The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held January 13, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the Mesilla Valley MPO website.

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** Chair
2. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS** Chair
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** Chair
   
   Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee Member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** Chair
5. **CONSENT AGENDA*** Chair
   
   6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Chair
      
      6.1. *December 9, 2015 MPO Staff
6. **ACTION ITEMS** Chair
   
   7.1. *Resolution 16-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2015 Calendar Year by the Mesilla Valley MPO MPO Staff
   
   7.2. Resolution 16.02: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue Phase A report BHI

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** Chair
   
   8.1. Arrowhead Research Park Presentation Wayne Savage
   
   8.2. Interstate Access Request Training MPO Staff
   
   8.3. FY 17/ FY 18 UPWP Discussion MPO Staff

8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** Chair

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** Chair

10. **ADJOURNMENT** Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held December 9, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers at City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)  
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)  
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)  
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (Arrived 1:54)  
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)  
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)

MEMBERS ABSENT:  
Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)  
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

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

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

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:06 p.m.)

Flores:  Okay. I'm going to call this meeting to order and we'll have a roll call and determination of quorum.

Murphy:  District Engineer Doolittle.

Doolittle:  Here.

Murphy:  Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez:  Here.

Murphy:  Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett:  Here.

Murphy:  Trustee Flores.

Flores:  Here.
2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Flores: So does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda and if so …

Sorg: Just the agenda first

Flores: Oh.

Sorg: Inaudible.

Flores: Okay. That's right. So we would like to remove Item 7.4: The Committee Training because we’re not prepared for that so can I do that on my own without a vote since we’re …

Murphy: I, I think you just, "Any objections," and …

Flores: Are there any objections? Seeing none. We'll just remove that. Okay. All right.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: Then moving forward to Public Comment. Is there anyone in the public that would like to make a comment? Okay. Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Flores: And we'll move to the Consent Agenda. So.
Sorg: Move to approve the Consent Agenda.

Garrett: Second.

Flores: Second from Billy Garrett and the first was with Councilor Sorg. Okay. And those include Approval of the Minutes. Oh. Oh, I need a vote. Sorry. The motion is made. Okay.

Murphy: You like a roll call or …

Flores: Please. Yeah.

Murphy: Okay. District Engineer Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Flores: All right. So that's approved.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *October 14 2015

VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 * Resolution 15-10: A Resolution Adopting the 2015 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects

VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6.2 * Resolution 15-11: A Resolution Adopting the 2016 MPO Meeting Calendar

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6.3 Resolution 15-12: A Resolution Amending the FY17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Flores: So we'll move, Action Items, Resolution 15-10: A Resolution Adopting the Annual Listing of Obligated Projects.

Murphy: We are on to 6.3: Resolution 15-12. The first two items were on Consent …


Murphy: Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. The Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP is the annual or, or biannual work program that the MPO adopts, directs projects that, that MPO staff works on in partnership with other agencies and then on, on our own. We adopted the, we adopted the Work Program for two fiscal years back in, in April of 2014 and the purpose of this Amendment is to essentially move unexpended, unexpended funditures, unexpended funds from Fiscal Year 2015 into Fiscal Year 2016 for the primary purpose of finish, completing the work on the University Avenue Study Corridor and the Missouri Avenue Study Core, Corridor and then we're also putting a little more detail into the modeling work that we are doing as part of that and I am looking for the … and there was, there was a, supposed to be a document in your packet but it did not, I'm going to see if I can pull that up onto the screen. So the, what the Amendment will prove and I'm going to try and pull, pull it up is it will have 73, move $73,699 of our planning funds and the associated $12,599 of the local match and then $29,113 of FTA5303 funds and its seven, $7,278 local match from the '15 budget to the '16 budget. And if anybody has any questions while I, I try to bring that up though I don't have any more substantial information than what's included in the discussion on page 40 of the packet.
Flores: All right. Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Mr. Murphy. Were you anticipating the possibility that this could go over a two-year period when, when this was put together?

Murphy: Yeah, yes we did and we anticipated some, some amount of slide but we also, we also knew that we had the amendment process in place in order to address it once we knew what the final numbers were from fiscal year to fiscal year.

Garrett: I, I guess I'm wondering whether there were any conditions that had to do with actually getting the work done that were different than what you'd anticipated when this was started.

Murphy: Yes. Yes there were. In part, you know and then, and then of course it, and then there are some conditions that we, I guess we consciously took. We knew that you know if we kept you know this, you, you know if kept communication with NMDOT which is the you know which is the responsible party monitor, overseeing the grant we took a deliberate public process. We didn't want to, we didn't try to rush these projects through and so when, when we had various conflicts and the timeline slipped we know we allowed that to happen in the interest of you know, you know these, these, you know they're planning studies not emergency fixes so there's no impetus to really get it done fast especially since we knew that we had a very good chance of being able to, to move the money in which working with NMDOT they allow that.

Garrett: Okay. Madam Chair. Just two other questions.

Flores: Okay.

Garrett: One is: What are the implications of the study in terms of future work being done? Am I correct in assuming that this will identify things that we should be applying for funding for in, in the future?

Murphy: The, the results of these, of these studies actually kind of narrows, narrows down the alternatives that we would have to look at further so it would help control the costs. We've all, you know we, it means we've already established a public participation process whereby we know, we know better what, what the public is more willing to support and we can, we can devote resources to study more in-depth the narrower range of alternatives than we would've been able to otherwise.

Garrett: My, my point is that once we get down to a preferred alternative there's a need to have the resources to implement that alternative, correct? We don't have the money yet?
Murphy: The funding that goes through the MPO is really not eligible, it's planning funding.

Garrett: Right.

Murphy: And it's not eligible to precede this. I think what we've done with the planning funds available was we, we have advanced these projects as far as we could given the type of funding that, that is identified in our work program, the PL funding.

Garrett: So when we're finished with this planning work we'll be able to put together project proposals for implementation, right?

Murphy: Yes.

Garrett: And in terms of the timing to get that done, is that being reflected in whatever the, the schedule is now to finish this planning? Because if, if we miss the window, I, I mean this, these cycles are on an annual basis to apply for funding for implementation, right? And it's often that we, we get in there but we still, we're, we're several years out for implementation, right?

Murphy: I, I think we'll, we'll still have to compete with, with other projects for the …

Garrett: Right.

Murphy: For the construction funding. I think the, the end result of having done this with the funds that we're able you know to do what we were able to do, it does put some of these, it puts them, gives them a little bit of a leg up on, on the other projects because they have, they have been advanced to, and the term is through the Phase A portion of the, of the study corridor procedures. And let's see if I can translate, translate that. NMDOT is, has developed what they call A, Phase A, B, and C reports in, in conducting study corridors and, and Phase A is the, you know the initial screening of alternatives which we're doing and FHWA allowed us to use our planning money for that. Phase, Phase B is going to look at more in-depth engineering issues in regards to you know alternatives along the alignment and then Phase C really handles more design and design documents up until getting it ready to, for conclusion and I, I look to Mr. Doolittle if I summarized that appropriately.

Doolittle: Madam Chair. Basically what Tom has said is correct. Once we finish the Phase A we will need to move forward with Phase B but really the intent and even the District is taking this, this position is if we can get these studies it really does offer a, offer us a leg up and other options for
potential funding. Later on, on my project discussion you'll see that we've
got several studies going through the same, exact same process. For
instance when ARA came out it was about shovel-ready and so it was, this
is the first step towards getting, getting ready for something like that, you
know if another district for instance doesn't spend their money if we've got
stuff on the shelf ready to go it allows us to, to you know use some of that
funding for the benefit of us so Tom's right, it, it, it's really a leg up but we
would still have to go through Phase B and C after we do a Phase A.

Flores: Go ahead.

Garrett: Madam Chair. The, the point I'm trying to make and, and not to belabor
this but we generally are on an annual cycle in terms of applying for
project implementation funds.

Flores: Right.

Garrett: Is that correct or do, we can do that almost any time?

Doolittle: For which funding category?

Garrett: For any funding category that would come out of this study. Here, here's
the, my, my basic question is: Does the timing of getting this study done
have any implication in terms of our being able to compete for subsequent
implementation funds?

Doolittle: Jolene, do you have …

Garrett: And I have never, I've, I guess what I'm saying is I've never heard of a
process where you go through studies and it doesn't matter when you get
done in terms of your application to get implementation money so you
could potentially lose an entire year if you, if you blew your schedule and
had it, and had the timing wrong.

Doolittle: I, I think Jolene, understanding the planning process may have something
she can offer.

Herrera: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett. There really isn't an annual funding
cycle. The MPO process updates their, well they update their, their
Transportation Improvement Program, their TIP every two years. So it's
really sort of a bi-annual or however you say that, every two years is the
cycle. The point I think that you're trying to get at is a good one. The fact
of the matter is that the, the funding that you're looking at here is for the
Phase A only. Funding for Phases B and C and then possibly even final
design have not been identified yet so those would still need to be
undertaken before a project could be applied for.
Garrett: Okay. I, I would recommend that staff look very closely at the timing in terms of working out the schedule to complete Phase A so that we are able to optimize getting B, C, and then being able to compete for money to implement whatever is, is determined. Thank you.

Flores: Did you …

Sorg: Madam Chair.

Flores: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Mr. Murphy. Could you tell us what VSIUM stands for?

Murphy: No I can't. It's a, it's a, it's a software program. I believe the acronym is German. It, it's from a company called PTV. The, the software it's a computer program that takes input from our employment and housing numbers and it uses that in conjunction with the traffic counts that we do and what we do is we try and, we try and model what the traffic flow is based, based on the socioeconomic inputs. Once, and we, we put that together, calibrate that. Once we calibrate that we can use it as a tool for predicting what happens if we have growths, you know if we have growth in the, in the housing sector or the employment sector, or if we add a new, a new roadway or, or we can see how, we can see how that may affect the, the traffic flows in the region.

Sorg: Thank you. That helps, yeah. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. So could I have a motion to approve the resolution or does anybody else have a question? Could I have a motion to approve the resolution?

Garrett: So moved.

Hancock: Second.

Flores: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Garrett and seconded by Commissioner Hancock. All right. Shall we vote? Is there any, well I think I asked that. Oh. Is there further to discussion? Okay, none. Seeing none we'll take a vote.

Murphy: District Engineer Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Flores: All right.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

6.4 Resolution 15-13: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to Sign a MOU between the MVMPO and the Camino Real Consortium

Flores: All right so moving to 6.4: Resolution 15-13: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to Sign MOU between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the Camino Real Consortium. We do not have a, the MOU, the final MOU to bring that I thought we could at least discuss the issue.

Sorg: I'll move to approve this Resolution.

Flores: Sorry?

Sorg: I move to approve this Resolution.

Garrett: Second.

Flores: Well shall we have discussion? Anybody …

Sorg: Please explain what the MOA is.

Flores: MO, want to have a crack at that?

Garrett: Madam Chair.
Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: The, the MPO has been a party to the Camino Real Consortium over the last three and a half years as work was done on the Sustainable Communities Grant that we got from HUD and that project is now done but we have all the products that have been generated and what this does is to reestablish the relationship between the MPO and the Consortium on a continuing basis for implementation of those plans and of support for further regional planning that's consistent with those principles. There are, one of the important things that's different here is that there's no obligation or commitment relative to a given grant. Now the, the MPO was separate from that because of the status of, of the MPO and its funding but in general the MPOs that we're look, or the, the MOAs, MOUs that we're looking at are, MOU, would allow for groups to form more specific agreements for it, for, for either applying for, for grants or for their implementation. But, but so this is more that in principle we're going to continue to work together on, on the regional plan.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner.

Flores: So any further discussion? All right then shall we take a vote?

Murphy: District Engineer Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.
MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Flores: Okay. So that's passed.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 University Avenue Study Corridor

Flores: And we'll move along to Discussion Items: 7.1 University Avenue Study Corridor.

Murphy: Okay Madam, Madam Chair. We are going to be wrapping up the, or we're anticipating wrapping up the University Avenue Study Corridor. We had a presentation at, at TAC last week giving the, kind of the final wrap-up of the alternatives that we plan to put into the Phase, the Phase A report. We will be having it back here next month for a, for recommended approval so that, that Phase A will be, will be wrapped up by this time next month. We, let's see I, I did have the, the presentation that we showed at TAC last week but apparently I've broken the computer so I, I can have that e-mailed to you but …

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: Essentially we're going to be recommending that two alternatives plus of course the no-build alternative before it for further, you know for the Phase, to the Phase B process. We've done some excellent work. We've had a lot of communication with Elephant Butte Irrigation District about co-use of some of those facilities so I think that the, that the public process that we held on this, on this project has really set us up to, to really advance that corridor and as, as Mr. Doolittle said you know it'll, it'll put that project up on, give it a leg up on others when competing for funding.

Flores: Okay. Thank you. Any comments? Okay. We're going to try the, to reboot your, the computer to see if we can get it up.

Murphy: I've tried. I, I …

Flores: Done that.

Murphy: I don't have the button up here for it. I've tried Alt Control Delete and Escape and …

Flores: All right. Okay. So that's done. So all right.
7.2 Missouri Avenue Study Corridor

Flores: So then we'll move along to the Missouri Avenue Study Corridor and …

Murphy: Missouri Avenue Study Corridor, we held the, the first public meeting for that last week. Kind of get, get the initial, initial reaction from the public as far as what they'd like to see into that area. The, our consultant is putting together notes from that meeting, accepting the comment, comment cards on it. We've also had stakeholder meetings, particularly with the public school in this regard being a main player due to the proximity and, of Centennial High School to, to the corridor. Mr. Wray was, represented the MPO at that meeting and I, I'll ask him if he'd like to add anything or his perceptions of how that meeting went.

Flores: Sure.

Wray: Thank you Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. It, it was a reasonably well-attended meeting. There were about 15-20 members of the public who were in attendance. There was also City staff in attendance. The, the general feeling that I got was one of intense opposition to a motorized extension of Missouri Avenue. We're still working through on a staff level some of the rest of the, the comments so I hesitate to offer any further comment as to the impressions to be gathered from the, the public but definitely a strong opposition to, to motorized extension of Missouri Avenue. There was also a discussion as part of, which has been part of the study area of the extension of Roadrunner Parkway south from its current termination there next to Walgreens on Lohman, connecting that out to Sonoma Ranch through some as yet to be determined alignment. The City staff has expressed more support of that and the, there was no opposition to that idea expressed by the attendees at the meeting last Wednesday. Other than that when the, the staff report is actually prepared and ready we'll be sure to distribute that to you and if you have any questions don't hesitate to ask them either now or later on.

Flores: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. Where do you anticipate the funding for the, this project is, either the Missouri Avenue or the Roadrunner?

Murphy: This would be the, the, the same, it would have the same conditions as University Avenue.

Sorg: Oh.
Murphy: There's no funding identified as of yet. We'd have to kind of look around and, and see what it would be competing with other projects around the state.

Sorg: So we're anticipating some state or federal funding for this?

Murphy: I think it, it's one of the thing, you know we are just trying to position it for ready you know for the instance that, that having another project closer towards, closer to shovel ready in the, in the event that funding does come available. Traditionally the way those types of roadways have been built in the city have been through developers subdividing land but that's probably not happening in this instance. I don't think that there, I don't think that there's much call for BLM to dispose that land to a, to a private entity so we needed to, to look at these avenues in order to provide some connectivity for that area especially with the high, you know upon the construction of the high school.

Sorg: Just thinking out loud here, would the MAP program, MAP program be suitable for it, do you know?

Murphy: I, I think there's, there's a, a large range of possible programs.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: And any, you know any work that, that we have done prior to this kind of increases the competitiveness of, of any proposal coming forward.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Any more discussion? No. All right.

7.3 NMDOT Update

Flores: So we'll move on to New Mexico DOT updates. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. If you'll look at your agenda package on Item number 7.3, there's a list of projects there. I'll quickly go through those.

The first one is the I-10 mill and inlay project. That project is basically from the I-10/I-25 interchange south to the Texas state line. That one is scheduled for a December 18th letting which is next Friday. We would anticipate probably starting construction sometime in the spring and that's really all I have on that project at this point.

The next one is the Phase B study for the High Mesa Road. We're currently working on a Notice to Proceed with the consultant for that study. At this point that has not been submitted so at this, at this juncture we're, we haven't done anything with that one. I believe the plan is still once we
get a contractor or a consultant on board they will come in and present a
quick summary of the Phase A study which we had requested as a, as a
body you know several months ago. So that is still the plan. We, we
discussed that a little bit with MPO staff earlier today and I think we're
working towards a February agenda item for that presentation.

The next project on there is our Union bridge replacement project.
Contractor's actually working real quickly on that one. We're scheduled to
switch traffic to the westbound lanes next Friday. Right now they're,
they're pretty much on schedule and then of course we'll switch and do the
exact same thing on the eastbound lanes. I believe that one's scheduled
for a summer finish but as long as weather continues to cooperate we're
getting really good production out of that contractor. We're supposed to
have a wet winter so we'll see what happens but they're doing a good job
on that one and again we'll switch traffic next Friday. The good thing
about that is right now the westbound off-ramp at University is closed.
Once we switch traffic that westbound off-ramp will be back open to, to
that University-Valley intersection there which will hopefully help with
some of the hotel complaints that we've been getting. We been really
trying to do a good job rerouting traffic around that but that's always an
issue but hopefully that interchange will have full access once we switch
the traffic. The only one, actually I, I, I need to correct myself. We still
won't have eastbound on-ramp access at Valley. They'll still have to go to
Conway because we'll be building the second bridge over that, that
underpass on-ramp. But Conway's you know just around the corner so we
have plenty of room there.

Next project on there is our Missouri bridge replacement on I-25.
They continue to work on that northbound section. We're still way ahead
of schedule on that project. We've had a little bit of, again I hate to say
this word as a delay because we're ahead of schedule but the contractor
is, is, has some down-time waiting on paving and those types of things
because of weather and, and other, other priorities for them but we are still
ahead of schedule. We're looking at an early spring finish on that project
which is still about two months ahead of schedule. But any time you drive
through there you can see the production that they've got and changes
really every day. So we're real happy with the work that's going on there.

The next one, the intersection at Spitz, Solano, and Three Crosses,
that's currently in design. We're hoping to let that project in June. So
once we get to that point we'll start having our monthly public meetings
letting everybody know what's going on but as I'm sure everybody's aware
that's going to be a, a real complicated congested project so it's going to
have a, a real tough public information/involvement/responsibility but I
think in the end that project and, will, will address some of the congestion
issues and the movement issues with that, that weird free right off of the
westbound Picacho, or North Main area. So we're looking forward to this
one. You'll have to bear with us while we build it but in the end I think it'll
alleviate a lot of the congestion issues that we've got in that area.
Next one on there is US-70 at 17th street so this is basically Picacho at 17th. I talked a little bit about this last month. That's where all of the school buses come in and out. We're currently working on right-of-way to buy a little bit at the corners for the signals, for the signal mast arms. It's a little ways off, a year out so we have a January 2017 letting on that one so I'll keep you guys aware of what's happening with the, with the design progress on that one.

Next one is the I-10 mill and inlay. You'll see this one ongoing right now. This is basically from I-10/I-25 up the hill to the Love's interchange. The contractor has already completed the westbound passing lane. They've started on the eastbound passing lane today. They're going to suspend for the winter from December nine, or not the winter the Christmas holidays from December 19th to January 3rd. that's Mountain States and they do a, they've always done a real good job getting stuff done. They are having to coordinate a little bit with the Union bridge project because the plans don't allow them to conflict traffic control so there may be a little bit of suspension depending on how that bridge project goes but again addressing all of the I-10 paving section through the Las Cruces and Dona Ana area with those two projects.

The next one is the Valley Drive reconstruction. This is the one that we've been in discussion with the City of Las Cruces staff on a potential road transfer if we can address some of the requests to include the Amador Proximo, some oversize drainage tied to drainage issues with adjacent neighborhoods. Currently we're seeking additional funding, the Department is working on getting some additional funding. Current design costs are estimated at about $14 million and we only have 11. So we'll continue to work with the City on that one but at this point that's really all I've got. The design with Molzen Corbin, that contract has suspended briefly the, while we work through the, the funding process on that one. Hopefully we'll have direction for Molzen sometime very early of the new calendar year so that they can start the design. And again I'll keep you updated on that one cause that's going to directly affect the City and, and what we're doing here in town.

Hancock: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Question about the, the Valley Drive. Is that going to be a Complete Streets project?

Doolittle: That project right now the current scope is, is full reconstruction. The proposal that we're working with the City on is to include one-way frontage roads not quite all the way from Amador to Hadley which is that section where the vacant industrial lots are and the, the softball fields. So at this point again it's real preliminary just because we haven't figured out where
we're going to move forward because of funding constraints. But that's
the general, the general goal. If for some reason we aren't able to come
up with the $3 million to include Amador Proximo and we design it to the
DOT standards the, the roadway typical section's going to be reduced. It's
not going to have a whole lot of landscaping and beautification. We will
address alternate modes of transportation such as a bike path, ADA
compliant sidewalks, so that'll be a big improvement for that section even
if we go with ours but it won't include you know some of the beautification
and maybe even some of the economic development opportunities that
the City's looking for.

Flores: Okay. Thanks. Okay.

Doolittle: The next three on this list are railroad crossing projects. Again that's
handled out of the general office and honestly I don't have anything, any
updates on those three.

US 70 through San Augustin Pass, this is the road safety audit to
allow for bicycle facilities over the pass. We just awarded the design of
that project. That's currently scheduled for a February 2017 let. Again at
this point with the design just started I don't have any specifics with that
project.

The NM 478 project, I touched a little bit on this one last month
also. This is the pavement preservation that's basically all of 478 from
Anthony up to basically the Union, just past the Union intersection here in
Las Cruces. We've suspended for the winter season because of
temperature constraints. We have the last four miles that we still need to
do and we'll pick that up in February but those last four miles are, are tied
directly with the Dona Ana County, southern Dona Ana County area. We've been real happy with that process but you won't see any work for a
couple of months.

The last, the, the next one is University interchange. We are
currently working on the RFP for the final design. That one is a dual-year
funded project because of the cost and the size. We don't have a specific
letting date but it is a end of Fiscal Year '18, start of Fiscal Year '19
project. Again we'll be working real closely with the City and even more
specifically NMSU cause that's going to provide some direct access onto
University as opposed to going around on Triviz.

Sorg: That won't, will that, that won't include the bridge there at University, right?

Doolittle: Yes.

Sorg: It does include a changing the bridge.

Doolittle: Yes.
Okay. Thank you.

Madam Chair. That one also, Councilor Sorg just so you know that one will also include the construction of a new bridge very similar to the one at Lohman, basically where Triviz will punch underneath University Avenue and provide direct access to the university. So there'll be two bridges built on that project. Okay.

And then the last one I have on here is the North Main/US 70 capacity and safety study. This, this ties in directly what Tom and the, the Committee discussed earlier. Basically we're trying to get a leg up on potential funding sources to six-lane and do some safety improvements on 70 from Three Crosses to the I-25 interchange. That project was recently awarded to Smith Engineering and at this point we haven't done anything with it. But again I'll keep you updated on where we, where we're headed on that one. But that's one of those safety, or one of those study projects hoping that we can put some projects on the shelf and get some additional funding later.

With that Madam Chair that completes my, my list of projects and I'll stand for any questions.


Thank you. Mr. Doolittle did you say that on North Main and US 70 from Three Crosses to I-25 is that correct they're going to, going to have three lanes going up there?

Madam Chair. The, the, the purpose of this study is to determine first of all if, if it even is, if a third lane is even justified so they'll go through a traffic analysis. You know right now that bridge is pretty narrow so really the intent of this is to tell us what the traffic flows in that area warrant.

Well I can tell you that I, I live in that, in that district and the traffic is horrendous especially during the, the hours of traffic. Oh my God it's just so much traffic in there so I think you're going to find justified that you may need a, a third lane. Thank you.

I, I think everybody would agree with you. They won't take my vote as they're moving forward with the design so I, I think that's, that's exactly what the data's going to show.

Okay. Anyone else? All right.

7.4 Committee Training

- REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA.
Flores: Committee and Staff Comments. So I'll start with staff.

Murphy: Thank you Madam Chair. Just one comment. We are hosting the quarterly, MPO quarterly here next week where staffs from the, the various MPOs you know just you know discuss, discuss issues, talk with the NMDOT General Office. But a part of that, we're also, we give them a little tour of one of the projects that're going on in our area and the, the tour that we've had arranged would be, is Nathan Small is going to give them a, a tour of the Amador Proximo so probably around 3:00 we'll be meeting here at the MPO offices and figuring out a way that former Councilor Small will, will then give a, give a tour of what happened with that planning project so if anybody's interested in, in showing up please, please let Andrew or myself know and then we can expect you.

Flores: You said next week but you didn't give us a date, will …

Murphy: Next Monday.

Flores: Next Monday.

Murphy: Right.

Flores: Okay, 3 p.m. meet here at City Hall. Okay. Should we post for that if, if there's people coming from the, it's not really a, no. Okay. All right. We're not making any decisions, it's not anything on the agenda so okay. Just going to, all right. Any further comments from staff? How about from Committee Members? All right then …

Hancock: Madam Chair.

Flores: Thanks. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. I just wanted to go back to the report about the West Mesa, High Mesa Road. My recollection is that the Board, this Committee rather took some action relative to this project, that we were favoring not moving forward with Phase B until there was more information about the implications or possibilities of, of a connection across at four, 404. What's happening with, with 404 as an option? Is that going to be considered as part of the Phase B?

Doolittle: Madam Chair. That is correct. That will be included as part of the Phase B. This body did vote against moving forward with the Phase B. That federal, or that funding was ultimately de-obligated and moved elsewhere. The Planning Division and the General Office acquired state funding to put
into the Phase B and that was brought before this Board, I think Commissioner Garrett that was one that you had, you were absent. But we did discuss at that one that it was moving forward with state funding and again we were reminded as a department that we wanted to make sure that we had that presentation so that everybody's on board but the Phase B will, will do exactly what Tom shared earlier. We'll focus more specifically on some of the alternatives and I believe that the tie-in at 404 is one of the proposed alternatives. But again Molzen Corbin will give us some more of those details at their presentation in February.

Garrett: Very good. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Flores: Okay. Anyone else? Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. It's, I'm going to put on my South Central Regional Transportation hat and it is my pleasure to introduce in the audience our new Executive Director for South Central Regional Transit District, David Armijo. And I think whenever you each get a chance to meet him you'll find that he is a, a wealth of information about transit from all over the country and we're very happy to have him. Also we have finalized our arrangement with the City of Las Cruces and we now have an office at the Move It Center, room 117. David has gotten the key and moved in and is setting up and we are moving forward. I believe we've received four of the five buses that were allocated by the legislature. We're probably, we're in the process of working with NMDOT and putting up signs and finalizing all the right-of-way issues for all the stops. I'm told if everybody holds their breath just right that possibly by the end of next week we'll be completed with that and that'll put us a little bit ahead of schedule but going into the holidays. There's discussions about the Transit District launching a couple of routes, instead of rolling out the full four routes we would have the two routes, perhaps two routes that would run based upon the signs that are put up, where they've been put up, what right-of-ways, depending upon a lot of different things. So we're moving forward with that and that's all I have. It's good information to, for everybody. Thank you.

Flores: Mr. Armijo would you like to come up and introduce yourself?

Armijo: Thank you very much, appreciate the opportunity to come forward. I just wanted to add one more point. Probably one of the most important parts of this process is to actually have some kind of a media communication/marketing plan so that's something that we're trying to integrate. We've been very focused on the logistics and rudimentary details of buses and signs and stops but in the end it really comes down to connecting and talking to the potential riders and trying to get the information out to them. I've been very fortunate in meeting with a number
of people. I think Sharon Thomas is the one that's kind of spearheading, she's got a wealth of information and contacts and I think she's going to be a great help in that process and so we think that's going to be part of our, our, our process of where we'll be and so we'll certainly have what we think could be a date certainly by next week. One other element that I haven't even shared with, with Commissioner Hancock is the fact that if we look at a date in January, if we could it would be great if we could, we could coordinate that with the, the university and community college schedules which I believe is in the, around the 20th of January so we're getting closer and closer to honing in on a date so the, the team is, is pulling that together so I'm very excited about this opportunity to roll this program out and of course the launching of the service is just the beginning. There's so much more to do well after this process and I'm looking forward to getting to know many more people and engaging in conversations and looking at what, where this organization can go in the future so thank you very much. Hopefully I'll be able come to you in the future with a more definitive update but right now this is very fluid but we're moving right forward.

Flores: All right.

Armijo: Thank you.

Flores: Thank you.

Armijo: Appreciate it.

Flores: Okay. Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Madam Chair. Perhaps Mr., say again?

Flores: Armijo.

Sorg: Armijo didn't know that Sharon Thomas was a former member of the MPO as well as chairman for a long, for, for, throughout her term as an elected official.

Flores: And I'd just like to note that Mayor Barraza has joined us so, all right. So …

Barraza: Sorry, yeah. Had a previous engagement at the Plaza with Santa and Mesilla Elementary so, sorry.

Flores: Don't want to disappoint Santa Claus. Any more comments from the Committee?
Benavidez: One more comment.

Flores: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Thank you Madam Chair. Mr. Murphy I guess next month the meeting, meetings will go back to the County, correct?

Murphy: That is correct.

Benavidez: Okay. And I just want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year and we'll see you next year.

Flores: All right, thank you.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: All right, so then we'll move to Public Comment. Is there any public comment? Seeing none.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:18 p.m.)

Flores: Then we'll move to adjournment, all right, any objection?

______________________________
Chairperson
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF January 13, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 Resolution No. 16-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2014 Calendar Year by the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization.

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 16-01 (Open Meetings Resolution)

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
1. Copy of Resolution 16-01

DISCUSSION:
Annually, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is required to adopt an Open Meetings Resolution pursuant to the State of New Mexico’s Open Meetings Act (NMSA 1978, Article 10, Chapter 15). This resolution affirms the Policy Committees intent to follow the Open Meetings Act. The Open Meetings Act specifies how meetings that formulate and adopt public policy are to be conducted. In addition, it also identifies the notice requirements of regular meetings, special meetings, and emergency meetings.

OPTIONS:
1. Vote “yes” to approve Resolution 16-01 approving the 2016 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Open Meetings Resolution.

2. Vote “yes” to approve Resolution 16-01 with additional amendments or modifications.

3. Vote “no” and do not approve Resolution 16-01 as presented. This action would result in the Open Meetings Resolution being denied by the Policy Committee and would result in the MPO’s committees being in violation of the State’s Open Meetings Act.
The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, Section 10-15-1(B) of the Open Meetings Act (NMSA 1978, Sections 10-15-1 to 4) states that, except as may be otherwise provided in the Constitution or the provisions for the Open Meetings Act, all meetings of a quorum of members of any board, council, commission or other policy-making body of a state or local public agency held for the purpose of formulating public policy, discussing public business or for the purpose of taking any action within the authority of, or the delegated authority, of such body, are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all times; and

WHEREAS, meetings subject to the Open Meetings Act at which the discussion or adoption of a proposed resolution, rule, regulation, or formal action occurs and shall be held only after reasonable notice to the public; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-15-1(C) of the Open Meetings Act requires the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to determine annually what constitutes reasonable notice of its public meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution certifying compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2016 calendar year for all MPO Committees to be approved.

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

(I)

THAT all meetings of the Committees of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization shall be held in accordance with the Open Meetings Act
and with the provisions contained in the MPO Bylaws and the Public Participation Plan, as amended.

(II)

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

**DONE** and **APPROVED** this 13th day of January, 2016.

APPROVED:


Chair

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

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

ATTEST:  

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary  

City Attorney
AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 Resolution No. 16-02: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue Phase A Report

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and Adoption of Resolution 16-02

DISCUSSION:
Over the past year, MPO Staff in cooperation with the hired consultant, Bohannan-Huston, have been working on a University Avenue Study Corridor.

There are two alternatives recommended by the Study for further examination. These alternatives will be discussed in the presentation.
RESOLUTION NO. 16-02

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE UNIVERSITY AVENUE PHASE A REPORT.

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

WHEREAS, University Avenue between NM 478 and NM 28 is one of the most significant corridors of the MPO area, acting as a connection between the City of Las Cruces and the Town of Mesilla; and

WHEREAS, Zia Middle School is located on the corridor and has a lack of bicycle and pedestrian accommodation; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Mesilla requested that the Mesilla Valley MPO conduct a study corridor to examine ways to improve safety along the corridor; and

WHEREAS, 23 CFR § 450.318 Metropolitan Planning Organizations are empowered to conduct such studies; and

WHEREAS, affected property owners and the general public have been properly notified according to the MPO Public Involvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the proposed amendment, seek alternatives to the requested amendment, evaluate the alternatives, and discuss recommendations to the MPO Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, Mesilla Valley MPO Staff closely coordinated with the New Mexico Department of Transportation and the Elephant Butte Irrigation District during this process; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval at their meeting held on October 20, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval at their meeting held on January 7, 2016; and
WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for this resolution to be APPROVED.

NOW, THEREFORE, Be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the University Avenue Phase A Report be adopted.

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 13th day of January, 2016.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: 
Second By: 

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

ATTEST: 

Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney
University Avenue Corridor Study

- Purpose and Need
- Outreach Summary
- Recommendations
- Approval Request
Purpose and Need

The purpose of the University Avenue Corridor Study is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Avenue between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

The NEED is based on the following:

▲ Safety concerns due to potential pedestrian/bicycle/vehicular conflicts

▲ Physical deficiencies due to lack of shoulders, pedestrian facilities and bicycle facilities

▲ Potential for economic development opportunities as a result of completing the City-wide bicycle loop route
Outreach Activities

▲ Project Team - April 2015
▲ Public Meeting – June 2015
▲ BPAC – July 2015
▲ TAC – Sept 2015, Dec 2015
▲ Public Meeting – October 2015
▲ TAC – December 2015 / January 2016
Public Meeting – October 2015

▲ Approximately 30 attendees
▲ Speed, noise, and lighting were concerns
▲ Questions on funding
▲ Concern with vehicle/bus/bike/ped conflicts
▲ Support for bicycle facilities
▲ Concern with limited ROW
▲ Overall support for improvements
Comments from Public/BPAC/TAC

▲ Bicycle facilities in the road

▲ Separate pedestrians

▲ Consistent typical section along the corridor

▲ Overall strong support
Issues and Concerns

▲ ROW
– Limited in some areas
– Coordination with EBID / LCPS / Private

▲ EBID
– No conflict with EBID improvements

▲ Utilities
– Minimize relocation
Recommended Alternatives

▲ Typical Section F:
60.5-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 6-foot sidewalk on one side / 10-foot multi-use trail on one side / curb and gutter

▲ Typical Section G:
44-foot ROW / 11 to 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 4 to 6-foot sidewalks / curb and gutter
Recommended Alternative

Typical Section F

- 6' sidewalk
- 2' buffer
- 5' bike lane
- 12' driving lane
- 12' driving lane
- 5' bike lane
- 5' buffer
- 10' multi-use trail

Total: 60.5'
Recommended Alternative

Typical Section G

4’-6’ Sidewalk
5’ Bike Lane
11’ - 12’ Driving Lane
11’ - 12’ Driving Lane
5’ Bike Lane
4’-6’ Sidewalk

curb & gutter
curb & gutter

44.0’ - 50.0’
Multi Use Alternative

University Avenue Corridor Study
Multi-use Trail Alternative
Figure 13
Request for Approval

▲ All comments considered and addressed
  – Public
  – TAC/BPAC
  – Stakeholders

▲ Report modified with final TAC comments
Questions / Comments
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AGENDA ITEM:
8.1 Arrowhead Research Park Presentation

DISCUSSION:
New Mexico State University and Arrowhead Center have received funding from the U.S. Economic Development Administration for master planning of the 175 acre Arrowhead Park development and additional studies for the proposed I-10/Arrowhead Drive interchange. An MoU with the NMDOT has been executed to kick off the Interstate Access Change Request study process. Arrowhead Center will provide an overview of the planned Park developments, including the proposed interchange and provide an expected schedule for study.
AGENDA ITEM:
8.1 Interstate Access Request Training

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will provide a presentation on the Interstate System Access Change Request process.
AGENDA ITEM:
8.3 Unified Planning Work Program Presentation

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will present on the upcoming update to the Unified Planning Work Program for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2017 and FFY 2018.