
<td>NM 226</td>
<td>At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (west of intersection with Berino Rd)</td>
<td>Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates</td>
<td>$30,000 in FY2014 for design, $290,000 in FY2015 for construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Staff is requesting a recommendation of approval on Item 5.1. These are amendments to 2014-2019 TIP. On the particular, particular amendments are outlined starting on page 18 of your packet. Briefly, we’ll quickly run through them, Missouri Bridge, change in terminus; addition of Baylor Canyon Road paving project through the federal lands and the County; a new traffic signal on US 70 and 17th Street by the Department of Transportation; and then two railroad safety crossings by the rail bureau on Goathill Road and NM 226. If you have any more detailed questions on any of those items I’ll try to answer, but essentially those are the amendments that we’re requesting a recommendation to the Policy Committee on.

Valencia: Any member of the Committee have any comments regarding, if not, then I take it you need a motion to approve the TIP amendment. The Chair will look for a motion.

Gwynne: So moved.

Altamirano: Second

Valencia: It’s been moved and seconded, is there any further discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

5.2 FY 2015 - FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program Adoption

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.

Valencia: That brings us to Item 5.2, FY 2015-2016 UPW, Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again we are asking a recommendation of approval to the Policy Committee. This is for the Federal Fiscal Year 2015 and Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Unified Planning Work Program for the MPO. We had it here last month as a discussion item. As you were walking in, I apologize that we didn't get it into your hands sooner, but we handed out to you the updated document from May's meeting. We did have it on our website for, to allow for public comment, for 30 days. Just to highlight the changes, since I stood before you last, if you direct your attention to page 9 of your packet and I'll go down through the table of contents and where the changes have been made. We added, added a line, the Task 1.8 to account for state and federal coordination. Our work with, our typical work interacting with FHWA/FTA and NMDOT, as well as more active participation in the Statewide Long Range Plan update which is ongoing. We added under Item 4.6, an item that somehow we missed, our coordination with the Regional Transit District, that we'll provide planning support as needed to the RTD, as well as attendance of the Board meetings for the RTD. Finally, Item 5.6, we've added the 2014-2015 Urban Sustainability Accelerator. The City of Las Cruces applied for and is going to be receiving some technical assistance through the Urban Sustainability Accelerator program, which is run through the, through Portland State University. The particular focus of this process would be trying to implement complete streets onto El Paseo Road in conjunction with the road safety audit that was conducted a few years back, as well as the City’s area blue print which they worked on last year and was approved through City Council. So this is a grant aiming to further work on El Paseo in order to make it a more complete street and that's in conformance with the MPO's Transportation Plan. Also the big items in Appendix A, we have the budgetary information figured out, starting, which is on page 29. That handles the major changes since this Committee saw this last. I'll stand for any questions.

Valencia: Any member of the Committee have questions for Mr. Murphy?

Walke: In Section 5.6, under responsibilities it lists a NMSU Civil Engineering Department and the College of Engineering. Do you know what the difference in those two are?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Walke, the difference being in them, is the City's been working with several individuals, not only with the MPO of the City and NMSU. Two of the individuals from NMSU, one identified themselves as being in the Civil Engineering Department, and the other one identified
themselves as the College of Engineering. I presume they are more of the Dean’s level office.

Walke: Alright, thanks.

Valencia: Additional questions, any member of the public here to speak on this item?

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Valencia: Jolene.

Herrera: I have a question. Tom, on the budget, on page 29, I’m just looking at your program total there, that $609,000, does that include the funding that you want to rollover from 2014?

Murphy: Yes that will include the anticipated rollover from, particularly from the special projects, the corridor studies, the Short Range Transit Plan that we don’t anticipate completing by October 1.

Herrera: Okay, thank you.

Valencia: Any other questions by any member of the Committee and/or the public? If not, the Chair will entertain a motion.

Herrera: Move to approve.

Valencia: It’s been moved, is there a second.

Bartholomew: Second

Valencia: Any additional discussion, questions for amendments? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

5.3 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan

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.

Valencia: Next is Item 6, Discussion Items, no I apologize, is Item 5.3 the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan and I know we have some guests here that are going to present after your intro, I'm sure, Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have Denise and Jennifer here again. You've seen them a lot throughout the past year. I think they've done a lot of great work for us. What we're asking for this afternoon is for a recommendation from the TAC to the Policy Committee on the adoption of this document, which we hope will help guide us in our planning efforts moving forward. With that I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Denise so she can walk through her presentation.

Valencia: I guess my first point of clarification on the title as I see it, it says Las Cruces MPO.

Westin: I was just going to apologize for that.

Valencia: Well, you can do it twice.

Westin: Old habits die hard. Just grabbed an old presentation and grabbed the wrong front screen, so good afternoon Chair and Committee members and again I apologize for that. We are here, and we appreciate the opportunity to be here one more time to be bringing you the final edits to the Mesilla Valley MPO Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan, known as the TASM Plan. So we, I'm not going to go through the whole asset management process again, we've all been through that. We've been a great team on this. We have actually, really appreciated your support on this process and what I'm going to do this afternoon is just sort of respond to the comments that I heard at the last meeting, and the comments we've received in the emails since then. So a quick overview, we edited the EBID maps, we enhanced the signage section, included some transit criteria, developed a section on drainage infrastructure, and then did some outreach and created an entire section and a recommendation on an asset management leadership committee. So the
EBID, I made you a copy of the sections we changed. I didn’t recreate the entire document in this draft form because I figure you have the one from last time. If you have any comments today I’m still willing to integrate them in quickly before we make a final version, hopefully, upon your approval, for the Policy Committee next week and then at that time I will make sure that I bring enough hard copies of the final version for Tom, for all of you to have after that time. So I just created paper versions of the actual sections that we made the edits to, so that you feel comfortable being able to review those and give your approval on those particular sections. So we worked closely with Chowdhury and Orlando and made sure that we had the correct reference and the correct, you know, reference to the EBID trails and we removed those and referenced them in a way that felt more comfortable to both of those agencies. Then we had one comment on the signage and Mr. Gwynne, if we did not respond to this as you had requested please clarify for me, but I felt that your concern was really about making sure that that reference to signage was comprehensive, and that. So what I did was I went back in and I made a clarification that the signage is an asset, that is, both can be regulatory, directional, informational and that in fact it does require a considerable cost and does need to be considered under the asset management process, but that each agency individually can determine how best to incorporate which signs they want to include. So does the Town of Mesilla want to include all of their way finding signs or do they just want to include their regulatory signs? I mean, I think under the federal guidelines, under MAP21, that you’d have to include sort of your regulatory signs, but it would be an individual decision at an agency level on whether you wanted to include informational signs or way finding signs, but does that address your comment?

Gwynne: Yes, very good thank you.

Westin: And then, Mr. Bartholomew was really great and gave us all of these sort of really specific decision making questions and criteria he uses to determine where transit sites are located. I know they’re tiny on our screen, they’re not really for you to read, as much as for you to see that he has an integral list of criteria that he uses on a daily basis to make that decision. I put that in the plan. I think that’s really important. Those are the, that’s the level of effort that each individual agency might want to go to at, for each asset, as it’s appropriate. So at the end of the day the great words of wisdom, the sites with the fewest constraints are usually, you know, built first, or they get the improvements done most quickly. So, does that address your comment?

Bartholomew: Uh huh.
Westin: Good and then Harold absolutely gave us the comment to include drainage infrastructure and it wasn’t one of our original assets. It didn’t come through the scope, it wasn’t identified in isolation, it does sort of, you know, it is considered under curb and gutter, it is considered in broad costs on road ways, but what I did was I built an entire section on drainage infrastructure so that we could really identify the value of it as an asset in its own right, and so that we can address the costs and the risks impacts from it, but given the fact that they are so, you know, there’s such a variation of drainage infrastructure that can be either be a standalone project or another component of another asset. I didn’t go through in this TASM plan and evaluate the costs, the lifecycle, the lifecycle costs, or the risks for each drainage type, but I did recommend at agency level that you do that under your asset management plan implementation and that, associated with that you would have to develop your own inventory and inspection process for each of those drainage infrastructure types. I think the most unique thing about the drainage infrastructure is that sometimes they’re done as part of a transportation project and sometimes they’re done separately on their own. So that is, that is actually you know, a way for on a regional basis, where you can sort of corral that together and really make that connection of getting those drainage projects done in association with your transportation projects. Not only do you make the implementation more effective, you can consider additional funding sources for those drainage projects, and I think all of that really helps you build sort of an asset management approach to drainage infrastructures that’s slightly unique, compared to the other assets which are a little bit more black and white. Jennifer handed out a copy of that chapter, so if you have any concerns about it over the next day or so you have 24 hours. Don’t hesitate if it doesn’t, if it doesn’t feel right to you, you just let me know and we’ll add some wording or we’ll expand it a little bit and make sure that it’s addressing that drainage infrastructure as an asset. And then I think the biggest piece that we added was the recommendation to create this asset management leadership team and it was a request of the Committee to do a little bit more research on this and we did, and we went ahead and did a peer review with the Ohio Department of Transportation, who has one of the most successful asset management leadership teams in the nation, and they were really gracious, actually, and spent quite a bit of time on the phone with us chatting about how they developed it and how well it works. No big surprise, they have the same sort of group of stakeholders that we’ve identified here. They have FHWA and the Department of Transportation Districts involved, the Council of Governments Regional Planning. They have it broken down into three levels, you can see there, where the Asset Management Leadership Team is everybody, they have a smaller executive level component of that, which is the decision, which you know really does the hard work, they meet on a monthly basis, and they make, they make the recommendations, and then a very small group of the IT Council, which
actually makes the final decisions on that. So how they got this started is they invited all the stakeholder agencies they could think of to the group, to the first kick-off meeting. So there were hundreds, you know, like a lot of people at this meeting, but then just sort of to give everybody the information and the education on what asset management is. But then they were really clear with these agencies that they had to pick two representatives, that’s, they got two representatives, two slots, because they wanted to make sure that they brought consistency and commitment, and accountability at the agency level for this Asset Management Leadership Team. So at the end of the day, they have about that 35 member executive level component that meets on a monthly basis and gets things done. So some of the work that they did, they did at the beginning as a leadership team, has already been done here in the TASM plan. You know, we, as a group here, developed goals, we have the stakeholder lists completed, we’ve evaluated your data gaps, the assets that you’re going to want to cover, so you have a really good start with this TASM plan and you’re ready to move right on into collecting that adequate data, creating those consistent parameters so you can make those prioritization decisions and the best news of all, is there wasn’t really any extra funding allocated to this process. They really just went to the agencies and requested the time commitment from the staff members and the leadership to be on that to be a part of that leadership team. So I’m not saying it’s free but it is a measure of a time commitment at the agency level. So the primary tasks and the greatest benefits from developing a management leadership team is to really engage in that regional prioritization process, as you know, which is the greatest benefit from doing asset management at a regional level. The other interesting thing that the Ohio DOT did was to create sort of an objective evaluation of the needs so that you wouldn’t be pitting agencies against agencies and assets against assets, is that they actually did a survey, sort of an anonymous survey on asset, on the needs assessment for each asset and that way the data came back to make the comparison and it wasn’t necessarily provided by somebody’s strong political drive on which assets needed to rise to the top. So they found that to be a very productive way. They literally just used Survey Monkey and they worked with the university and they found some good connections with the university, and they collected the data to help them prioritize their needs. Then, obviously, to have the ability to have a leadership team that can maintain that regional coordination, can bring validity to those decisions and really keep the asset management data updated and establish a, you know, a local and a regional spot to keep the data. I know that question came up last time and Tom graciously offered that the MPO would be happy to do that but I won’t commit him to that. But something like that, so that it’s all in one location and there’s not confusion about where that data is being collected. So those are the edits that we did. We’re pretty excited to be able to finalize the plan for you and but we’re happy, like I said, we’re happy to take any
comments on those edits, anything else we can do to make this plan work for you, we’re happy to hear about that tonight.

Valencia: Any questions from our Committee? I do have one, in the data collection and all of that, is there a monetary amount that is provided to the assets and if so, is there a depreciation or replacement kind of value to the, in totality of what, what you discovered in your inventory?

Westin: Absolutely, I mean we gave some samples in the plan itself on sort of cost to certain assets and that is the, one of the most beneficial questions you can ask, is when is it most valuable to replace that asset and when you know, cause it’s a lot more valuable or it’s a lot more beneficial financially to get in earlier, do maintenance, keep things updated than it is to wait ‘til the end and have to replace the entire asset. So we gave some samples in the TASM plan that would actually, that are real estimates on cost, based on engineering data. But certainly the agencies would have to get in and look at their historic expenditures and really enhance that component when they’re actually implementing asset management. Does that answer your question? So for like drainage infrastructure I didn’t go in and give cost, I didn’t give approximate cost for that just because of the various, you know, wide range of potential drainage infrastructure required. But when they’re implementing the asset management plan they would have to really take some time to

Valencia: There’s a tradeoff between doing a new project or utilizing that same source of funding for maintenance. Greater longevity out of the use of the...

Westin: Totally. Right and historically those decisions had been made in isolation, in separate silos right? You have your maintenance decisions made over here, and your capital improvement projects made over here. But one of the goals of asset management is to marry that decision making process, for the better use of public funds and the better level of service provided to your residents.

Valencia: In the business world they utilize depreciation and that for tax advantage and things of that nature. In the private, in the public sector, it’s for replacement.

Westin: Right. I don’t think you’re going to get any tax cuts.

Valencia: Any other comments?

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Valencia: Jolene.
Herrera: I just have a question, I guess it's more general, how do you see the asset management leadership team working within the MPO? Because I think you did a really good job. I just read through it briefly, outlining what Ohio DOT did, but on a smaller scale within this MPO, do you kind of see the Policy Committee being like the executive.

Westin: I think you can set it up anyway you want and I think that's a really good point, that you may only need two components of that triangle, right. Because you're not going to get more than 30 people on your larger piece of your stakeholders. So yeah, I do think and absolutely if you want to double up and have your Policy Committee be your decision making group, then you're not asking extra efforts from people, you know, and you could really keep this TAC as your sort of asset management leadership team if you felt comfortable and you felt like it was comprehensive enough, you could do it at that that level. But that's really your decision or you might find benefit from grabbing, maybe an additional staff member for each of these agencies so that you have the extra leg work that you need, somebody else who's really able to spend the time and the effort, doing the data collection and understanding what's going on at the, you know, at the staff level, combined with your TAC representative and then together that's your committee and then you go to the Policy Committee to get your decisions made.

Herrera: Thanks and I guess, if I could extend the question over to Tom, how, have you thought about how, kind of the implementation of this plan will go?

Murphy: I think what Denise alluded to; I think it would really start with this Committee. This Committee historically has been who we've relied on for the expertise. I don't really see, you know, expertise lying in different areas, maybe supplemented by additional members of your agencies but I think informally this Committee has historically been that and I think formalizing it and just making it move forward into a usable work product.

Herrera: Thanks. The reason that I'm kind of asking this question is because, as you both know, the State is also working on an asset management plan and I think you guys are ahead of the game in that and it's just some ideas to think about how you're going to about implementing it, so maybe we can see how that's going to work on a smaller scale and try to scale it up. So let's not recreate the wheel right?

Westin: Right and as we have mentioned several times, whatever you do at this level really does need to align directly and coordinate with whatever is being done at the state level to make sure that you are in federal compliance, if nothing else.
Valencia: Any additional comments or discussion? Mr. Murphy you want approval of this, I assume. The staff recommendation?

Murphy: Yes, we're asking for recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Valencia: The Chair will entertain a motion for 5.3, the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan.

Altamirano: So moved.

Gwynne: Second.

Valencia: It's moved and seconded, any further discussion amendments? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All Approved.

Valencia: Thank you Denise.

Westin: Thank you and I do want to thank you. It's actually been a very enjoyable project, so we appreciate the opportunity.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Arroyo Road/Nation Monument Impact 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.

Valencia: Going to the next item, Item 6.1 Discussion Item, Arroyo Road National Monument Impact discussion. Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. As many of you are aware since we last met, there was announcement of the new national monument designation for the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Park. We looked at it and we were also specifically requested by the City that we evaluate its impact on the existing MPO plans. Happy to say there's only one, even close impact and that's, you'll see on the screen, we got a snap shot out of the proposed or the functional classification proposed Thoroughfare Plan, which shows that proposed Arroyo Road is a proposed principal arterial that crosses the pre-existing BLM recreation area and the monument boundaries are close to within that area. So the question being was where does this proposed right-of-way cross over the monument proper and what impacts would that have to our planning
process. As you can see from the zoomed out version of the Thoroughfare Plan, is that Arroyo Road does, has been planned to be a very important connection for the region, connecting the Dona Interchange to I-25 in the West, eastward up the East Mesa, ultimately ending as a principal arterial at Weisner Road, which is proposed to be a major north south for the region in connectivity to the US 70 points further east. Also with the major development known as Metro Verde, immediately east of the proposed monument area, this facility could provide traffic relief to US 70, which is, we know is right now one of our most heavily traveled thoroughfares. So, working with the staff from Senator Heinrich’s office and from Mr. Childress at the BLM, we’ve gotten some more information about how those boundaries line up and this one, I appreciate this photo of Mr. Childress’. The Arroyo Road, it connects into the Desert Wind alignment as it ultimately goes onto the Dona Ana Interchange. With this monument boundary, you see that the dirt road of Desert Wind Way is outside the monument boundary and then it would connect here. You can see the golf course in the upper right hand corner of that picture and then here’s a zoomed out view. We have that, so essentially we’re here today to discuss whether we want to move forward with doing any kind of amendments to the Thoroughfare Plan or do we feel that the, or feel that it’s adequate as is. I think I’d like to open it up for discussion.

Valencia: What is the timeframe for the expected build out of Arroyo Road? I mean I know there have been many discussions over the years of the so called “loop” system in Las Cruces that is a component of it, also from Santa Teresa up to the airport, is the discussion of the West Mesa Road, and that. What are the estimates of that really becoming a roadway?

Murphy: As with most of the proposed thoroughfares on our system plan, it’s mostly been a matter of the function of how development proceeds. Development builds our thoroughfare system and then turns its over to the respective governments for maintenance. This particular section of Arroyo Road goes through federal land that we now know absolutely will not be disposed of, so it will continue to cross public lands. There’s really no funding source lined up for that section of Arroyo Road now, and then I guess if I can kind of just reference the TIP amendment that you voted on earlier this meeting, the paving of Baylor Canyon Road, that’s something that the federal lands recently, recently was able to, or came up with the funding to pave that roadway even though it’s been a widely used roadway within our region for, I would say decades. So the short answer is there’s nothing programmed for it, so I cannot give a timeframe and I’ll defer to Mr. Childress if he knows more than I do.

Childress: As far as the buildup of the road, I haven’t heard any, there’s no indications that there’s movement in the direction, we haven’t received a right-of-way. But I would like to reaffirm the position that the road is
outside of the recent monument that was established through proclamation and even if it wasn’t there’s language in the proclamation that allows us upgrade or improve existing rights-of-ways. This is probably viewed as a revised statute, 2477 route; the counties and cities are allowed to improve prior to FLPMA, which was established in 1976. So those are claims and we view those as valid claims until they’re adjudicated or we receive a FLPMA title 5 right-of-way applications, which we’re able to approve it through that process. So the road is, the edge of the road on its north side, we view that as the boundary for the new national monument. So the road can be improved to the south or it can even be improved in the edge of the nation monument because of the language in the proclamation.

Valencia: That was going to be my next question, is there anything prohibiting the buildup? So that answers that. Any other questions?

Marmolejo: Where is it, more or less, is it that area in green above, in the Goathill area, or where about are you talking about?

Murphy: If you can see the arrow, this is the Goathill itself. Currently Desert Wind exists as an unpaved roadway serving some single family residential uses and then it continues eastward. This appears to be the current trail head parking lot for the BLM recreational area and it gets a little narrower as you proceed eastward but it’s still discernable, and it heads in towards the Metro Verde and then you see the new golf course there on the upper right hand side of that.

Valencia: You satisfied Luis? Any other questions? I guess my comment, as far as moving forward on this, it’s obvious that it isn’t imminent, and it’s not an emergency, so I mean we have time to, you know, take it at another meeting for further discussion. Is that what you’re looking for?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, this was placed on the agenda at the request of the City. They’re currently working on a special assessment district for building of roads in Metro Verde and I think that there was some concern that the roadway would have to dead end at the monument boundaries and would not be improved further, but viewing the information that I’ve learned since we’ve placed this on the agenda today and I would view this as really a non-issue and that it could be.....

Valencia: We’ve just been briefed and we have no objection of it moving forward on the City level.

Murphy: We’re not asking for any action, it’s a discussion item, but if anybody thought that it merited a closer look, we could continue to study that and bring it back to further, to future meetings. But as of this point, if staff were
to give a recommendation, I think we would recommend that the
Thoroughfare Plan remain unchanged in this regard.

Gwynne: Mr. Childress I have a question. I believe BLM has, what, three to five
years to put together the operation and maintenance plan for the
monument. Would this be included as part of that plan because it’s right
on the boundary?

Childress: Yes, we’ll probably take about five years, we’ll take about five years to
develop a land use management plan, which will make decisions on
designating routes that exist within the monument boundaries. We’ll have
to sort of think about this a little bit in terms of where the road exists and
whether or not the road would need to be expanded into the boundary of
the monument versus on its edge. If it’s on the edge we wouldn’t, it
wouldn’t depend on that land use planning process to make that decision.
But also, in saying that, I think that any plans to move forward with an
application, what we call a Title 5 right-of-way application from the City or
whomever, we could still move forward with processing that request. Very
similar to what we’re doing on the Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs,
we’ve got the FLAP funding to pave those two small segments of each of
those roads and our plans are to move forward even though they’re in the
middle of the national monument. All the other routes out there that BLM
is responsible for, roads, trails, all of those remain open and of use until
we go through the land use planning process as well.

Gwynne: Thank you very much.

Valencia: What is the pleasure of the Committee? Mr. Murphy?

Murphy: I don’t know if there are any members of the public that would like to
speak to this.

Valencia: We’ll open it up for public discussion right now on Item 6.1. Do we have
members from the public that would care to make comment specifically on
this item? With none being seen, or I see some movement in the
audience. Just state your name for the record.

Parker: I’m Dara Parker, I’m with Senator Heinrich’s office. I just wanted to,
actually before the Committee, thank Tom for his work with, it was then
Senator Bingaman’s office, and working through that area and making
sure that we had the information from your Thoroughfare Plan to make
sure that everything was compatible as well and so I’m glad things are still
shaking out the way it was intended. But I did just want to thank everyone
for their work on that.
Valencia: Thank you. Do we have any other member of the public that cares to make comment on this item? Seeing none, Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: That concludes my presentation, and unless there is any compelling need, I don’t think that we’ll look at this again unless it’s requested separately.

Valencia: Thank you. Well I think the Committee concurs with you, so we’ll allow it to maintain its path.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Valencia: We’ll go ahead and close discussion on that, we’ll move to Item 7, Committee and Staff Comments. Any member of the Committee have any announcement, comments, or anything with regard to the area that your represent? I have one. The Regional Transit District is rolling out South Valley service on Monday, on South Main Street, Highway 28, Chaparral, and Sunland Park area. I want to thank the DOT, Mr. Loven, Jolene for your efforts in assisting us with our signage, and we’re looking forward to providing public transit service in this region. Our schedules can be seen on scrtd.org starting next Monday, and they can call 855-RTDBUSS.

Herrera: Mr. Chair?

Valencia: Yes, Ms. Herrera.

Herrera: I guess I’ll follow up your comment about NM28, specifically. We had a couple of public meetings over the last two weeks about that roadway. We’re going to be starting a chip seal project on it, on June 16, and the reason that I wanted to bring it up for you specifically and then for Mr. Altamirano, is because we’re going to have a pilot car operation.

Valencia: A what car?

Herrera: A pilot car operation, we’ll have lane drops, so it’ll be one lane in each direction, with a pilot car to lead traffic through, so expect, probably, 20-30 minute delays, in four mile section.

Valencia: And beginning on June...

Herrera: June 16.

Valencia: And how long is that going to run?

Herrera: So far the project manager has said that we should only be out there about 13 or 14 days on the road. So it’s going to go really quick, but just be aware that for a couple of weeks we’re going to have that going on and
the schedule right now is from 7:00 a.m. until about 5:00 p.m. They might
go longer to finish up on time.

Valencia: Can you provide me your contractor information so that I can have our
people to have a clearer understanding as how these detours or delays
would impact our service, so we that we can get a rider notice out to the
affected parties?

Herrera: Sure.

Valencia: Thank you.

Herrera: Oh, I guess I should clarify that we’re chip sealing the entire section of
roadway and we’re starting at the Texas state line and working our way
into town.

Valencia: That’s only heart attack number 57 this week for me so.

Herrera: Well. I thought you should know now instead of encountering it out on the
road.

Valencia: Which I totally appreciate.

Altamirano: Mr. Chair?

Valencia: Mr. Altamirano.

Altamirano: I have a question for Jolene. So then the starting date, June 16 and then
for possibly, let’s say twenty days, which would put us into the end of July
and stuff, in looking at pilot car situation, where that is determined by the
amount of vehicles that going one way or the other, if we have to turn
around, you’re not blocking off any of the access roads to it, correct? I
mean, you’re not going to close off any roads?

Herrera: Not that I’m aware of, no. That wasn’t discussed at the public meetings
and I’m pretty sure the project manager would have brought it up
specifically. I don’t think we’re going to have any side streets closed at all,
it’s just going to be leading people slowly through the construction.

Altamirano: So we can get in and out still without any particular problem? Okay, thank
you.

Herrera: I can get you information on the contractor as well. Bridget Spedalieri, you
both know her, she’s coordinating.
Altamirano: Right, I missed it, I was out of town. They had the public hearing, but. Thank you.

Valencia: Any other members of the Committee have any comments?

Knopp: Just a reminder, we don’t meet in July, right?

Murphy: That’s correct.

Valencia: Mr. Murphy, any, you or your staff have comments?

Murphy: Mr. Knopp got my only one.

Valencia: Then I’ll close committee and staff comments, unless I see another hand.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT — No public comment

Valencia: With that we’ll go to public comments, a second time during the course of the meeting that we allow any member of the general public to make comment. Does any member of the general public care to speak on any issue that was not on today’s agenda? If not, we’ll close public comment. And that brings us to adjournment.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Valencia: The Chair will take a motion to adjourn.

Walke: Mr. Chair I do have a question. In my packet there was another agenda item which was part of the TIP program modifications. Was that included in our vote on the TIP modifications?

Valencia: Under 5.1?

Walke: It’s called agenda Item 7.0, and it has to do with an increase in apportionment in Roadrunner Transit.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Walke, I apologize that I didn’t make that clear, that I didn’t explain that under staff comments. These are TIP administrative modifications that the agencies are allowed to process without approval from the Board. They happen rather frequently and we’ve been providing them in your packets as informational items.

Walke: So this is just for information?
Murphy: Right, yeah, and we didn't think that it rose to the level of discussion unless there's a specific question but we wanted you to have the information.

Walke: Thank you.

Valencia: No other comments, Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mike Bartholomew motioned to adjourn.

Greg Walke seconds the motion.

All approved.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Chair