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The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held February 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Doña Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
                  Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
                  Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
                  Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:12)
                  Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
                  Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
                  Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT:   Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
                  Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
                  Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)

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

OTHERS PRESENT:   Angela Rael, South Central COG
                  Andrew Bencomo, Mesilla Valley MPO BPAC Member;
                  Board Member, Doña Ana Communities United
                  Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:07 p.m.)
Sorg: It appears we have a quorum so we'll get the meeting started at 1:07.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY
Sorg: First order of business is a Conflict of Interest. Is there anybody on the
Commission or in the staff that has a conflict of interest on any item on the
agenda today?
Pedroza: No.
Garrett: No.
Sorg: Okay.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT
Sorg: Any public comments? Any member of the public would like to comment? Seeing no hands raised.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *
Sorg: We'll move on. Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to move to approve the agenda?
Garrett: So moved.
Pedroza: Second.
Sorg: Okay moved by Commissioner …
Pedroza: Garrett.
Sorg: Garrett and seconded by Councilor Pedroza. All those, go ahead and take a vote here Mr. Murphy.
Murphy: Okay. Member Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.
Murphy: Member Flores.
Flores: Yes.
Murphy: Member Pedroza.
Pedroza: Yes.
Murphy: Member Garrett.
Garrett: Yes.
Murphy: Member Barraza.
Barraza: Yes.
Murphy: Mr. Chair.
Sorg: Yes. Okay, passed.
5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *January 13, 2015

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Removal of BPAC Member of Nonfeasance of Office

Sorg: The first Action Item is removal, is 6.1, removal of PA, BPAC member for nonfeasance of office. Is there a motion?

Pedroza: Move to approve.

Flores: Seconded.

Sorg: Motion and move to approve and second. Could the staff explain?

Murphy: Okay.

Sorg: This Action Item.

Flores: (inaudible)

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Mr. Bentley was a, was appointed to the, the BPAC last, last summer I believe. He attended one meeting and has since not been. We have a request from the Chair of the BPAC. We also had as a discussion item at one of their meetings. Mr. Bentley has, has been, contact has been attempted, we've received no response. The, the will of the BPAC was to ask for you, this Committee, to remove him so that the MPO staff can advertise the position as vacant and place somebody else on that, in that spot.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Murphy. Is there any further discussion?

Pedroza: I have a question.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you. Is there something in the bylaws that says that once you have missed such and such a number of meetings the question of your continued membership can be brought up?
Murphy: Mr. Chair, Member Pedroza. That is correct. The, the number is two meetings, is, is two consecutive meetings and also if you do not maintain a 75% attendance record through a calendar year.

Pedroza: And are you telling us that that has occurred with Mr. Bentley?

Murphy: He … that is true.

Pedroza: Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Any further comments or discussion? If not, Mr. Murphy take a roll.

Murphy: Member Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Member Flores

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Member Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Member Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

6.2 Resolution 16-03: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Sorg: All right next item on the agenda is discussion … oops, this is different than the agenda we got earlier, isn't it?

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair we …

Sorg: Okay.
Wray: We distributed an updated agenda …

Sorg: Okay.

Wray: Middle of last week.

Sorg: Yeah I just had the first one. I got the new one here. Yeah. So the next Action Item is 6.2, an Action Item, Resolution 16-03. Move to approve. I'm waiting.

Garrett: Could you, could you explain that again?

Sorg: The Action Item 6.2, a resolution 16-03, a resolution amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

Garrett: So moved.

Pedroza: Mr. Chair. I don't have that.

Sorg: Moved, moved by Commissioner Garrett.

Wray: Could you bring …

Sorg: Is there a second?

Pedroza: Councilor Pedroza …

Flores: I'll second it but maybe we should have discussion.

Sorg: We will have discussion …

Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Sorg: For sure.

Barraza: Okay, I, I need, Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Barraza: I have a copy and I don't think Commissioner Garrett has one either so if you could provide us with some copies please.

Sorg: Yes.

Barraza: Thank you.
Sorg: Okay it's moved by Commissioner Garrett and second by Commissioner, by Trustee Torres, Flores. And we'll move on to discussion. We'll have to have staff explain this one.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to ask the Committee to direct their attention to page 57 of their updated packet. This is an amendment that's been requested by RoadRUNNER Transit staff. This is the result of the close out of the, the past federal fiscal year. The, the roll over money was made available and the request is to move that money over from the now past federal fiscal year 2015 to the current federal fiscal year of 2016. The, the particular project is for support and rolling stock. The amount is new FTA 5307 amount is $1,038,719 and the new local match amount is $127,021. And I'll stand now for any questions.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Trustee Flores, uh, Trustee Barraza.

Barraza: I just have a question. I see that the amendment is for the RoadRUNNER Transit program and I was just curious how did you go about in choosing this project versus other projects?

Wray: This was requested by their staff. The, the process is that the agencies initiate their own amendments to bring forward, so RoadRUNNER staff requested that this amendment proceed forward.

Barraza: Okay. And Mr. Chair if I may?

Sorg: Sure.

Barraza: Where there any other entities that knew, I guess I probably need to ask when you say "Unobligated federal funds" is it a pool of money that's in there and they're not obligated and that way different programs can ask for it?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. No it is not. These monies were supposed to have been obligated for this particular project for RoadRUNNER Transit in 2015, they were not obligated in time because the wheels of the Federal Government grind slowly, so this is, this is money that is not up for grabs for anybody. It is, it's for RoadRUNNER Transit.

Barraza: Mr. Chair thank you. Thank you Andy.

Sorg: Thank you Andrew. And may the record correct my referring to Mayor Barraza as Mayor instead of Trustee. Thank you. Any other comments or questions on this resolution? If not we'll take a vote.
Wray: Member Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Member Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Member Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Member Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Member Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Committee Training

Sorg: Next item, next item on the agenda is on Discussion for Committee Training, 7.1. Can, take, take it over Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. At last month's meeting the Committee, the Committee had asked staff to come back with a report on, on coordination between the MPO and the, and the RTPO and, as well as the El Paso MPO. So Mr. McAdams has put together a presentation that kind of, kind of lays out the rules of, and all of the work products of the various transportation planning agencies. We also have in the audience Ms. Angela Rael who is the Planning Program Manager for the South Central Council of Governments. And with that I'm gonna turn you over to Mr. McAdams.
Sorg: Thank you.

McAdams: Thank you Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee. This is by, this is maybe a little dry but I hope you'll stay with me. But it's very important I think. If you look at, here are all, the state is divided into RTPOs and MPOs and we'll discuss that later, and the roles of both, and where they cooperate together too, or what is the means of cooperation. The transportation planning process of New Mexico is, is really specified by federal law and requires states to carry a continuing cooperative and comprehensive statewide planning that considers all modes of transportation and provides for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services. Transportation planning's a cooperative process designed to foster involvement by all users of this system, such as community, a business community, community groups, environmental organizations, the public, the traveling public, freight operators, and also public transportation providers too as well. If you look at, in New Mexico the process of, is conducted jointly by the NMDOT, MPOs, the RTPOs, and public transit operators. It involves a lot of things you're already aware we do already. Both organizations do is monitoring existing situations, forecasting population and employment, and land use along major corridors, identifying current and projected future transportation problems, analyzing through detailed studies like you know the Missouri and University, developing long-range plans, we just got through, and of course short-range plans like the transit development, short-range transit plan. If you look at how many MPOs we have; we have one, two, three, four, five MPOs. The El Paso Metropolitan Organization, the Farmington MPO, the Mesilla Valley MPO, the Mid-Region MPO, and the Santa Fe MPO. What do they do?

And all these work items should be very familiar with you as we, we go through them every couple of years right. The MTP we just completed. We have a plan that we do public participation plan we have to do every five years. The Title VI plan is for antidiscrimination and for addressing discrimination. The transportation system performance measures and targets. The unified work, planning work program we'll be doing this year. The, the TIP which we do every year. We do this every two years and we update it often. And the traffic counts that we do daily almost to try to show traffic flow maps and for analyzing relative to do, for this as far as what we do the, the TAZ, the, the transportation analysis zones and update for the, the statewide travel demand model. And some important but not, you know I guess you know some more but not equally important is quarterly reports. The annual list of obligated projects where we, the projects we're gonna do this year. The annual performance and expenditure report every, every 10 years or 14 years out we look at. The smoothed urbanized area based on the density, that are contiguous density. And then also we look at almost yearly the functional, the functional classification are according to schedules. This with the, the 12
is TMA but it really doesn’t apply to us too much because we’re looking at congestion management process and that’s really Albuquerque and El Paso area. And also we do the FHWA New Mexico certification process and documentation and also the FTA Regional Five certification documentation.

If you look at the internal project, you’re part of the internal structure here too and we look at several major put, keys that, the keyboards of course, the Policy Committee, and of, made up of local elective leaders and appropriate state and local officials and the Policy Boards for the MPO serving the area designated as a transportation management for the MRMPO and also the EPMPO as well. So they’re kind of sped off a little bit different. And the MPO boundaries are really specified, one as a contained urbanized area but also where, where we think in 20 years we’ll be growing, so it’s always larger than, than the metropolitan areas. The boundaries are specified every 10 years as far as the MPO planning areas and the urbanized areas as well. And we, we smooth the areas around as well.

Here is again all the, the MPO, the state RTPOs and the MPOs, and you noticed that the, where we’re located and look at specifically the area where we’re in. And so sort of zooming in we can see that Doña Ana County is contained really has three people, three boards they have to answer to, well more than that but in transportation, the El Paso area which is one MPO, our MPO, the Mesilla Valley MPO, then also the, the County is also involved in the South Central RTPO which includes Otero and Socorro and Doña Ana. And I’ll go a little bit more specifically in looking at the RTPOs. Angela correct me if you would like to chime in. The RTPOs are federally designated forums for cooperative planning for a population of 50,000 or fewer people and there are seven RTPOs in the state; the Mid-Region, the Northeastern, Northeast, Northern Pueblos, the Northern regional, the South Central Regional Transportation Planning Authority Organization which contains Doña Ana County, Otero, Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization, and the Southwest Regional Transportation Organization. All the state is contained, or divided in these, the RTPOs. The, the RTPOs are consistent with Federal Surface Transportation law. The RTPOs have been established and designated by NMDOT. They're different from MPOs. MPOs are designated by the Federal Government, by the urbanized area and then, they cooperate with the states or the, where MPOs are kind of autonomous and we'll explain that later, where, where RTPOs are, are subject to, to the state and they're coordinated through the state directly. So the DOT is their, forward, well they're designated by the DOT to enhance planning, coordination, and implementation of statewide, strategic long-range transportation plans and TIP programs, TIPs as well, with the emphasis on addressing the needs of non-metropolitan areas of the state, rural areas, all right, outside the urbanized areas, but not, well outside the MPOs as well.
And if you look at RTPOs, their core responsibilities are to develop and maintain in cooperation with the state, regional long-range plans, develop regional transportation improvement program recommendations or the RTIPR for consideration by the state. See the recommendation, they're, they're different from our TIP. The RTIPR is a recommendation to the state. The state can either decide they will approve it and put it in the, in the STIP or they can decide to reject it too. So when we put our things is in the STIP is considered, it will, a (inaudible) that, these regulations. So we foster, it's also to foster the coordination we, our local planning, land use, and economic development plans of course. The RTPOs to provide technical assistance to local officials, provide training to Board and Commissions like I'm doing today but it's basically a national multistate and state policies and planning development.

If you look at also the RTPOs are providing a forum for public participation and the statewide and regional transportation planning process. Consider and share plans and programs with neighboring, with other regional organizations including MPOs and travel organization. Maintain an RTPO website which shows you know the current documents like we do in our website as well. Conduct other duties as necessary to support and enhance the regional statewide planning process. Maintain in an organized fashion all applicable records per the state achieving records, all the well, according to FHWA and FTA Region VI regulations.

This is, this also part of the, this, the RTIP, RTIPR process is looking at each RTPOs individual agents to (inaudible) something called the Project Feasibility Form and this is to provide it, a way to open the dialogue between the MD, the, the NMDOT districts and the local governments regarding projects for possible inclusion in the RTIPR and the STIP. The RTO member organizations complete and, and submit the RTIP, the PFFs to the RTPO planning program manager and the respective NMDOT district technical support and appropriate GTE, G liaison. The following the RTPO established submittal deadlines, meetings are held and you know really discussion about the appropriateness and the feasibility of this project with the MPO district.

This is really important too, how do coordinate, there is coordination between the MPOs and RTPOs. The NMDOT coordinates with the MPOs and the RTPOs through the following; cooperative agreements; so they have to have a cooperative agreement says we agree these things also the membership and abide by the, by rules and regulations that were set by, for by the state and by the federal government. And the CAs delineate the responsibility each organization carry out the task contained work program, so we have to have a, a work program, you know our work program, our planning work program and also the RTPOs do as well. And the MPOs are required to submit every two years, we're doing right now and the RTPOs are also required to submit a two-year regional program. In addition this goes in a statewide work planning work program to the New Mexico Division of Federal Highway and also Region VI of the FTA.
The PWP includes all the RTR, the MPO and RTPO work programs as part of the submittal package, so they are submitted all to the H, FHWA and the FTA. Any questions? And I have something to hand out. I came with goodies. This is the STIP, I mean not the RTIPR for the South Central Regional Transportation Planning Authority Organization. Get, get my acronyms confused. You can see this is what these are not, these are not, like they're not like the TIP, these are recommended for approval by the state. So the state can say we don't have enough money or we don't think it's appropriate at this time of year, but it's not like our TIP which we approve it, it becomes part of the STIP, all right. And of course we check as a staff and also people with DOT and other organizations attribute where there's money available for it. So I'm standing now for questions.

Sorg: Any questions from the Commission? Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. Appreciate the presentation.

McAdams: Oh thank you.

Garrett: Could you go back to the slide that shows the close up of the, Doña Ana County and …

McAdams: Okay.

Garrett: And the map. Yeah right there.

McAdams: All right.

Garrett: I brought up the issue of coordination at the last meeting …

McAdams: Right.

Garrett: Because there are two areas and projects that Doña Ana County and I think City of Las Cruces, Mesilla, we all have a vested interest in, and that has to do with development along the border and it also has to do with our connection with the Spaceport. And I wanted to look at this because I've never really paid a lot of attention to the boundaries with the El Paso MPO, to what degree, are there portions of a connection from Santa Teresa to 404 that go outside of the MPO boundaries? You know Tom we've talked about …

McAdams: Yeah.

Garrett: An alignment that would run along the escarpment and then actually that's, that's a potential beginning of a West Mesa connection. I'm just
curious about where, if, if you've got a portion of a road system that's in two MPOs and an R, RPO how does that get anchored? Who, who works on that?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Member Garrett. In the case of New Mexico 404 that's, the, it's pretty much entirely within the El Paso planning area.

Garrett: Okay so even if portions of it go outside it's, it's going to be looked at as …

Murphy: I mean if, if portions went into different things we would, we would coordinate it, but in this specific instance and, I, it is entirely contained in the El Paso planning boundaries.

Garrett: Okay. So let's, let's work with that as a, as a working assumption. It seems to me that it's important to know where projects like a connection between Santa Teresa and Chaparral and, and connecting in with, with I-10 as, as part of New Mexico, where that project would sit in I guess the work program and the STIP for the El Paso MPO. Do we know if it's on their STIP? Okay.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle indicate, indicates no.

Garrett: Okay. So, so, the question that, I mean it's great that this is all set up to promote coordination and, and, and cooperation and yet this is something that's an important issue, we've been talking about it for several years and I think part of it may be that we don't know what the process is to actually get these projects into the system and it's one thing if, if we're, you know we're simply sort of muddling around in the dark, but it's another if there's real opposition. And, and, and so we need to sort out what it is. Do we need to fill out a Project Feasibility Form and write a letter and submit it to the El Paso MPO and say "We would really appreciate it if you would work on this." Because as I understand your presentation that would then trigger at some point or is that just for the RPOs, or the, yeah the, the RTPO?

McAdams: Yeah the RTPO for the PFF is for …

Garrett: That's when you get into consultation.

McAdams: Right.

Garrett: Okay so …

McAdams: But I think …

Garrett: We could do this and nothing would happen necessarily.
Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Member Garrett. The MPO could work within the framework of the, of the PFF. In this instance I am unsure how it's, NM-404 and I-10 I believe are you know are state owned facilities so I'm, I'm unclear whether the, the County could submit, submit one, a project on those facilities or do they need to, or does County staff need to work with DOT staff in order to have that project submitted, but generally those are, are DOT facilities so you would expect that the, the origin would come from, from their staff. If it was you know, if the County felt strongly enough about it I think that the County staff would need to engage the DOT on getting that project and perhaps the County could do a PFF on that. Mr. Doolittle if you could assist me on, on that, that process.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair if I may. I, I believe, we're currently working on trying to get the contract completed with Molzen for the Phase B study for the West Mesa Corridor, or the West Mesa Study and I believe that they're supposed to work on giving a presentation at the April Policy Board meeting to bring us up to speed on what happened with the Phase 1, or the Phase A study. Maybe what we can do as part of that is I can be sure to have Jolene here so that we can talk through that process. I'm not as familiar with it as Jolene would be, but maybe when Molzen gives us an update on what happened with that initial study we can have Jolene also present on where the El Paso MPO sits with that, what we need to do to coordinate that process, but I think having that update from Mozlen would be the first step.

Garrett: Thank you. Would, would it be possible for us to know what the scope is earlier than April? You know one of the things that, that's interesting about the transportation planning is it, it's very regimented and it just feels like if you miss a, you know the, the window to get something on the work plan or you miss a window to get something on a project list, you're out of luck for a long time. And, and you know part of what we've been asking for is an evaluation of the feasibility and the implications of having that loop instead of just going straight up the West Mesa. And, and, a, I'd like to know whether it's in the study that they're working on because if it's not then, then the question is "Well how do we get an amendment or how do we get another study or whatever." I mean we're trying to work within a very regimented bureaucratic system and, and I don't think we've been clear about what the steps are we need to do in order to, to move forward on, on that. But what I'm, what I'm hearing is that, that we, the County should initiate some kind of, I mean maybe it's a matter for County staff to talk with, look at the El, El Paso MPO planning and their work plan and, and all those kinds of things and then out of that figure out if there's something missing that has to do with the south, southern part of the, of the County. And then maybe the, this MPO could weigh in with a letter of support or something. I mean it, these are, these, these, these boundaries are, are very difficult to work with because they are, they seem
to be held as if there, these are silos and it's just really hard for us to know how we can get the planning and eventually the development that we need.

McAdams: Okay.

Garrett: That's one, that's part one. I don't want to dominate, but I'm, I'm really concerned with this and I'm looking for clarity. Part of what I'm looking for is direction on what to do. The other one is at the other end of the County, and that has to do with the Spaceport. How do we get an interchange plan on somebody's list? Because it's outside the MPO boundary. Do we have to initiate the Project Feasibility Form in order to get, okay well, then is that something that we can ask staff to do?

Murphy: That would be a, a function of the County staff to, to submit that.

Pedroza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you very much. I have a, a somewhat related question but maybe it's a little bit easier. If you look on the map that we have up right now, you see Doña Ana County is in that greenish/blue.

McAdams: Yeah.

Pedroza: But, a, the boundaries for the MPO are much smaller than the entire County.

McAdams: Yes, because that's …

Pedroza: So who do, who does anything outside of that area?

McAdams: The RTPO goes everything outside of the, both the MPOs. They're the one, like we're discussing (inaudible) projects outside the area, they would go to the RTPO. They are not, we are not contained with the RTPO, they are separate distinct boundaries. You know that's on purpose so we don't, we don't mess around with other people's business (inaudible).

Pedroza: So are you saying that in order to answer Commissioner Garrett's question we have to go and present it to the RTPO?

McAdams: Exactly.

Pedroza: To …
McAdams: Exactly. We can issue like a letter of support of course, say we support it but we can't, it, it should be initiated in the RTPO all right.

Pedroza: Do we know who that is?

Sorg: Well I was going to ask if maybe …

Pedroza: Okay.

Sorg: Commissioner Pedroza. What representation from Doña Ana County is there on the RTPO?

Rael: Mr. Chair and, and Members of your Committee. We have …

Sorg: Your name please.

Rael: I'm sorry. I'm Angela Rael. I'm the Regional Transportation Coordinator for the South Central RTPO.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Welcome.

Rael: You're welcome. Thank you for having me. Thank you Tom for inviting me. To try to provide some clarity we have, the boundaries as you can see, we generally go up to I guess I would say a little north of Radium Springs, right, right about there and then you know we have an … to correct you we have …

Pedroza: We meaning who?

Rael: Sierra. Sierra County, Socorro County, and portions of Doña Ana County. We have someone who sits on our, our Policy and Technical Assistance Committee from the area of Hatch. We, he never shows up and we've …

Pedroza: Oh.

Rael: Tried to get him to go. But we, years ago had somebody, Robert Armijo, I believe he's still employed with the County, he attended some meetings for our RTPO but that's been years ago. We haven't seen anybody at all from Doña Ana County. And so part of our responsibilities is yes to communicate with our local government agencies and, and such, however, it's, we, we are employ, I'm the single employee of the South Central RTPO, so it's just me covering all those three counties and the areas that you see. So it's difficult for me to make monthly phone calls, weekly phone calls to ever municipality within my region to say "Do you have a project? Do you have a list? Can you get me a Project Feasibility Form?" So I, I rely on the members of my committee who come and, and
represent themselves at our quarterly meetings to come with ideas from their local governments and their elected officials and so they're Commissioners and Mayors, so much as yourselves, who come in and say "This is what my Commission's telling me. This is what my project manager's are telling me. This is what my you know County Manager is telling me." Things like that. So we can make those contacts and connections and then we're gladly, I just was on the phone all the way over here with people from City of Socorro and Socorro County because they have projects that are in the STIP and so those kinds of things, we're glad to provide that technical assistance, however it's next to impossible to try to pull those projects from you guys unless we even know that they're, they're happening so.

Sorg: I understand. So; therefore, as Mr. Murphy referred to it, it's up to the Doña Ana County to provide that impetus for this exchange on I-25 then?

Rael: Definitely. And I'll gladly, I'd love for somebody from Doña Ana County to identify some, someone, I would gladly add them onto our, onto our committee, give them a seat at the table to, to come and bring those projects to us. Unlike the MPO we don't have a, a pot of money that would identify projects and be able to, to fund those within our organization you know, so we do have to go through the Project Feasibility Forms.

Sorg: Sure.

Rael: So we get to sit …

Sorg: Understand.

Rael: With DOT, which is great and it's been a, a good practice so far. This was our first year that it was a requirement. So any other projects that you see on your handout that were on the RTIPR, those projects have all been vetted out through a feasibility meeting with the DOT and that's how they, they got on there. And so, I, I know that when you do an application of course you all know it's based on some points, on you get points …

Sorg: Yeah, I understand.

Rael: (inaudible) planning. So a lot of planning, I know that there was made mention of the statewide long-range plans that each of the MPOs and the RTPOs did and so we have mentioned in my, in my, my regional long-range plan have made mention of you know the, the importance of access to Spaceport and things like that, although in ours I think it's different than yours. We don't identify specific projects. We just try to identify the needs of our region and incorporate dialogue and some, and some you know
verification and clarification about what is needed in our area. So I, it's, there's a, made mention extensively about rural transportation and you know the importance of it, the need of it, so that if somebody's making an application for a transit program maybe like the RTPO, they can refer to our plan as something that, that shows a need for their area, so.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you.

Rael: You're welcome. Any other questions?

Sorg: I have one of more a, a general question concerning the TIP and the STIP. Can the state put a project on the STIP that is not on a local TIP list?

Murphy: Mr. Chair. The, outside of an MPO boundary the state can, can put any project they're working on onto the STIP subject to the Transportation Commission approval. Within the …

Sorg: So they can initiate a new project that the MPO or RTPO doesn't initiate?

Murphy: They can, they can, in the RTPO areas they can do that.

Sorg: They can do it in the RTPO.

Murphy: Within an MPO area they must first get approval of the TIP.

Sorg: From the MPO.

Murphy: In order for, to include it on …

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: The STIP.

Sorg: Okay, that's good to know.

Pedroza: One more question.

Sorg: Any more questions? Pedroza.

Pedroza: You mentioned the Transportation Commission, are they a part of, who are they a part of or, or are they separate entity or?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Member Pedroza. The Transportation Commission is a, a body of six members appointed by the Governor to oversee the, to oversee the New Mexico Department of Transportation.
Pedroza: Excuse me. Are they, do they sit in Santa Fe or do you know when they meet?

Murphy: They meet …

Pedroza: How are they formed, etc.?

Murphy: A, again they're appointed, appointed by the Governor. They do meet on a monthly basis. They do rotate their meetings throughout the state, month-by-month. Usually they're in District 1 in December and May …

Doolittle: It really depends on the other schedules but typically it's December and then right around, like for instance this year it's during the Engineering Conference that we have at the university's convention center.

Murphy: That's usually in April.

Doolittle: Right.

Pedroza: Okay. And where is District 1? Oh is this District 1?

Doolittle: Yes. And, and just to clarify Mr. Chair if I may, our, our Commissioner for District 1 is Dr. Ken White from the university.

Pedroza: That's good to know. Thank you.

Sorg: Any other comments or questions?

Benavidez: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Sure, Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Thank you. I needed to ask a question to Ms. Rael. It's regarding the organization that you represent is the, what again, I'm sorry.

Rael: Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. It's the South Central RTPO. So on the map it's the like teal area that surrounds the, the green.

Benavidez: And it's not the Regional Planning Organization policy committee, that's a different organization? Because I'm having, I'm, I see that Mr. Robert Armijo is a, sits on, sits in on that organization so it's not the same one.

Rael: Yeah, no it's definitely the same on. I have been in this position for a little over a year, maybe about a year and a half. The, the program manager before me was Tony Mcrobert, I think he was there two or three years. I
helped him you know in the planning of those meetings and I don't know that I've ever met Mr. Armijo so I know that he hasn't been in attendance in, in several years.

Benavidez: Okay so when's the next meeting so I can inform Mr. Armijo to, to be present at the next meeting.

Rael: Okay, we have scheduled it for March 15th.

Benavidez: March 15th, at what time?

Rael: At 10:30 a.m. in Elephant Butte.

Benavidez: Okay.

Rael: I will gladly forward you all the information that I have out for that and make sure that you get that information.

Benavidez: Great. Thank you. Because I'm an alternate to that organization.

Rael: Okay.

Benavidez: So, yeah just send me that information please.

Rael: I definitely will. I'll get it to you if I get back to my office in time today.

Benavidez: Great.

Rael: Thank you.

Benavidez: Thank you very much.

Rael: Thank you.

Benavidez: That's, that's all Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you. Then we have removed a, the next discussion item, the 7.2 on Doña Ana.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: I'm sorry, real quickly before we move on from that subject.

Sorg: Doolittle.
If I may, don’t forget that the County also has representation on the El Paso MPO in the same capacity.

Yeah, we know.

So Dr. Garcia and then through all of their technical committees, there’s Doña Ana County staff that sit in on those so that, that’s the coordination that we have with that group as well. Thank you.

That’s right. Very good to point that out.

Viva Doña Ana! Presentation

- REMOVED FROM AGENDA

COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

So therefore we will go onto Committee and Staff Comments. Mayor Barraza.

Mr. Chair just to inform staff also, Trustee Sam Bernal will no longer be on the MPO. He did not run for re-election. Our elections are March 1st so once we do our reorganization we will appoint another member from the Town of Mesilla. And I think Trustee Bernal served, I know at least six years on the MPO and if not longer I think. So I just wanted to recognize him. Thank you.

Thank you Mayor. All right, any more public comments? Commissioner, Commissioner Garrett.

Thanks, just as a follow-up to that, would it be appropriate for us to approve a resolution appreciate, of appreciation for Trustee Bernal's service? That could be developed and provided to us at our next meeting.

Very good. Agree.

Mr., Mr. Chair, Member Garrett. We could do that. Traditionally we've, we've presented the member a plaque commemorating their service, but we've, we've not done a full, a resolution in the past, but …

Whatever.

A plaque sounds good.

The committee's preference.
Garrett: No, plaque is, is nice too. I mean maybe a plaque and a letter that goes with it. I don't know.

Sorg: Very good.

Barraza: That is much appreciated. Thank you.

Sorg: Very good Mayor. Any other comments from Commission? Mr. Doolittle do you have any reports on your projects?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair honestly I, since it wasn't on the agenda I failed to give my guys notice but I, I can give you some real quick updates on the projects that we have in the area.

Sorg: Greatly appreciated.

Doolittle: I'll, I'll make it real brief.

Sorg: Please.

Doolittle: For the most part the North Main project is finished. I know that we have a few very small clean up repair punch list items to do but for the most part we are finished.

The Missouri bridge, I know originally we were a little bit ahead of schedule, right now we are about right on schedule for an April completion. That, that project's still continues to, to move along very well even though we had a few small setbacks.

The Union bridge project which is replacing the four bridges right at the I-10/Union/University area, that one is currently a little bit ahead of schedule, we're probably looking at a May completion. Again that's working very well even with you know the University being on one side and you know the apartments and some of those things on the south side, I think our contractor has done a really good job coordinating with our media outlets to get those closures out. So it, it's moving along very well.

Those of you that travel on I-10 will have noticed that we, we've been doing some pavement preservation on the west side of town with Mountain States, they're expected to finish all of the paving except for the, the seal coat which requires a little bit warmer temperature. All of the paving will be completed around the 16th or 17th of this month. Those guys are actually way ahead of schedule and they do really good work for us. With that being said, they're also the contractor to replace the hot mix on the six-lane section between Las Cruces and the Texas state line. And just to clarify, you know a lot of people have asked you know why are we already out there when we just did the six-lane a few years ago. That six-lane all it did was added a new pavement, a new roadway to the inside, so
this project is going to mill and replace the old asphalt on the two lanes that we didn't do anything at all. And then we'll do one, one quick seal coat on that one. They're expected to start the Monday after the Pope's visit. They actually wanted to start on the 17th, the day he was here, and we very forcefully told them "No way." So they'll start on the Monday following that. They're expecting that project to take about 14 weeks for total completion, so I'll keep you in the loop on that. But you may want to avoid that area if you can. They're gonna adjust their closures based on directional traffic for the eastbound lanes, they're gonna work, they're gonna try to work from about 10:00 until eight in the evening. For the westbound lanes basically coming from El Paso to Las Cruces they're gonna work from two o'clock in the morning until about 10:00 in the, until about 10:00 in the morning and then we'll adjust those depending on how the traffic flows. For the most part that's the, the major projects in this area. I'll do, I'll do a better job. We have some studies coming up, we, for instance the US-70 between Three Crosses and the I-25. We're doing a study on the NM-404 pass to determine you know do we need a four-lane improve the intersection specifically at I-10. We've been waiting on notice to proceed with those consultants and I don't have those yet. As soon as we get that I'll be able to give you a better idea of the schedule for those studies. I, I guess with that being said, Tom one thing I would ask is I know you and, and I and Andrew have had discussions, if you wouldn't mind on the discussion topics just put NMDOT update, don't necessarily list items specific to that update, but that'll be a good reminder for me to come in with, with more details for you all.

Sorg: Very good. Commissioner Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Trent is there any kind of a document or any kind of maybe a letter that would advise the, the City Streets and Transportation Department that in fact you have finished, when, when you have finished the Missouri bridge so that then they can say "Okay now the street again becomes the jurisdiction of the City and then I can start bugging them about …" I didn't mean that. I never do that. About the, the changes that I think might be needed.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. That's, we actually have a final inspection on all of our projects and because a lot of the work that was included on that one is City work, they will be in, invited to that final inspection. Once all of the punch list items are completed there is a final letter of acceptance that goes to the contractor and the City is copied on that letter as well. At that point …

Pedroza: (inaudible) is, how 'bout me?

Doolittle: I, I will be sure to get you a copy of that letter.
Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Sorg: Okay, thank you Ms. Pedroza.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

- NO PUBLIC.

10. ADJOURNMENT (1:55 p.m.)

Sorg: So if there's no more business, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Barraza: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

Sorg: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: Meeting's adjourned.

Chairperson
AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Resolution 16-04: A Resolution to Amend the MPO By-laws

DISCUSSION:
At the January 19, 2016 meeting, the BPAC directed staff to develop alternative proposals for consideration of an amendment to the MPO Bylaws regarding BPAC quorum size. At their February 16, 2016 the BPAC recommended the following amendment to the MPO Bylaw to the MPO Policy Committee:

A quorum of the Committee shall consist of five members. At least one of those members must be a citizen representative. No action shall be taken without a quorum of the Committee in attendance at any meeting.
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE MPO BY-LAWS

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Policy Committee has the authority to adopt and amend the MPO Committee Bylaws and Operating Procedures as it deems appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bylaws provide the basic framework for the Policy Committee and the advisory committees to conduct the business of the MPO; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bylaws identify the role and make-up of each Committee; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bylaws govern quorum size for each committee; and

WHEREAS, at their February 16, 2016 meeting the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee requested an amendment to the MPO Bylaws regarding the quorum size of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee; 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 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I) THAT the proposed Amendment to the MPO Bylaws attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made part of this resolution be APPROVED.

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

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

APPROVED:

__________________________
<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>Chair Sorg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Barraza</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 Hancock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Eakman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Pedroza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTEST:  

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  

Recording Secretary  

City Attorney
Exhibit “A”

The following language will replace the existing language in the MPO Bylaws regarding the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee quorum size:

A quorum of the Committee shall consist of five members. At least one of those members must be a citizen representative. No action shall be taken without a quorum of the Committee in attendance at any meeting.
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MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 13, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee Appointments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review, Evaluation, and Appointment

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Letters of Interest from Maggie Billings, Chambo Chambers, Charles Clements, Carol Flinchbaugh, John Gallagher, and Frank Sholedice

DISCUSSION:
The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee (BPAC) has 11 members: 6 citizen representatives and 5 staff representatives. According to the MPO Bylaws, the staff representatives are appointed by the head of the department they will represent within each jurisdiction. The citizen appointments are made by the Policy Committee.

Currently, there is one citizen representative positions open: Bicycle Community Representative.

There are two types of citizen representatives: jurisdictional and modal. The jurisdictional representatives will be selected to represent the three MPO member agencies – one per agency. Based on MPO staff’s interpretation of the Bylaws, this representative should understand planning issues and facility needs surrounding non-motorized transportation. This understanding is required to integrate walking and biking into the regional transportation system. Finally, the role of the citizen should be to promote walking and biking in their respective jurisdiction.

The modal representatives consist of two bicycling community representatives and one pedestrian community representative. For their respective roles, the desired representative should understand the planning issues and facility needs for bicycling or walking, and promote bicycling or walking in the community at large.

Attached to this Action Form are the letters of interest from the individuals who answered staff’s request for volunteers on the BPAC. Please review the letters, evaluate the applicants’ abilities to fulfill the roles described above, and prepare questions that may help you make a final decision. As there are multiple candidates, the appointee will be selected by ballots to be provided to the Policy Committee at the meeting.
To Mr. Andrew Wray,

Please consider this my letter of interest to be on the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee. I grew up in Las Cruces and have recently moved back here as a political science student at NMSU after spending a year in Albuquerque. I have been riding a bicycle as my regular means of transportation for several years, and I am very interested in improving the city for other bicyclists and pedestrians, as I think Las Cruces is a truly beautiful place to live and ride a bike in. I believe that it’s important to have a bike and pedestrian friendly city because it increases access for those who do not have an alternate means of transportation, making the city safer and more accessible for all. I am able to attend all BPAC meetings and fulfill all other qualifications listed in the letter, and I am very excited to have this opportunity to help work to improve this beautiful city and my and other’s means of getting around in it. Thank you for your consideration!

Maggie Billings
Andrew
Please consider me a candidate for community representative on BPAC.

I am a 76 year old active bike rider. In recent years I have managed the cycling event in the Senior Olympics both for Dona Ana County and the state of New Mexico. I am a member of the Bike and Chowder cycling group.

I have competed in cycling events in NM, NV and UT.

Currently I volunteer as a tax preparer for low income people, a docent at The Farm and Ranch Heritage museum and as a Las Cruces tree steward.

Thanks for your consideration.

Chambo Chambers
Good afternoon. Several folks have encouraged me to volunteer for a committee that advises the city about bicycling and pedestrian policies. I currently serve on the Transit Advisory board. I'm retired and use either the city bus or my feet for transportation. I have walked pretty much everywhere in Las Cruces west of I-25. If it looks like I could be of help, please let me know the hoops I have to jump through. Thanks.

Charles Clements
2141 N Solano Dr #305
Las Cruces, NM 88001
541-0036
Hi Andrew,

I’m sending this email to express my interest in serving as a citizen member on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee. I received your information from both Dave Rutledge and Ryan Blickem. I am an avid cyclist – I race for Via Velo, ride recreationally, and also occasionally bike commute to my job at NMSU. I am interested in joining the conversation about avenues to improve bicycle facilities in our community.

Please let me know if you need any further information from me.

Thanks,
Carol

Carol Flinchbaugh
Assistant Professor | Department of Management
New Mexico State University | College of Business
cflinch@nmsu.edu | http://business.nmsu.edu/directory/management/flinchbaugh-carol/
hi Andrew

my name is John Gallagher and I met a friend of yours Ashleigh Curry at Becks coffee shop on my bike a couple of weeks ago

i would like to apply for community member board position of BPAC

i have been residing in Las Cruces since June 2014 - originally from the UK and have lived in Chicago, Paris, Richmond VA, and the island of Crete

i have my own tech support company here

i am an avid cyclist and trips i have undertaken include London to Athens, south Italy to Amsterdam, Sydney to Adelaide and the circuit of Tasmania to name a few

plus a few other back packing trips

i am a certified spin instructor and taught class at the Y in Richmond for several years

i have an interest in all things bike technology and maintenance

i have cycled around Las Cruces extensively and traveled on very city bus route have a bunch of suggestions and ideas and hope i can bring my international experience to the organization

cheers

john
Dear Mr. Wray,

My name is Frank Sholedice, and I am writing to express my interest in serving as a community member on the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.

I am a bike commuter; I do not own a motor vehicle, and my bicycle is my main mode of transport. Las Cruces has made great strides in recent years toward becoming more accessible for bicyclists and pedestrians. I feel we can continue to build on this success to make bicycling, walking, and other forms of non-motorized transport part of the fabric of this city.

In the past, I have advocated for bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure by writing to city councilors and attending public input sessions. I would appreciate the opportunity to continue this advocacy as a member of the BPAC.

I can be reached at fsholedice@gmail.com or 575-571-0544 for questions or to discuss this position further. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Frank Sholedice
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 13, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 Presentation on the Missouri Ave./Roadrunner Pkwy. Study Corridor

DISCUSSION:
Bohannan-Huston Staff will give a presentation on the ongoing Missouri Ave./Roadrunner Pkwy Study Corridor.
Missouri Avenue Corridor Study

- Study Area
- Planning Process
- Purpose and Need
- Input and Feedback to Date
- Potential Alternatives
- Next Steps
Planning Process

▲ Study utilizes Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning funds

▲ NMDOT Location Study Procedures Phase A

▲ Public input is critical

▲ Plan and recommendations will be used to request funding

▲ Environmental analysis, design, and construction to be undertaken in later phases
**Phase A** includes:
- Initial alternatives, screening for fatal flaws, limited engineering
- Recommendations on 1-3 alternatives (including No-Build)

**Phase A does not include:**
- Exact costs (will consider magnitude of costs)
- Preliminary engineering analysis (i.e. project design)
Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Missouri Avenue Corridor Study is to provide additional multi-modal connectivity from Missouri Avenue or Roadrunner Parkway across vacant land to Sonoma Ranch Boulevard.

The NEED is based on the following:

△ Lack of network connectivity in the area

△ Lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area
Opportunities

▲ Enhance multi-modal facilities
▲ Create additional network connectivity
▲ Active participation of BLM and NM Farm and Ranch Museum
▲ Potential trail connection with Adobehenge

Challenges

▲ Land is owned and maintained by BLM
▲ Potential conflicts with ATVs on vacant land
▲ Project implementation funding has not yet been identified
▲ Topography / drainage
▲ Study area is generally rugged and marked by a number of arroyos
Project Team

▲ Mesilla Valley MPO
▲ NMDOT
▲ City of Las Cruces
▲ Doña Ana County
▲ Bureau of Land Management
▲ Las Cruces Public Schools
▲ NM Farm and Ranch Museum

Meetings in August 2015 / September 2015 / January 2016
Input & Feedback

▲ New Mexico Farm and Ranch Heritage Museum
  – Supports access to Museum
  – Appreciate bicycle/pedestrian facilities
  – Supports least intensive development near museum

▲ Adobehenge
  – To be built in conjunction with Farm and Ranch Museum
  – Could be accessed via bicycle / pedestrian facilities
Las Cruces Public Schools

- No immediate need for additional roadway access
- Roadway to north would require additional access point and traffic management
- Appreciate the bicycle/pedestrian access for students
Input & Feedback

▲ Public meeting on December 2, 2015
  – Concerns about additional through traffic on Missouri Ave and impacts to property values
  – General support for pedestrian/bicycle facilities

▲ Additional meeting later in 2016
Transport 2040 MTP Network

Proposed Roads in the MTP
- Minor Arterial
- Collector
- Study Area
- US Bureau of Land Management
- Private Ownership
- Schools
- BLM Disposal Land
- NMSU Parcels
- Las Cruces City Limits

Feet

No Build

Minor Arterial Characteristics
- Trips of moderate length and speed
- Lower level of mobility than principal arterials
- More land access emphasis
- Local bus routes
- Intra-community continuity
- Usually does not penetrate identified neighborhoods
- Provide inter-county access

Collector Characteristics
- Lower degree of mobility than arterials
- Designed for shorter distances and lower speeds
- Typically two to three lane roads
- Collect and distribute traffic from the arterial system to local network
- Provide land access
- Provide traffic circulation with residential, commercial, and industrial
- May penetrate neighborhoods
Potential Alternatives to be Considered

▲ Roadway Typical
  – Travel lanes / bicycle lanes / multi-use trail

▲ Non-Motorized Trail
  – Trail to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians

▲ No Build
  – Do nothing at this time
Alternative 1: No Build

Proposed Roads in the MTP
- Minor Arterial
- Collector
- Study Area
- US Bureau of Land Management
- Private Ownership
- Schools
- BLM Disposal Land
- NMSU Parcels
- Las Cruces City Limits

Alternative 1: No Build

Minor Arterial Characteristics
- Trips of moderate length and speed
- Lower level of mobility than principal arterials
- More land access emphasis
- Local bus routes
- Intracommunity continuity
- Usually does not penetrate identified neighborhoods
- Provide inter-county access

Collector Characteristics
- Lower degree of mobility than arterials
- Designed for shorter distances and lower speeds
- Typically two to three lane roads
- Collect and distribute traffic from the arterial system to local network
- Provide land access
- Provide traffic circulation with residential, commercial, and industrial
- May penetrate neighborhoods

Source: Mesilla Valley NPO - Future Thoroughfare Map
Alternative 2: Missouri Extension
Alternative 2: Missouri Extension

Potential Typical Section for Collector

Minor Collector
Alternative 3: Roadrunner Extension
Alternative 3: Roadrunner Extension

Potential Typical Section for Minor Arterial A

Minor Arterial: Option A

Potential Typical Section for Minor Arterial B

Minor Arterial: Option B
Alternative 4: MTP Build Scenario

Proposed Roads in the MTP
- Minor Arterial
- Collector
- Roadrunner Alternative 4
- Missouri Alternative 4
- Study Area
- US Bureau of Land Management
- Private Ownership
- Schools
- BLM Disposal Land
- NMSU Parcels
- Las Cruces City Limits

Feet
Alternative 4: MTP Build Scenario

Proposed Adobehenge

Minor Arterial Characteristics
- Trips of greater length and speed
- Lower level of mobility than principal arterials
- More land access emphasis
- Local bus routes
- intra-community continuity
- Usually does not penetrate identified neighborhoods
- Provides inter-county access

Collector Characteristics
- Lower degree of mobility than arterials
- Designed for shorter distances and lower speeds
- Typically two to three lane roads
- Collect and distribute traffic from the arterial system to local network
- Provide land access
- Provide traffic circulation with residential, commercial, and industrial
- May penetrate neighborhoods

Source: NMSU Valley MPO - Future Thoroughfare Map

Bohannan Huston
Alternative 5A: Missouri Northern
Alternative 5B: Roadrunner Northern
Alternative 5C: MTP Scenario Northern
Alternative 6: Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection
Alternative 6: Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection
Alternatives Evaluation Criteria

▲ Purpose and Need
▲ Access Across Study Area
▲ Network Connectivity
▲ Environmental Impacts
▲ Community Impacts
▲ Consistency with Existing Plans
▲ Right of Way Needs
▲ Magnitude of Costs
Next Steps

▲ Generate feedback on alternatives
▲ Further analysis (e.g. bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, drainage concerns)
▲ Refine alternatives with project team
▲ Public meetings in fall 2016
▲ Identify potential funding opportunities
▲ Finalize study by mid-late 2016
Questions?

▲ Denise Weston, AICP
dweston@bhinc.com

▲ Aaron Sussman, AICP
asussman@bhinc.com

▲ Kristen Woods
kwoods@bhinc.com

▲ Andrew Guerra, PE
aguerra@bhinc.com
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 13, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 Committee Training - Presentation on the Multi-Use Trail Loop

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will give a presentation on the ongoing work planning for the southern leg of the Multi-Use Trail Loop.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 13, 2016

INFORMATION REPORT:
This report is for informational purposes only, MPO Staff will make no presentation on this item.

DISCUSSION:
The El Paso Metropolitan Transportation Board met on February 19, 2016.

The New Mexico members of the Transportation Policy Board who were present:
Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer
Javier Parea, Mayor of Sunland Park, NM
David Garcia, Doña Ana County Commissioner

New Mexico Related Items on the February 19 Agenda:
Item 3.
   a. Program the NM 273 Drainage and Guardrail Project, using $350,000 STP-Flex funds in Fiscal Year 2017. This amendment was sponsored by NMDOT
   b. Program the Airport Road Improvements project using $294,931 of NM Local Government Road Fund, $8432,000 of New Mexico Capital Outlay funds and $100,000 of Doña Ana County Local Match for a total project cost of $8,826,931 in Fiscal Year 2017. This amendment was sponsored by Doña Ana County

Item 9.
Status report on the New Mexico Department of Transportation’s Santa Teresa Border Area Transportation Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan.
The consultants on this project, Wilson and Company and Bohannan Huston gave an update on their work on prioritizing transportation investments based on economic potential and creating a foundation for a regional asset management program. They also briefed the TPB on the timeline of the project.
The PowerPoint presentation is attached.

Non-New Mexico Related Items on the February 19 Agenda:
Item 1. Executive Director’s Report
Item 2. Approval of Minutes
Item 4. Series of Texas amendments to the El Paso MPO TIP and MTP
Item 5. Rescission of CMAQ funds
Item 6. Excuse Absent TPB Members
Item 7. Discussion of the Texas 2016 Unified Transportation Program Update
Item 8. Discussion of proposals to end toll roads in Texas
Item 10. Status report of efforts at International Ports of Entry
Item 11. Monthly Report
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9:
Status report on New Mexico Department of Transportation’s (NMDOT) Santa Teresa Border Area Transportation Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan.

ACTION REQUESTED:
Status report, no action required.

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
- PowerPoint Presentation

DISCUSSION/OPTIONS:
The Santa Teresa Border Area Transportation Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan (STBAT) will be a guiding document designed to contribute to effective decision-making strategies for transportation infrastructure in the Santa Teresa Border Area. The study is funded by a Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), and, consistent with the objectives of that grant, the study examines potential long-term outcomes related to economic competitiveness, quality of life, state of good repair, safety and environmental sustainability. Given the proximity to the U.S.-Mexico international border and the significant economic changes – current and projected – in the New Mexico, Texas and Chihuahua Tri-state region, a specific emphasis of the study is the nexus between employment opportunities and transportation infrastructure, in particular investment in regional transportation projects that will ensure proactive transportation planning related to regional economic development.

The STBAT represents the first attempt to aggregate all previous regional plans, studies and reports and determine the highest priority transportation infrastructure projects for the Santa Teresa border region based on the considerations mentioned above. The study is multi-modal in nature, and while there is by necessity a strong emphasis on freight mobility, other transportation modes such as personal vehicles, transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are included as they are important factors in defining economic development opportunities in the region. The process of determining the highest priority recommendations is supported by a Needs Assessment of the existing transportation infrastructure network that identifies current and projected economic development growth and needs. Ultimately, the study is designed to provide local, regional, state, and national entities with concrete, viable recommendations to guide their policy decisions given identified constraints and opportunities.
El Paso MPO Transportation Policy Board
February 19, 2016
Project Team

• Randall Soderquist  
  NMDOT Project Manager

• Homerio Bernal  
  NMDOT Assistant Project Manager

• Vanessa Spartan, AICP  
  Wilson & Company Project Manager

• Mario Juarez-Infante, PE  
  Wilson & Company Project Manager

• NMDOT District 1
• Existing condition impacts within study area
• Recommendations target area within New Mexico only
Project Goals

- Prioritize transportation investments based on most advantageous economic development potential.
- As data is compiled and a shared database is developed, a strong foundation for a regional asset management program will be provided.
- Provide a comprehensive approach for developing feasible transportation options.
• Coordinate maintenance, planning and capital improvements.

• Improve the housing-job connection for residents of the border area.

• Promote new transit service connecting the current and expanding employment centers.

• Identify the highest priority projects for implementation.
## Project Schedule: Santa Teresa Border Area Transportation (STBAT) Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1: Work Plan and Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Close Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2: Stakeholder &amp; Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Mtg #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Mtg #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Mtg #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Mtg #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Atlas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3: Database Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4: Needs Assessment on Existing Transportation Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 5: Employment Opportunities, Employee Locations and Transportation Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 6: Transportation Infrastructure Decision-Making Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Framework Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Ranking Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 7: Draft Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Project Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 8: Final Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

- **Task 1**: Work Plan & Schedule
- **Task 2**: Stakeholder & Public Outreach
  - Project Steering Committee
  - Focus Group Forums/Interviews
  - 2 Public Meetings
  - **Online Transit Survey**
  - Electronic Newsletters
  - Project Website
  - Email Blasts & Social Media
  - Spanish Outreach and Translations

Contact
Tel: 1-800-457-3445
Email: santateresaplan@wilsonco.com
Web: santateresaplan.com
Facebook: facebook.com/santateresaplan
Twitter: twitter.com/SantaTeresaPlan
• **Task 3**: Database Development
  • Task 3.1 Base Mapping
  • Task 3.2 Transportation Literature Review

• **Task 4**: Needs Assessment of Existing Transportation Network
  • Task 4.1: Travel Demand Modeling & Traffic Modeling
  • Task 4.2: Transit Survey
  • Task 4.3: Pavement Evaluations
  • Task 4.4: Safety Study
Process (continued)

• **Task 5**: Employment Opportunities, Employee Locations and Transportation Options
  • Task 5.1: Economic Literature Review
  • Task 5.2: Ongoing and Future Developments
  • Task 5.3: Economic Forecasts & Workforce Development
  • Task 5.4: Transportation Options

• **Task 6**: Transportation Infrastructure Decision-making Criteria
  • Task 6.1: Project Ranking Methodology
  • Task 6.2: Data Sharing Framework (GIS Based Monitoring)

• **Task 7**: Draft Document

• **Task 8**: Final Plan

• **Project Completion Date**: December 2016
• Project Ranking Precedent Review:
  • TIGER grant recipients
  • NMDOT LRTP Performance Measures
  • NM-CH Border Master Plan

• Categorization by TIGER categories
  • Safety
  • State of Good Repair
  • Mobility
  • Economic Competitiveness
  • Quality of Life
  • Environmental Sustainability
  • Project Readiness/Delivery

Where we left off...
• Work with Steering Committee to identify points and weights for evaluation criteria.
• Received project evaluation criteria from EPMPO.
• Present recommended method at future Stakeholder Meeting.
INFORMATION REPORT:
This report is for informational purposes only, MPO Staff will make no presentation on this item.

DISCUSSION:
The El Paso Metropolitan Transportation Board met on March 18, 2016.

The New Mexico members of the Transportation Policy Board who were present:
Gene Paulk, proxy for Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer
Mayor Diana Trujillo, City of Anthony, NM

New Mexico Related Items on the March 18 Agenda:
Item 4.
Approve the recommendation from the Transportation Project Advisory Committee to amend the Horizon 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Horizon 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program to program the NM 136 (Pete Dominici Highway) Roadway improvements project to include pavement rehabilitation, bridge maintenance and drainage improvements in Fiscal Year 2018 using $16,000,000

Non-New Mexico Related Items on the March 18 Agenda:
All other items on the agenda were administrative in nature