



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://MesillaValleyMPO.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **June 8, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers**, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://MesillaValleyMPO.org).

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **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
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 5.1. ***May 11, 2016** _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Resolution 16-06: A Resolution Adopting the Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 6.2. Resolution 16-07: A Resolution Amending the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Transport 2040) _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 7.1. Committee Training _____ **MPO Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **POLICY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held May 11, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in
6 Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
12 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
13 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
14 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
15 Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
18 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
21 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
22 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
23 Zach Taraschi (MPO staff)

24
25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Wyatt Kartchner, Molzen Corbin
26 Jerry Paz, Molzen Corbin
27 John Montoya
28 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

29
30 **1. CALL TO ORDER (1:04 PM)**

31
32 Hancock: All right. The time is now 1:04 and we call the meeting to order.

33
34 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**

35
36 Hancock: Does any Member, does any Committee Member have a known or
37 perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so that
38 Committee Member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific
39 matter or if they feel that they can be impartial we will put their
40 participation up for a vote by the rest of the Committee. Do we have any
41 conflicts?

42
43 Pedroza: No.

44
45 Barraza: No.

1 Hancock: Very good. Oh the Chair is here. I absolve myself as being Chair now.

2
3 Doolittle: I second the absolution.

4
5 Wray: Mr. Chair. Your mic is not on.

6
7 Sorg: Well it is but I'm *(inaudible)*

8
9 Wray: Okay. Ah, got you.

10
11 Sorg: See, now I'm, um let me get the agenda out in front of me here please.

12
13 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

14
15 Sorg: The next item on the agenda I believe is Public Comment. Is there any
16 public comment? Seeing none.

17
18 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

19
20 Sorg: Um, next item is the Consent Agenda. Is there a ...

21
22 Wray: Mr. Chair.

23
24 Sorg: Motion to approve the agenda? Yes.

25
26 Wray: Staff has an amendment to the agenda. We need to move Item 6.2 from
27 being an Action Item to being a Discussion Item so we propose moving
28 6.2 down to become 7.3.

29
30 Flores: I'll make a motion.

31
32 Sorg: I thought only Consent items were starred, has an asterisk and I don't see
33 where Action Item 6.2 has an asterisk.

34
35 Wray: No. We're, we need to amend the agenda itself um because we're not
36 ready to do the UPWP uh, uh, the, we're, staff is not ready to have the
37 Committee vote on the UPWP. We need to amend the agenda.

38
39 Sorg: Ah, now I understand. Thank you. So is there a motion to move Action
40 Item 6.2 to Discussion Item 7.3?

41
42 Flores: I'll make the motion to move it to, and change it to 7.3 and to move to
43 discussion.

44
45 Barraza: Mr. Chair. I will ...

46

1 Pedroza: Second.
2
3 Barraza: Go ahead. Go ahead Olga.
4
5 Sorg: Motion's been made by ...
6
7 Pedroza: Seconded.
8
9 Sorg: Trustee Flores and uh seconded by Councilor Pedroza. Is there a vote
10 please.
11
12 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
13
14 Barraza: Yes.
15
16 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
17
18 Doolittle: Yes.
19
20 Wray: Councilor Eakman.
21
22 Eakman: Yes.
23
24 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
25
26 Pedroza: Yes.
27
28 Wray: Trustee Flores.
29
30 Flores: Yes.
31
32 Wray: Mr. Chair.
33
34 Sorg: Yes. Okay. So then there's an amendment to, or is there a motion rather
35 to uh approve the agenda as amended?
36
37 Eakman: I would so move.
38
39 Flores: I'll second.
40
41 Sorg: Moved by,
42
43 Flores: Trustee Flores:
44
45 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman and second by Trustee Flores. Any
46 discussion? If not we'll have a vote.

1
2 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
3
4 Barraza: Yes.
5
6 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
7
8 Doolittle: Yes.
9
10 Wray: Councilor Eakman.
11
12 Eakman: Yes.
13
14 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
15
16 Pedroza: Yes.
17
18 Wray: Trustee Flores.
19
20 Flores: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Mr. Chair.
23
24 Sorg: Yes.
25

26 **5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

27
28 **6.1 * April 13, 2016**

29
30 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
31

32 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

33
34 **6.1 Resolution 16-05: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021**
35 **Transportation Improvement Program**
36

37 Sorg: Okay. Next item on the agenda then is Action Item 6.1: A Resolution
38 Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.
39
40 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like ...
41
42 Sorg: Is there a motion to approve?
43
44 Flores: So moved.
45
46 Eakman: Second.

1
2 Sorg: Moved by Trustee Flores and, and second by Councilor Eakman.
3 Proceed Mr. Wray.

4
5 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the Committee to
6 page 52 of your packet. There's a series of TIP amendments that have
7 been requested by New Mexico Department of Transportation and by
8 RoadRUNNER Transit for this month. The first one is TL00013. This is
9 another roll-over funding from Federal Fiscal Year 2015 to Federal Fiscal
10 Year 2016. The new FTA amount is \$543,460. The new local match
11 amount is \$100,729 for a new total of \$643,189.

12 The next amendment is to TL00010. This is operations, this
13 operations funding category. The new FTA 5307 amount is \$2,270,916.
14 The new local match is \$1,829,185 for a new project total of \$4,100,101.

15 We're going to skip over discussing LC00160 briefly and I'll, I'll
16 cover that one in just a minute.

17 Moving down to LC00120, this is the intersection of US-70, Spitz,
18 and Solano uh, uh realignment and improvements project. There's a new
19 project total of \$6,200,000.

20 Regarding LC00160, yesterday I was notified by NMDOT staff that
21 they wish to make a change to the amendment so I'll turn the floor over to
22 NMDOT at this time to discuss this project.

23
24 Doolittle: Mr. Chair if I may.

25
26 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.

27
28 Doolittle: Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee. On that um project specifically
29 we need to modify the dollar amounts very slightly. We need to include
30 \$1.4 million for design in Fiscal Year '16. The Fiscal Year '17 project cost
31 of \$14 million will remain the same. So for that project it will actually have
32 a total project cost of \$15.4 million.

33
34 Hancock: That is Valley Drive.

35
36 Doolittle: That is Valley Drive, correct.

37
38 Sorg: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Doolittle, Doolittle. I gotta stop repeating
39 myself. Any other questions? Councilor Pedroza.

40
41 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Um, can you a tell me what the new amount is, you
42 know you said what the new amount is. What was the old amount?

43
44 Wray: For the ...

45
46 Pedroza: Each one of them.

1
2 Wray: The previous amount for LC00160 was \$11 million and previous amount
3 for LC00120 was \$6.2 million.
4
5 Pedroza: It's one ...
6
7 Sorg: That's what it is now, isn't it?
8
9 Pedroza: Right. The, what's written on here, new project total six ...
10
11 Wray: Oh, I'm sorry, \$5.45 million. It's on page 61 of your packet.
12
13 Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Thank you.
14
15 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
16
17 Sorg: Yes Mayor Barraza.
18
19 Barraza: If I may ask, where is this additional money coming from?
20
21 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I think I can address that.
22
23 Sorg: Okay, Mr. Doolittle.
24
25 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. Those are actually modifications and it's coming out of
26 the District 1 STIP budget. Ultimately what we've done is specifically for
27 the Valley Drive project, um after discussions with the City um ultimately
28 wanted, we wanted to increase the total project cost to the \$14 million. I
29 discussed that increase with Executive Staff so that is federal funding
30 coming out of the General Office so it is not impacting the District 1 STIP
31 targets at all. The additional money for the Spitz/Three Crosses project is
32 coming out of the District 1 STIP budget and ultimately the, the biggest
33 increase tied to that is due to the retaining wall on the northwest quadrant
34 of that intersection. We have to build a new wall because of the new
35 alignment to that roadway and so once we got the estimate for the wall,
36 the cost increase with, that you see there is the price of the wall.
37
38 Barraza: Okay. Thank you.
39
40 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
41
42 Sorg: Yes Commissioner Hancock.
43
44 Hancock: Would you please let the record reflect that I am here and I'm sorry I had
45 to rush out. Thank you.
46

1 Sorg: You, may it be so. Yes. Any other questions on these TIP changes?
2 Okay.
3
4 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I would make a motion to approve the TIP with my proposed
5 amendment specifically to LC00160 to include \$1.4 million for design
6 money in Fiscal Year '16, remaining \$14 million in Fiscal Year '17 for a
7 total cost of \$15.4 million.
8
9 Sorg: I believe that would be a, an amendment to the motion. So yeah, your,
10 we'll take it as that.
11
12 Doolittle: Okay.
13
14 Sorg: Is there a ...
15
16 Barraza: I will second the amendment.
17
18 Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mayor Barraza. And um, okay. If there's no further
19 discussion I'll call for a vote.
20
21 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
22
23 Sorg: On the amendment.
24
25 Barraza: On the amendment. Yes.
26
27 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
28
29 Doolittle: Yes.
30
31 Wray: Councilor Eakman.
32
33 Eakman: Yes.
34
35 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
36
37 Hancock: Yes.
38
39 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
40
41 Pedroza: Yes.
42
43 Wray: Trustee Flores.
44
45 Flores: Yes.
46

1 Wray: Mr. Chair.
2
3 Sorg: Yes. Okay. Is there any further discussion on the motion for these TIP
4 changes? If not I'll call for a vote.
5
6 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
7
8 Barraza: Yes.
9
10 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
11
12 Doolittle: Yes.
13
14 Wray: Councilor Eakman.
15
16 Eakman: Yes.
17
18 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
19
20 Hancock: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
23
24 Pedroza: Yes.
25
26 Wray: Trustee Flores.
27
28 Flores: Yes.
29
30 Wray: Mr. Chair.
31
32 Sorg: Yes. Mr. Wray could I ask a question though?
33
34 Wray: Yes sir.
35
36 Sorg: I didn't want to put it as part of that motion. Um this retaining wall that Mr.
37 Doolittle was talking about, that is a long ways away from that intersection.
38 I, what are you going to do there? Are you going to use that property
39 between what would be Three Crosses and the retaining wall?
40
41 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. That, that is correct. Our current proposed design to increase
42 the efficiency of that intersection is moving Three Crosses to the north.
43 We are actually purchasing that entire property up to the face of that wall,
44 actually it, it incorporates that wall itself. But we will be shifting that
45 roadway alignment to the north.
46

1 Sorg: Do we have a engineering plans for that whole intersection yet?
2
3 Doolittle: We are at I believe 90% design for the intersection itself. We have a
4 meeting with City staff next Thursday to discuss the retaining wall itself
5 and I believe we're at 65% design on the wall.
6
7 Sorg: Okay.
8
9 Doolittle: But for the intersection itself we are at 90%.
10
11 Sorg: Is it possible the Committee could just take a peek at that design when it's
12 ready?
13
14 Doolittle: I will work on getting a copy of the current design or at least a link to the
15 design somehow through the MPO staff so that it can be distributed.
16
17 Sorg: Well we could see it next meeting maybe, in June. How's that?
18
19 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.
20
21 Sorg: Or whenever it's ready.
22
23 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I could certainly, I could certainly provide that as part of my
24 monthly update ...
25
26 Sorg: Okay.
27
28 Doolittle: For discussion. At that, by that point I would guess it will be very close to
29 100% design.
30
31 Sorg: Okay. That'd be great. Cause I recall the City Council some time ago was
32 shown a plan. Maybe Councilor Pedroza remembers it.
33
34 Pedroza: I can't remember the dates, no.
35
36 Sorg: It, it's, it's got to be well over a year, could be two to three years ago now.
37
38 Doolittle: Yeah. I remember that.
39
40 Sorg: I just wonder if it's changed. Okay. Uh, let's proceed on to the next item
41 on the agenda.
42
43 Doolittle: Real quickly Mr. Chair.
44
45 Sorg: Sure.
46

1 Doolittle: Just for clarification purposes, the plan set itself is rather large. Do you,
2 would, do you want to just see like a plan view of the intersection and
3 alignment itself?
4

5 Sorg: Sure.
6

7 Doolittle: Just like a one- or two-page aerial view.
8

9 Sorg: Sure. That's plenty good now. Thank you.
10

11 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

12 **7.1 West Mesa Study Area**

13
14
15 Sorg: Um so the next item would be seven, Discussion Item 7.1. Proceed.
16

17 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. We are pleased today to have with us staff from Molzen
18 Corbin to discuss the West Mesa Study Area.
19

20 Sorg: Thank you.
21

22 Wray: Mr. Wyatt Kartchner.
23

24 Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I want to thank you guys for
25 allowing us to give this presentation today. I'm Wyatt Kartchner with
26 Molzen Corbin out of our Las Cruces office. I'm also joined today by Jerry
27 Paz who's our branch manager for that office. You guys have probably all
28 heard of the West Mesa Corridor Study. It's been around for decades,
29 started as the High Mesa Road Study. Then we did a Phase A study for
30 that project and then we just received notice to proceed, continue with the
31 Phase B portion of the process about two weeks ago so we're, we're kinda
32 getting started on that again. We wanted to give you guys kind of a, an
33 update on where that um project is, kind of the things we're going to be
34 doing in this phase, and then um give you a little background on what we
35 did in the Phase A project.

36 Our team consists of us, Molzen Corbin as the lead engineer. We
37 also have Souder Miller & Associates doing some engineering. Eco
38 Resources Management Systems, they are doing the traffic modeling and
39 then Marron and Associates is doing the environmental study for it.

40 The in, introduction here, the West Mesa Road is, basically it's to
41 take a road from the Santa Teresa border crossing and connect it to I-10
42 somewhere, um we've originally started it on the west side of Las Cruces
43 but we have also expanded that to include areas around NM-404 as well.
44 Right now traffic and all those trucks that cross the border, they have to go
45 along Pete Domenici Highway into Texas, get on I-10 at Artcraft where it's
46 kind of a mess, and then make their way through Las Cruces and then,

1 especially if they're headed west towards Deming. So this proposed route
2 would keep them out of Texas more than anything and shorten that travel
3 distance. One of the things that we looked at was how much time savings
4 would that be and what the cost for that road would be.

5 Some of the things that are going on in the border I'm sure you
6 guys are aware, well aware of. There's an industrial park in Santa Teresa,
7 the UP just put in that big rail yard, there's been over 50 new businesses
8 built. The port of entry was expanded. The trade policies have changed.
9 There's an over-weight zone right around the border where heavier trucks
10 can cross the border. There's lots of manufacturing going on in Mexico
11 and on that side of the border and then there's just lots and lots of plans
12 for growth on both sides of the border in that area. There was recently a
13 Santa Teresa International Rail Study that was completed. We've just
14 received some of the information on that so we're going to be updating our
15 alignments to make sure we don't interfere with what the, the railroad was
16 wanting to do there.

17 As I mentioned before we're in the Phase B process. The Phase A
18 we did in 2013 and 2014 and that's kind of an initial screening of
19 alternatives. We throw out any crazy idea that you may have, screen it
20 down to a few alternatives to carry forward into Phase B. We just received
21 the notice to proceed for Phase B and so that's more of a detailed study.
22 We look at the alternatives that came out of Phase A, we refine them a
23 little bit more, and then we come up with a recommended alternative.
24 We'll look at the traffic impacts, the costs, one of the big factors on this
25 project is the environmental impact, so cultural impacts, any endangered
26 species kinda things like that. And then finally Phase C is the
27 environmental document phase of the process. Currently the NMDOT
28 does not have funding for that phase. However in Phase B, because we
29 know environmental is going to be such a divide, deciding factor we have
30 some field investigations included in that study just to, to make sure that
31 we don't have a fatal flaw from an environmental standpoint.

32 The NMDOT and FHWA has a study process which we are
33 following and that process includes seven ways that a project can receive
34 funding. Those purposes can be system connectivity, so how do you
35 connect one system to another; physical deficiencies, so if a road is in
36 terrible shape or it needs to be three or four lanes and it's only got one
37 lane, it's, we can upgrade a road based off of that; travel demand or
38 congestion, Las Cruces and this area we really don't experience
39 congestion as you would think as compared to big cities but like Paseo del
40 Norte in Albuquerque was one that was justified based off of some
41 congestion; safety issues can also cause a project to go forward; access
42 and mobility. Any project you do is gonna have some sort of economic
43 develop, development as it's gonna put people, local people to work and
44 so that can also spur a project, and then some of the GRIP projects were
45 legislatively mandated and so a project can also be funded and carried
46 forward that way.

1 In our Phase A report we had to generate a Purpose and Need
2 Statement and the statement is there in front of you. It says "The purpose
3 of the proposed West Mesa Corridor is to provide a high-speed access-
4 controlled roadway to provide access to Santa Teresa border area from I-
5 10 west of Las Cruces to accommodate growth of the Santa Teresa
6 border region and reduce traffic congestion on the existing roadway
7 facilities." So that was kind of what we, we started with. We needed to, to
8 meet those conditions in order to carry forward with the project. We've
9 kind of, we'll need to modify this statement to take out "I-10 west of Las
10 Cruces" if we go ahead and, when we go ahead and study the 404
11 connections, it kind of contradicts itself there.

12 So in the Phase A study we gathered a lot of information. We
13 gathered from our sub-consultant Marron and Associates all the
14 archaeological sites that are out there that are recorded. There's a whole
15 lot more out there I'm sure, so all those red blobs are the recorded
16 archaeological sites and all these different colored lines are proposed
17 alignments that we had for the study. And so we know that we couldn't
18 avoid all of the archaeological sites that are out there but we did our best
19 to avoid huge ones that you might see, I don't know if you guys, there's
20 one here that, just massive that we tried to avoid and so those are one of
21 the factors that we included.

22 Topography, we didn't want to go through, you can see here the
23 contours get really tight. There's a, a hill right here so we wanted to make
24 sure the road didn't do something silly and go through a mountain when it
25 didn't need to.

26 And then land ownership was another thing that was a big
27 consideration. A lot of the land out here is either owned by BLM or State.
28 The white pieces you can see are privately-owned property but, so you
29 can see for the most part this blue is State and then this other kind of tan-
30 hatched color is BLM property. And so there wasn't a whole lot of private
31 property that we would be impacting by any of these alignments. As we
32 study the 404 option in more detail in this phase that option is going to
33 have much more impact to private land as it goes through Anthony and
34 through the valley of Las Cruces, towards I-10.

35 Another thing that we found during our study was that there's a
36 solar zone that's being done by BLM, you can see in this crosshatched
37 area. They didn't have any issues with us going through that but we just
38 wanted to make sure that it was documented.

39 So this road across the prairie that we don't really know who's
40 going to use or what's going to happen, we had to use traffic modeling.
41 Our traffic modeler, his name is Bob Shull and he actually is the inventor
42 of the VISUM model. He's probably the most well-renowned traffic
43 modeler in, in the country. He's used by the Las Cruces MPO, he's the,
44 Mesilla Valley MPO excuse me, El Paso MPO, he's got the Statewide
45 Transportation Network Model. He invented the model and he is as good
46 of a traffic model guesser as you can, can get. He took data from the

1 Statewide Transportation Model, he's incorporated data from the Mesilla
2 Valley MPO's model, also the El Paso MPO, and then we also got
3 information from the USDOT Freight Yard, stuff from the Union Pacific,
4 and then we got information from the border crossing to determine, "Okay,
5 what's the land use around the region going to be? How many vehicles
6 will be generated by the border crossing? Where will those vehicles go?
7 How will traffic react by putting this roadway in? Will traffic use it or will
8 they just continue on their, their current route?" And so we modeled the
9 traffic in Phase A for 2010 and 2040. In the Phase B process we will
10 refine those traffic numbers even more. So here's some of the results
11 from that preliminary traffic study. This is 2040 numbers and so traffic and
12 travel congestion is measured on what's called LOS or Level of Service is
13 what LOS stands for, and it's given a grade from A to F, where A being
14 great to F being it's completely jammed and failing. So in 2040 we found
15 that our two-lane roadway which is what we had modeled, one, one lane
16 in each direction would have a Level of Service between D and E which
17 means that there's going to be a lot of cars on the road if we put this in.
18 We found that it would improve the traffic for the regional and interstate
19 trucks rather than local traffic.

20 If you think about it, if a trucker comes through the Santa Teresa
21 port of entry and he's headed to Los Angeles or somewhere in California,
22 he wants to get there as quickly as possible and so when he came out of
23 Mexico he deliberately used the Santa Teresa rail yard, or Santa Teresa
24 border crossing to get there. If he was going to go east out of Mexico they
25 would probably use a border crossing on the east side of El Paso rather
26 than go through Santa Teresa and then have to navigate through El Paso
27 and so what we found through our traffic study is that most of the traffic is
28 probably going to be headed west. And so Alternative, you can see here
29 in this table, Alternative B was an alternative that tied into the Jackrabbit
30 interchange which is US-70, it's kind of halfway off the, the hill between
31 here and the airport. And you can see there was about 6,600 cars that
32 used it here and 12% trucks. Alternative C tied into the Airport
33 interchange which is where the, the Love's truck stop is, there's about the
34 same volume of traffic and a little bit higher percentage of trucks. If we
35 took that Alternative E which ties it onto the Corralitos interchange which
36 is west of the, the fairgrounds you can see the traffic numbers jump
37 significantly. And then finally if we do just the NM-404 connection so we
38 don't bypass Las Cruces whatsoever, there's only 4,000 cars that would
39 use that and the large majority of them are cars and not trucks. And so
40 these are our preliminary numbers. It kind of seems, some of them seem
41 a little bit strange in that there's such a large discrepancy between the
42 12,000 and the 6,000 but we were, we're gonna evaluate this again and
43 make sure that we get the best results that we can from our traffic model.

44 In Phase A our recommendations were for further evaluation or the
45 no-build. Do we really even need to spend \$85 to 100 million on a, a road
46 or can we just use or improve the existing infrastructure that we have?

1 We recommended Alternative B which ties into the Jackrabbit interchange,
2 Alternative C which ties into the Airport interchange, and Alternative E
3 which tied into the, the Corralitos interchange. And then we also didn't
4 want to discount the NM-404 connection. During this Phase B we're going
5 to look at more options to make sure that we didn't miss something that's
6 obvious and then we're going to do some tweaking to these to make sure
7 that with the development and the changes that have happened in the last
8 three years, that nothing has impacted these. And so on your screen here
9 you can see the options that we're going to study further in this Phase B
10 process.

11 From our Phase A study the conclusions that we could draw were
12 that there is a need for the West Mesa Corridor. It will be used. We found
13 a cost range of \$85 to 100 million. That could go up or down depending
14 on if you put a concrete road in. If we cross, if we use the NM-404
15 connection there's going to be lots of properties that are gonna have to be
16 acquired so right-of-way costs, there'll be a river crossing so that's going
17 to be expensive, and then if we need to upgrade an interchange at
18 Jackrabbit, Airport, or Corralitos to accommodate this heavier volume of
19 traffic. There's lots of environmental impacts that we would need to
20 mitigate as best as possible. And then based off of our, our traffic
21 numbers we found that the connections, the further west you get the
22 better, the higher volume of traffic you're going to see and the benefits of
23 NM-404 are, are marginal.

24 So in the Phase B which is what we just started we're going to
25 update our, all of our alternatives and incorporate the BNSF rail study.
26 We're going to do new drawings and alignments. We're going to do a
27 complete cost estimate for all of these align, alternatives to, to see which
28 one costs the most. We're going to do an environmental study. Once we
29 kind of narrow down our alternatives our environmental sub-consultant's
30 actually going to walk the entire alignment. Could be 30, 33 miles of
31 walking across the desert to see if there's any endangered species or any
32 cultural resources that we need to avoid. As I mentioned the traffic
33 model's going to be updated. We're going to look at the drainage impacts.
34 All that water's flowing from the west towards the Rio Grande so drainage,
35 there's going to be lots of culverts and we need to know what that cost is
36 going to be.

37 One of the major evaluation criteria that we've come up with is a
38 cost:benefit ratio. One of the alternatives may have a significantly less
39 cost than the other one but if it doesn't gather any traffic, is it really worth
40 it? And so we're going to determine a way of measuring all of these
41 alternatives apples to apples if you will. Because some of them are going
42 to be 35 miles long, some of them are going to be 30 miles long so of
43 course the 35-mile-long's gonna cost more but if it gets 15,000 cars a day
44 versus one that gets 6,000 a day it's a better investment. And so that's
45 one of the criteria that we're going to weigh. And then we're also going to
46 look at a private-public partnership on this project. New Mexico probably

1 doesn't have \$85 to 100 million to throw at a new road across the desert
2 and so we're going to see if maybe a, a company or a toll road could be
3 put in. I know it could, couldn't be done currently because of the New
4 Mexico's constitution doesn't allow that but we're going to look and see if
5 that's even an option. We've had several people approach us and say,
6 "Hey, we'll build the road if you'll let us toll people." And so we need to
7 look and see is that something that's viable and something that can be
8 done.

9 Our schedule right now, we have a pretty tight schedule. Our
10 contract actually expires in February of next year so we have to complete
11 our entire Phase B study before then. In June we're planning on having a
12 stakeholder meeting. We have a pretty good list from our last meet, last
13 phase of the project of about 80, 85 people. Then we're going to do a
14 draft Phase B report in November. We'll help hold a public meeting in
15 November and then our final Phase B report will be in January. And then
16 as far as the remaining phases, Phase 1C, the environmental stuff, or final
17 design and construction, all that's to be determined at this point. And with
18 that I'll take any questions you may have.

19
20 Sorg: Thank you Wyatt. That was really good. Any questions from the
21 Committee? Mr. Doolittle.

22
23 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Wyatt. I do have a, a couple of questions or requests I guess.
24 Next week I'm actually headed to TxDOT to meet with them to discuss the
25 Northeast Parkway ...

26
27 Kartchner: Okay.

28
29 Doolittle: Corridor Study. So I'm just wondering, the 404 connection, did the data
30 that's included in this modeling consider the Northeast Parkway?

31
32 Kartchner: I believe it did.

33
34 Paz: Under the 2040, yes. The 2040 is part of ...

35
36 Sorg: Could you state your name please.

37
38 Paz: Oh, I'm sorry. Jerry Paz with Molzen Corbin, also worked with Wyatt on
39 this project. On the 2040 the Northeast Parkway is part of the El Paso's
40 long-range thoroughfare plan so we're, that assumption was built into, to
41 that number.

42
43 Doolittle: Okay. Mr. Chair I do have one more request specifically of, of the Molzen
44 Corbin folks. This Committee, or this Board has been very interested in
45 this, this corridor. Looking at your schedule we're expected to have the
46 Phase B draft in November with the public meeting that same month. I

1 just ask you to keep us and maybe Tom for the MPO staff informed so that
2 we can present that information to the Board so that they're aware of when
3 they can attend the public meetings and provide their input as either an
4 elected official or as you know personally, just because of the interests of
5 the Board themselves. And I'll try to do the same on my, on my monthly
6 meetings but more specifically I guess I would ask of you and Tom just
7 kind of keep the Board in the loop so that the Board knows when to
8 participate in those meetings and give their input.
9

10 Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Mr. Doolittle. We also have in here which we didn't show on the
11 schedule a preliminary draft report which we're going to come out with
12 probably the end of June and we can make sure that you guys get a copy
13 of that and, and we'd be happy to come back and present as the project
14 progresses.
15

16 Doolittle: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.
17

18 Sorg: Very good. Commissioner Hancock.
19

20 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for the presentation. I only observed
21 one particular item that was not addressed and that is the UAS. Did you
22 consult with NMSU regarding, that entire area is UAS. Was that
23 considered?
24

25 Hancock: In the phase, or excuse me Mr. Chair. No it, it wasn't in the first Phase A
26 report. It will be in this next phase.
27

28 Hancock: I see. Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.
29

30 Sorg: Would someone explain what a UAS is?
31

32 Hancock: The Physical Sciences Department at NMSU um has that entire area uh
33 designated as a Unmanned Aerial Flight Area and so it has particular
34 restrictions that could be um problematic.
35

36 Sorg: Understand.
37

38 Hancock: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.
39

40 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.
41

42 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm going to sound a little bit, well I don't know a lot
43 of this stuff. Can you tell me who the stakeholders that you have
44 identified, what, what, what groups, it's not just "Y'all come!" Who in
45 particular has been targeted to be at, and, and identified as stakeholders
46 for these meetings?

1
2 Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Ms. Pedroza. The stakeholders have included people from
3 Dona Ana County, the Sunland Park ...

4
5 Pedroza: People from, just residents of?

6
7 Kartchner: No.

8
9 Pedroza: No.

10
11 Kartchner: The employees from Dona Ana County.

12
13 Pedroza: I see.

14
15 Kartchner: We've had border crossing individuals, we've had a group from Mexico.
16 We had the trucking industry, Border Patrol. Who else?

17
18 Paz: We have, the NMDOT Borders Office has a list of about 120 stakeholders
19 that they collaborate with on a number of border projects that are going on
20 in the area. So they include the Border Trade Alliance, they include all the
21 people at Customs, INS, all the law enforcement individuals they, and the
22 trucking industry's a big element in that in, in terms of their, their use and
23 they're the ones that came forward on a 3P alternative which was, it came
24 from them at some of our previous stakeholder meetings. So that was
25 kind of interesting that, that the private sector has expressed an interest in
26 them building the road and, and taking on that responsibility cause they
27 saw the benefit. And so once the traffic numbers came back it, it kind of
28 shed light that well maybe there is a demand because we went into this
29 not knowing if there was a demand and, and how much of a demand and
30 who would use it and, and so as the traffic numbers started to come in it
31 started to shed light on the things that we were hearing at these public
32 meetings, these stakeholder meetings about a, a need for that.

33
34 Pedroza: Okay.

35
36 Paz: And mostly in a westward direction so that was, that was you know
37 something we learned through the course of the study but there's about
38 128 border industry/border groups, again staff from both El Paso, Las
39 Cruces that, that are collaborated with that.

40
41 Pedroza: Okay.

42
43 Paz: And we can get you a full list of the, our ...

44
45 Pedroza: Thank you.
46

1 Paz: Of the stakeholders list.
2
3 Pedroza: I would appreciate that. Again I'm only familiar with 404 where it intersects
4 I-10 and goes in one direction towards Chaparral and the other direction
5 toward, through, through ...
6
7 Kartchner: Anthony.
8
9 Pedroza: Not really. It goes north of Anthony. But so is that what we're talking
10 about or, or then they talked about something about Anthony and, or gave
11 me the impression that you were going north of Las Cruces. Does that,
12 you're not talking, I was probably mistaken. It doesn't go north of Las
13 Cruces.
14
15 Kartchner: Mr., Mr. Chair.
16
17 Pedroza: Right.
18
19 Kartchner: The, as you can see on the alignments here there's the, this turquoise
20 alignment, the blue alignment, and this red alignment all would connect to
21 I-10 west of Las Cruces. The, this 404 connection here would actually
22 connect to the 404 interchange which takes you to Chaparral. It would go
23 through, across the river and then it would tie into what is O'Hare Road
24 now.
25
26 Pedroza: Oh, okay.
27
28 Kartchner: Which is, I believe is a county facility that would have to obviously be
29 upgraded, and then it would go through O'Hare Road as it changes from
30 O'Hare Road to NM-404 at NM-478 and then ties all the way to the
31 interchange at NM-404 to I-10.
32
33 Pedroza: Is there any thinking about routing some of that through the actual City of
34 Las Cruces?
35
36 Kartchner: If that alternative was chosen that traffic would go on I-10 through Las
37 Cruces.
38
39 Pedroza: It would.
40
41 Kartchner: Yes ma'am. Current, like it currently does now. Any traffic that currently
42 uses Artcraft Road, they get on I-10 ...
43
44 Pedroza: Right.
45
46 Kartchner: In El Paso ...

1
2 Pedroza: Right.
3
4 Kartchner: And then they take I-10 ...
5
6 Pedroza: Yeah.
7
8 Kartchner: West, so it would be ...
9
10 Pedroza: Then ...
11
12 Kartchner: Similar. It would just connect in Anthony.
13
14 Pedroza: So then my question would be to you or, or possibly to Tom: In, in terms
15 of some of those residents that I had kind of been saying, "Oh, we don't
16 need to have residents. What do they know?" Believe me, but if it does
17 go through Las Cruces then I think, suspect that staff will need to
18 somehow or another connect with plain old ordinary residents as to what
19 their opinion of, of these alternatives might be. Is that a possibility?
20
21 Paz: Yes. And, and ...
22
23 Pedroza: Okay.
24
25 Paz: To back up a little bit Councilor Pedroza, so in El Paso they have what
26 they call like the Inner Loop, so it's Transmountain Road ...
27
28 Pedroza: Right.
29
30 Paz: Loop 375, and it goes around El Paso. Now they're building that Outer
31 Loop which is that one that's on that I don't know billion-dollar project
32 that's connecting the Outer Loop of El Paso. Well that Outer Loop would
33 then tie into 404 because the, the grade on Transmountain Road is too
34 steep for truckers. They don't like it. And so going through the Anthony
35 Gap is much smoother and much easier, and so they're looking at if, if,
36 see Texas does this a lot. They have the Inner Loop, they have the Outer
37 Loop. I think Houston has some, you know three or four loops.
38
39 Pedroza: And very confusing too.
40
41 Paz: So this'll be El Paso's Outer Loop so the 404 as, as Trent mentioned, what
42 they're calling their Northeast Parkway alignment is the Outer Loop to El
43 Paso so it, it would be in, in terms of system connectivity and that criteria,
44 it would really match up with the goals of the region that are being
45 developed down there. With respect to the other alternatives as, as Wyatt
46 had mentioned, oops. Which way am I going? So this Alternate E which

1 ties into Corralitos, what, what we were finding, what came out of the
2 results and it just kind of startled us is you're seeing that large volume of
3 trucks that are heading to California. They're not wanting to stop in El
4 Paso, they're not wanting to stop in Anthony, they're wanting to get, they
5 save 30 minutes going through El Paso, going around and going, and
6 heading off west. So you're looking at a large volume of traffic that would
7 simply bypass Las Cruces altogether and it would take that congestion off
8 the local roads, I-10 and, and, and others and it would, it would ship it
9 towards the west. So that's, that's that concept there. So there would be
10 less of an impact on Las Cruces unless you're a hotel owner. They want
11 that business to sit here and come in Las Cruces. But you're you're
12 talking about truckers that are long-haul, I mean they're, they're ready to
13 get going, they're ready to move so how many of them would actually stay
14 the night in Las Cruces versus El Paso or all that stuff so those are things
15 that are difficult to determine. But, but that's what we're finding; 404
16 would, it has the least amount of vehicles on it, it's more of a regional
17 corridor. It's meant to circulate traffic around the region. And so as you're
18 seeing that it's probably, it's, the truckers probably use Artcraft Road, get
19 on I-10, and go just like they always have, less of an incentive to use the
20 404 than they would be if they saved 30 minutes heading, heading on the
21 west side. So those are the dynamics. We're kind of learning as we get
22 deeper into this that's happening with this travel. So traffic you know
23 when, when people set up a Dunkin' Donuts they look for the busiest ...
24

25 Pedroza: Sure.

26
27 Paz: Most congested, worst street you can find and that's where they want to
28 be. So traffic, it depends on who you're talking to whether it's good or
29 bad.
30

31 Pedroza: What, how did you get the totals that you have there on, on that particular
32 slide? The, the, in Alternative E resulted in 12,780. Is, those are not real
33 numbers, that's just like projections or something?
34

35 Paz: Projections. Your staff would like you to believe that there is this scientific
36 black box that all these inputs ...
37

38 Pedroza: You know how they are.
39

40 Paz: Are put into and out spits these you know genuine numbers and, and if we
41 could guess the future boy we'd be in the stock market not in traffic
42 demand. But it is a very scientific, educated, very thought-out wild guess.
43

44 Pedroza: It's a good crystal ball.
45

1 Paz: Crystal ball. And, and I don't know if you can explain it any better Tom,
2 but it, it's very scientific. What goes into it, the character of the drivers, the
3 character of the truckers ...
4
5 Pedroza: Oh, geeze.
6
7 Paz: They interview ...
8
9 Pedroza: Ask their wives.
10
11 Paz: People at the border crossing, say, "Where do you want to go?" And so
12 the origin and destination and the, the travel demand is all predicted
13 based on, and then they count cars all over the streets and they're seeing
14 if their model matches the numbers they're physically counting on today so
15 they calibrate their model based on today's traffic and say, "Okay if it, if it
16 matches more or less what we see today," then they growth it up to see
17 what would happen in the future. So these ...
18
19 Pedroza: Okay.
20
21 Paz: How they code their, their driver characteristic makes a difference, so
22 there's a lot of variables that go into it and, and ...
23
24 Pedroza: Okay.
25
26 Paz: A long time ago we took a step back and said, "Let's, let these experts
27 who that's all they do," Bob Shull's out of Washington State. We've used
28 him and this, he's a DOT expert for their statewide program and, and
29 they're used by the MPO here so we've, we've long ago just collaborated
30 with him to help develop these numbers and then you sit there and scratch
31 your head and say, "Well, that makes no more sense, I mean that's kind of
32 crazy." And as he explains these, these things about the Outer Loop/Inner
33 Loop of El Paso you're talking about a local situation versus long-haul
34 truckers that want to get through.
35
36 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much.
37
38 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
39
40 Sorg: Oh, dear. Mayor Barraza first and then Commissioner Hancock.
41
42 Barraza: Okay. Mine's a simple question or a concern. I think I've been on MPO
43 for quite a few years and when this project was first brought up, I think the
44 major concern was the economic development of Las Cruces and the
45 Town of Mesilla where all this traffic was going to be routed around uh the,

1 the City of Las Cruces and I don't know if that's something that had been
2 discussed or what is the opinion on that.

3
4 Sorg: May I suggest uh that, and you can back me up or tell me I'm wrong but
5 this traffic is going to go to the border, the Mexico border so it would affect
6 that. Yes, it would affect that, that traffic that might be coming to, in and
7 out of the border at Santa Teresa but as far as traffic that comes through
8 and around and in El Paso that shouldn't be affected. They're not going to
9 go way over there as a rule, I would think. Back me up or tell me down.

10
11 Kartchner: Mr., Mr. Chairman, Mayor. One of the things that people had concerns
12 about was if somebody that's going from California to Florida, that they
13 would take this road and bypass Las Cruces altogether. The traffic model
14 that we have can predict that and what they determined was it's not going
15 to save them any time to do that and so they didn't see any traffic that was
16 going from either Florida to California or vice-versa that would actually use
17 this corridor to, to skip Las Cruces. It may have an impact in that 12,000
18 vehicles aren't routed through Las Cruces. I believe our traffic model can
19 predict the number of traffic, or number of cars or trucks that would
20 actually stop in Las Cruces and I, I believe we had them do that. I don't
21 remember what the, the result of that was but it was a very low percentage
22 of people that would actually stop in Las Cruces. But we can, that's one of
23 the things that we've been concerned about. We had hotel owners at our
24 first public meeting that were very concerned about, about that and so
25 we're going to continue to investigate that and see if we can't get a, a
26 number as to what that impact would be.

27
28 Paz: The other thing that I think was calibrated in this model is previous
29 predictive models overestimated traffic so there was, there was high
30 volumes that were predicted in the past that never materialized. And so
31 this, this model took that into consideration. But overall what we did see is
32 a continuous increase in travel all over the region and so you're not going
33 to lose any traffic or any visitors to the Town of Mesilla that you don't, you
34 currently have. You're going to see a growth in travel, in visitors. But
35 there may be a slight, slightly lower growth with this, with this bypass road
36 than there would've been without it. So there, there's not a decline in
37 number of people going through the town and the area at all but there is a,
38 it, it could be that there's a less grow, lower growth than there would've
39 normally been.

40
41 Sorg: Thank you Jerry, thank you Wyatt. Mr. Hancock.

42
43 Hancock: What, what is that current number?

44
45 Sorg: What number?

1 Hancock: The, he mentioned there, there was, there were projections that were um
2 way too high so that must mean that we have a current number.
3
4 Paz: Well that's the other element that make, makes this unique. A lot of, like
5 when we did the I-10 project you count the cars and then you can growth it
6 out from a baseline. There's no road out there to count cars on so
7 everything is predictive. But what was, like NM-136 that ties into the
8 border crossing, some of that travel that was predicted early on did not
9 materialize and so of, of all the vehicles that are coming through at this
10 point it's, it's less, lower on the growth curve than, than people had
11 predicted. And I think that was, I think we saw with the housing slow-
12 down in the, in 2009 there was all these growth projections that were way
13 out there and, and they just didn't happen and so that could be a
14 phenomenon that occurred nationwide that happened here. But I think
15 this model has calibrated itself for that for a more realistic forward growth.
16
17 Hancock: But wouldn't we be looking at what the current volume is on I-10 now?
18
19 Paz: The volume on I-10, the 66,000 or so vehicles that are on there now are,
20 are, would continue to again as I mentioned to the Mayor, would continue
21 to grow and there's plenty of capacity on I-10 to handle all of this
22 additional traffic. So the, the capacity of I-10 is not the bottleneck. It's the
23 savings in time, would, would anybody use a brand-new corridor and, and
24 how much, and that's what these numbers are predicting. But ...
25
26 Hancock: I, I understand.
27
28 Paz: I-10 has the capacity.
29
30 Hancock: I, I, we, the reason I'm asking the question is because I'm just cross-
31 referencing the numbers. South Central Regional Transit has a, a study
32 underway currently on rail between Las, between Las Cruces and El Paso
33 and our consultant, our traffic engineer indicates that there are 41,000
34 trips between El Paso and Las Cruces every day. And that, that means
35 that it's on the I-10 before you hit I-25 down to El Paso. So 41,000 minus
36 12,700 or ...
37
38 Paz: No, it would, the, I think if, if I'm hearing you correctly, like I had two of
39 those this, one over and one back so I had two this morning to El Paso
40 and so I think that it's those daily trips that people take to and from El
41 Paso that that's counting because ...
42
43 Hancock: Okay.
44

1 Paz: I believe there's more than 45,000 currently volume of cars on I-10. So it,
2 I-10 has plenty of capacity to add the 12,000 if that's what the study would,
3 would, would come down to.
4

5 Hancock: Well it, the, the reason I ask is that, that there about the middle on I-10
6 between El Paso and Las Cruces we have the weigh station and every,
7 every truck that goes through is counted. So we have an, we have an
8 accurate count of how many trucks there currently are between El Paso.
9 So that means that we have, we don't count them going to El Paso, we
10 count them coming from El Paso. So the, in that route that would be the
11 number that may very well be bypassed, or some portion thereof. So it,
12 the ones that are not going to be taking 25 going north that are going to go
13 west, then that's, that's a real number that can be identified. Because if
14 you, if you look on both sides you have a weigh station over here at,
15 between El Paso and Las Cruces and then you have Customs which
16 counts every one of them also on I-10. So you, you can tell the difference
17 between these two and the number of trucks is going to be the ones that
18 went up I-25, and then you have another, you have another Customs up
19 on 25 that, those three should add up so if they don't that means they
20 went to Las Cruces and dropped a load and then went back.
21

22 Sorg: Or Commissioner they could've been traveling from Houston to Phoenix.
23

24 Hancock: Well you would count those then on, on 10.
25

26 Sorg: Right.
27

28 Hancock: Right. So you're going to know one way or another where they are and ...
29

30 Sorg: Right.
31

32 Hancock: And on which load, whether it is the west load or whether it is the north
33 load. So it, that's going to tell you very likely what the, the volume, the
34 true number is going to be for this one.
35

36 Paz: The, the ...
37

38 Sorg: But if you're traveling ...
39

40 Hancock: Except for the stuff ...
41

42 Sorg: From Houston to Phoenix ...
43

44 Hancock: Coming from the east.
45

46 Paz: Yeah.

1
2 Sorg: You wouldn't go over there ...
3
4 Paz: Right.
5
6 Sorg: To Santa Teresa ...
7
8 Hancock: Yeah.
9
10 Sorg: And go up.
11
12 Hancock: No. No. No.
13
14 Sorg: Not necessarily.
15
16 Paz: But what ...
17
18 Hancock: Well, you'd come up 10.
19
20 Sorg: Yeah.
21
22 Hancock: Yeah.
23
24 Paz: But what this is showing is those 12,000 vehicles would be taken off of I-
25 10.
26
27 Hancock: Right.
28
29 Paz: They, they would be removed from I-10 and put on this corridor. So, but
30 as I mentioned to the Mayor I-10 is still increasing in its volume of trucks.
31 So, so the region is, is increasing all together at a lower rate and it would
32 be 12,000 less vehicles which is, which to me was shocking. I, I thought if
33 it got up to four or 5,000 initially just kind of growing up here if I thought
34 four or 5,000. That, that, that road's not going to get that much use. I
35 was, when I saw six, 12,000 I was kind of shocked.
36
37 Hancock: Yeah. Well I think the numbers Mr. Chair in, in the Transit Study um
38 indicated um that to add another lane onto I-10 in that section is \$6.5
39 million a mile. So if you don't have to add a lane there and you're building
40 it over here to bypass then the roads are going to last a lot longer.
41
42 Sorg: Oh yes.
43
44 Hancock: So thank you.
45

1 Paz: The, I think the, well the other startling point Commissioner was, and this
2 was before we got the numbers, when the trucking industry approached
3 us about the public/private partnership saying, "We'll build it if there's a
4 way to recoup our money," and, and it would be a County led type of
5 project because I do think the Constitution prohibits the State from taking
6 on that task. However the, like many things in our Constitution they, they
7 delegate activities to local governments and so I think that, and, and we've
8 asked our Project Development Engineer from the DOT to get a legal
9 opinion on even is that a possibility but when you think why would, you
10 mean you're willing to put your private dollars in to fund this because they,
11 they felt like there was that demand for it so it, it, it keeps coming back
12 and, and then once we got the numbers I, I could see where they could
13 make some money if they, if they really materialize the 12,000. And it
14 would also be on their risk. You know if they charged a dollar maybe
15 12,000 users, if they charge \$15 people go I-10 and, and save that
16 money. I think we calculated the gas alone would be you know 12, 15
17 bucks so I mean there's that point where they're going to say, "I'm, I'm
18 going to take it and pay that toll and, and keep going on." So that there's,
19 there's that element in it but it seemed having \$100 million, if you make it
20 concrete \$120 million project, those projects don't come around very often
21 or the funding for those are just not available unless there was some sort
22 of private investment. So that, that was just a thought that we would ...
23
24 Sorg: Yeah.
25
26 Paz: What we're exploring as a part of this.
27
28 Sorg: We understand, Jerry.
29
30 Hancock: Mr., Mr. Chair. I'm, I'm, as he's saying that I'm thinking okay if that's the
31 County issue then, then I'm wondering if we could use the infrastructure
32 development zone as the, the means for that.
33
34 Sorg: I don't know what an infrastructure ...
35
36 Hancock: IDZ.
37
38 Sorg: Development zone ...
39
40 Hancock: Remember the IDZ?
41
42 Sorg: IDZ, okay. Perhaps ...
43
44 Pedroza: Yeah. And I would, I would caution, oh may ...
45
46 Sorg: Go ahead Councilor.

1
2 Pedroza: I would caution you not only with the Infrastructure Development Zone
3 because that has implications of non-local government but I would also
4 caution you to listen very, very carefully to what your legal advisors tell
5 you about whether a private/private or a county or some other entity within
6 a county is, is totally exempt from the Constitution because I suspect
7 they're not. Thank you.
8

9 Sorg: Okay. Councilor Eakman.

10
11 Eakman: Two small points. In looking at these alternatives and this is based on
12 what is happening currently, if somebody were to enter Alternative B at
13 Jackrabbit Lane and going west they'd still have a three-mile grade to
14 climb. If they entered at Corralitos all the other traffic would be dealing
15 with merging huge semi trailers at a 75-mile-an-hour rate when they're
16 actually doing 85. Where, whereas the Airport interchange the grade is
17 complete and you're at a 65-mile-an-hour zone. And so today I favor
18 public safety as an option here.
19

20 Sorg: Thank you Councilor. I, I had one thing I wanted to bring up as long as, if
21 you could just move to the solar zone map and I just wanted to comment
22 that I would imagine the solar zone is going to have to deal with the UAS's
23 too, issue, but I, I, I don't have my glasses on but I wonder if, if you could
24 outline on there where the new national monument boundaries are. Not
25 necessarily right now and show us, have future maps have those
26 boundaries on it so everybody when you go to stakeholders, etc. um they
27 know where the national monument is. And one stakeholder will be the
28 Friends of the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument. You
29 will need to contact them.
30

31 Kartchner: Correct.

32
33 Sorg: So yeah, it's going to be important. There's going, it may or may not
34 affect, there might be an impact, may not, probably not, probably, anybody
35 would, we need to know.
36

37 Kartchner: Yeah, Commissioner, Chairman. We, we did look at that. I will add that to
38 the other maps. It is on um the west side of the railroad tracks from what I
39 understand and so we'll make sure that it doesn't impact that. That was
40 one of the first things that I thought of when we revised this project ...
41

42 Sorg: Sure.

43
44 Kartchner: Was, "Oh boy, what does that do to it? Does it just ...
45

46 Sorg: Yeah.

1
2 Kartchner: Shut it down completely?" so ...
3
4 Sorg: And you might want to expand the maps, all of them, to show the 404
5 crossing the valley and connecting ...
6
7 Kartchner: Correct.
8
9 Sorg: Up with I-10 and 404, 404.
10
11 Kartchner: Yeah, we, we need to look at the, that's one of the alternatives. We have
12 a lot of work to, to do to see what impacts it will have to the, crossing the
13 river.
14
15 Sorg: Yeah.
16
17 Kartchner: All the private properties and then that area between NM-478/NM-460 on
18 O'Hare Road is kind of a residential area that's pretty narrow and so ...
19
20 Sorg: Sure.
21
22 Kartchner: How do we accommodate the traffic through there?
23
24 Sorg: Very good. Last words by anybody? Go ahead Jerry.
25
26 Paz: Yeah, I would just add that um as we concluded up our Phase A,
27 Commissioner Garrett was the one that brought up the 404 and I, I wish
28 he were here today but, and, and its relationship to the overall circulation
29 within the regional area and the system connectivity that's going on there
30 and it made, it made a lot of sense and so we went to the Department of
31 Transportation and, and added that to our Phase B study so that we could
32 look at it in more detail. And, and that's how that one got kind of added on
33 at the very end of our Phase A study.
34
35 Sorg: Very ...
36
37 Paz: By, we, we did an amendment to our Phase A study to add that into it.
38
39 Sorg: Okay. Very good.
40
41 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.
42
43 Sorg: Yes Mr. Doolittle.
44
45 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. Just to kind of close the loop, that's part of the reason, you
46 know I appreciate all of y'all's comments but that's part of the reason that

1 my initial comments were, were brought up related to this, the Phase B
2 report and the public meetings is you know I'm sure that Wyatt and Molzen
3 will, will hear your comments and try to implement them but I can't stress
4 enough that most of y'all's entities are represented as stakeholders.
5 They'll be participating as staff but I, I can't stress enough the importance
6 of having representation from your different groups and even you
7 personally in these public meetings so that ...
8

9 Sorg: Absolutely.

10
11 Doolittle: We can address those formally but I appreciate your comments as part of
12 the Board and ...
13

14 Sorg: Sure.

15
16 Doolittle: Look forward to working for this, this part of the study.
17

18 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. That's well, well said. Okay.
19

20 Paz: Thank you.
21

22 **7.2 Committee Training**

23
24 Sorg: Are we ready for the next Discussion Item which is 7.2: Committee
25 Training?
26

27 McAdams: Commissioner Sorg, Councilor Sorg and Committee Members. I would
28 like to discuss about the - not that. Where's the thing to get it off? I'd like
29 to discuss about, hold on. Yeah. That's what I want. I'd like to discuss
30 about the MPO structure and process, and many of you (*inaudible*) we
31 have a lot of new Members and so I'd like to sort of briefly, this is the,
32 really the structure is what we, we use to do all the things we're doing
33 now. Without it we would have, basically we'd be shooting from the hip I
34 think. If you look at the connection, transportation's the glue for the
35 communities. It connects work, shopping, recreation, medical, social trips,
36 and how people get to their destination, maybe by various modes. A
37 MPO's a vehicle and framework, we can see it today to coordinate
38 transportation projects to serve the needs of the people of the planning
39 area. And what we were seeing is democracy in action, being deliberate
40 and transparent and inclusive. And these are really the hallmarks of a
41 innovative and successful MPO.

42 And before we get into the meat of the thing, we are dealing with
43 complex, chaotic, fractal, and problem, and problems and solutions that
44 are wicked which means that they're wicked in the sense that they're
45 almost impossible to give solutions and also impossible to solve. The
46 problems are wicked, the solutions are wicked you can see here and

1 sometime when you think you're causing, you're solving one problem you
2 cause another. And I think we all bear that responsibility.

3 Let's go back, sort of talk about what is an MPO and some of this
4 may be new, hopefully not to most of you. And a Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization's a federally designated decision-making body which for
6 planning, funding, coordination for all projects within its area, our planning
7 area. And the, you see the map on the right-hand side. Here's our
8 planning area, or Dona Ana County and the red outline is our planning
9 area. Mesilla Valley MPO's the, is the multijurisdictional agency
10 responsible for regional transportation organization, or, by, designated by
11 the State of New Mexico. If you look at, and I'm, these are actual, I can
12 sort of give you interpretations that are actual things within our plan which
13 are, are authorization for that process. We are federally designated by, by
14 law. And if you look at the authority for the MPO comes from the Code of
15 Federal Register which say here's what, how we are given authority. First
16 any, any MPO that's more than 50,000: 1) Any urbanized area which
17 needs contiguous development gets an MPO and then after that the
18 government, the governor of the state, in our case the Governor of New
19 Mexico goes to the general, the jurisdictions and say, "We'd like to have
20 you form an MPO." And so the body we have now was established in the
21 '80s to, really to, as designated by the Federal Government and by the, by
22 the State of New Mexico to do transportation planning for this area. That's
23 why it's very important of course. And we further, so this is kind of the
24 authority, but then, within the structure of course you have the bylaws and
25 the Joint Powers Act so implemented that so our bylaws well say that the
26 MPO is established by the Joint Powers Act which is agreement after the
27 MPO's established and by the designated Governor of New Mexico and
28 contract between the City of Las Cruces and New Mexico and Video-T
29 and others, also the Town of Mesilla and the County. And the MPO's
30 purpose is to carry out the urban transportation planning process as
31 defined within these provisions.

32 You look at our decision making, we have three bodies: Of course
33 yourselves and we'll discuss it a little bit later; the MPO, the MPO Policy
34 Committee is comprised of elected officials from the City of Las Cruces,
35 Town of Mesilla, Dona Ana County, and NMDOT and you see all the,
36 listed are the, your, and, (*inaudible*) your bodies listed on the, the top. The
37 MPO Technical Advisory Committee is composed of support staff from
38 regional agencies who help evaluate the transportation and give advice.
39 They are (*inaudible*) by the Policy Committee to serve you in your, in your
40 efforts. And then also the Technical, the, the BPAC or the Bicycle and
41 Pedestrian Advisory Committee is composed of agencies and also citizens
42 to aid the Policy Committee and the Technical Committee in looking at
43 bicycle issues and pedestrian issues.

44 What are the products? We know a lot of the products. Our, the
45 three major products we do, we're going to talk, we've already talked
46 about one very recently about three, four months ago was the

1 transportation plan that's for a 20-year period and it's updated every five
2 years. Then the T, the TIP is looking at obligated which means financially
3 constrained project when you have to have money to do them for the next
4 five years, they all have federal funds in. And right now you know we're
5 updating the TIP for two years' basis but we know we can also update it
6 when necessary as well. Unified Work, Planning, Work, Shop, Work
7 Program that Tom will be discussing is basically what the task we'll be
8 undertaking in the next two years as well. So these are our major, we
9 have other things we do too, studies like the stuff we did at Missouri
10 Avenue, or Missouri Avenue and with Valley, (*inaudible*) Valley but with
11 other things we look at for studies in the meantime so.

12 What is the role of the Policy Committee? And this comes directly
13 from the Federal Register, for the Code of Federal Register and mean that
14 you're, this body is responsible, well given the task for MP, for planning,
15 transportation planning. It's designated for each urbanized area for
16 develop a comprehensive multimodal and when you see that even more
17 so now than in the past, transportation planning process including the
18 development of the plan and the TIP. Now we also say also is involved in
19 that is the UWP, the Work Program as well. For it encourages efficient
20 and safe and management and serving the mobility people and freight
21 including accessibility, pedestrian walking, bicycles, public transportation,
22 growth and development, and minimizing also fuel consumption air
23 pollution. That's pretty big, that's a big task but I think y'all doing just fine
24 and of course the details are, I think the, the devil's in the details certain
25 degree in that we do do a very deliberate process and you're
26 overwhelmed.

27 So we're looking at these three items that are, are, what's your
28 purpose. And the Technical Committee is really your support group. We,
29 the, looks at there, is established by the Policy Committee and responsible
30 for looking at technical review of the transportation plans within the urban
31 area and the urbanized areas that we urbanize the area, and then put to
32 the Policy Committee on issues directed by the Membership or brought up
33 from the other region like the, your, your staff, or other staff, the MPO with
34 that, would say this is something that the Policy Committee should know
35 of too. So they're, it both works way, yeah, both work way. And so other
36 responsibilities include as designated by the Policy Committee, so of
37 course if you want the Technical Committee to study an item and stuff you
38 can, right. And so it's really your body to, to use as you will.

39 The pedestrian, the Bicycle and, and Pedestrian Advisory
40 Committee was established, well fairly recently but again established by
41 the Policy Committee. Everything's established by the Policy Committee
42 under their directions and their authority and really the, the Pedestrian
43 Committee, BPAC we will sort of shorten it a little bit is responsible for
44 looking at design implementation of all bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
45 We, we just recently look at a multi, completion of the lower part of the
46 multi-use path and a lot of issues too as well. And so again it's, it's, it's a

1 unique committee because it's composed both citizen advisors and also
2 public officials, right. And so it's really for education, looking at facilities,
3 and anything related to it. And these are also outlined in the bylaws.

4 If you look at what is the MPO staff, myself, Tom and Andrew and
5 Zach, it's develop, we are, we're, we're often considered the workhorses of
6 the, of the Committee. We develop the, the TIP. We do the MTP with
7 your assistance well and the UWP and provide data and analysis for
8 monitoring existing transportation systems, one thing we said we're
9 involved in the travel demand model which we're working with several
10 agencies on that, and short- and long, long-term transportation planning
11 needs, and to facilitate regional forum for various agencies. While we are
12 not a implementing agency ourselves, we open ourselves to issues that are,
13 are regional in transportation, in pedestrian, bicycles, public transportation,
14 highways. So we, we hope we facilitate and that's where our mission, to
15 facilitate discussion and not to dictate, that's the way we feel, but to really
16 bring together everybody in a forum that's rational we hope, and calm and
17 deliberate. Make participating agencies aware of funding opportunities
18 although we do not, we not, we don't do grants, we want everybody to be
19 aware of them regardless of town, county, state, well state knows,
20 anybody, public transportation so they know the, the opportunities out
21 there. With the TAP funds it's pretty well, like it right now in looking at
22 different applications from various authorities and processing them too.
23 So we want, as a staff we want everybody to get full opportunity to fund,
24 federal funding. Provide direct planning assistance to RoadRUNNER
25 Transit so we are, the staff are, are the official representatives of
26 RoadRUNNER Transit for our, for the planning so we do the short-range
27 transit plan recently and we're also doing some maps etc. and the new
28 routes. And plug, plug, plug, we hope in July that the RoadRUNNER will
29 be starting the new services. Example of something very short-term
30 where we could plan for it and immediately we see results of the, often
31 planning is not that way. You see results 20 years from the time you start
32 planning. And of course we coordinate meetings and, on all levels and
33 meetings on technical policy and BPAC and that's also one of our function
34 too, to make sure everything's running smoothly so when you get here you
35 don't have to worry, right.

36 In conclusion this process is a very dynamic and innovative
37 planning process. The cogs of transportation planning are sometimes
38 seem to move very slowly for citizens and sometimes for ourselves too,
39 right. How, that's the nature of planning, right. Where we're doing
40 expensive project, million dollars, \$10 million projects and once you do
41 them you can't reverse them can you, you can't just tear up a bypass, you
42 just can't tear up a road or interchange. They are very serious decisions.
43 And so looking at, well actually we say it, this is democracy and involving
44 several stakeholders and we think about it, it should be a deliberate. It
45 shouldn't be by fiat, you know it should be involving public officials, other

1 stakeholders so everybody's aware and so we can get a better process we
2 hope.

3 Everyone on the MPO including those in committees and staff have
4 a tremendous responsibility. We all, we always have sometime we get
5 caught up in the, in the maze I think, but I think we also have to get out of
6 the, the maze or the vortex and realize that we have a responsibility to our
7 citizens as well, to make sure that the, the mobility is granted for all. You
8 know a lot of time we talk about automobiles but all, we often forget
9 mobility for pedestrians, for those that have mobility problems I think, and
10 that's one of the things that has shifted in the last 30 years you see.
11 Before pedestrians and bicycles and public transportation were sort of
12 aside but now they come to the forefront and I think that as our population
13 becomes older, our mobility issue become even greater. So economic
14 equity is also important too I think to make sure that people have mobility
15 so they can get to jobs. Of course that's more public transportation,
16 bicycle but we also remember that, that it's just not cars, it's just not
17 people that to provide econ, to provide economic equity and job
18 opportunities requires a different way of looking at things, right. And
19 equality of life for all citizens, just making roads and just expanding things
20 because you have capacity problems we know is not the way to have a
21 good quality environment, it really has multimodal and you look at the,
22 really the, the, the by, how we get people to our area is not because we're
23 moving people fast through them. It's because the quality of life we're
24 generating, right and that's why places, people in Colorado, other places
25 move to us, new to them, perhaps not to other places. So it's just not
26 moving people fast through the area but providing a good quality of life.
27 We have an MPO structure and process that's decades old, not only
28 decades old here but decades old across the United States which has
29 served for many, many years very well as a engine for change and for a, a
30 forum that's unique. There's probably not any regional organization that
31 has lasted as long as the MPO for planning purposes. I think it's good to
32 50 years old and our mission is to assure that these, we use these
33 elements wisely to assist our communities to prosper and move forward
34 for the wellbeing of all citizens. Thank you very much. Chairman Sorg do
35 we have any questions?

36
37 Sorg: Sure. Any questions by the ...

38
39 McAdams: Yes.

40
41 Sorg: Any questions by the Commissioner, the Committee? Mr. Hancock.

42
43 Hancock: Thank you. How do we get something on the TIP?

44
45 McAdams: The TIP is through your, we petition through the MPO. You'll put this, you
46 know the, you're, you're an implementing agency and you would say,

1 "Here's where we can have federal funds," you would coordinate with the
2 DOT and also then just talk to Andrew about this too, as well. If you, if you
3 know you going to, but is this a ways to a particular question about ...
4
5 Hancock: Well we need to get the, the exchange at Spaceport Road on the TIP. We
6 don't have it on the TIP.
7
8 McAdams: Is that ...
9
10 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. That particular interchange is outside
11 of the MPO's boundaries so that would be, the process you'd go is to get it
12 on the, on the RTIPer through the Regional Transportation Planning
13 Organization and then they can work with NMDOT to get that onto the
14 STIP.
15
16 McAdams: Right.
17
18 Sorg: I believe we've talked to the R, RTD too, on that. The RTO.
19
20 McAdams: RTO, Jay Armijo but probably a ...
21
22 Sorg: Right.
23
24 McAdams: Person (*inaudible*). Yeah.
25
26 Sorg: She was here and we told her all about it.
27
28 McAdams: Right. Okay.
29
30 Sorg: So she, they're aware of it.
31
32 McAdams: Yeah.
33
34 Sorg: It's in their hands I guess really. Are, are we ...
35
36 Hancock: Thank you.
37
38 Sorg: Back to saying that.
39
40 McAdams: But we wish we could help you but I think this, it, we just got it before.
41 There's a good reason for separating the RTPO ...
42
43 Hancock: Right.
44

1 McAdams: And the MPO and, and the El Paso, the two MPOs too so even though it's
2 not convenient sometimes I think well we don't want M, El Paso to be
3 messing with our stuff and they won't, and vice versa.
4
5 Sorg: Yes.
6
7 McAdams: Or us messing with the RTPO too. So there's a ...
8
9 Hancock: Right.
10
11 McAdams: Although it's frustrating sometimes I think it works, it's very much
12 advantage to all parties you know.
13
14 Sorg: Right. Well there, there still has to be cooperation though ...
15
16 McAdams: Oh.
17
18 Sorg: Between the different POs.
19
20 McAdams: Yes there are. We can comment, we can comment about this ...
21
22 Sorg: Right.
23
24 McAdams: Job and if they come for advice we could probably tell you how it's going
25 to impact.
26
27 Sorg: Yeah.
28
29 McAdams: But we cannot, we don't have any direct ...
30
31 Sorg: Right.
32
33 McAdams: Authority to judge or make decisions.
34
35 Sorg: Right. I remind the Committee about our ...
36
37 McAdams: Right.
38
39 Sorg: MOU with the El Paso ...
40
41 McAdams: Right.
42
43 Sorg: MPO. Okay?
44
45 McAdams: Okay.
46

1 Hancock: Thank you.

2
3 Sorg: Any other questions? Comments? Okay. Thank you very much.

4
5 McAdams: Thank you Chairman Sorg, thank, thank the Committee.

6
7 **7.3 Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program**
8 **(UPWP)**
9

10 Sorg: And now we go on to 7.3, the item that was moved in the agenda, the
11 Unified Action, Work Planning, or Unified Planning Work Program.

12
13 Murphy: The ...

14
15 Sorg: Mr. Murphy.

16
17 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. The Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP for
18 short is our two-year work program, identifies tasks, connectivities that
19 mainly MPO staff would be working on. I had it moved from the Action,
20 the Action Item, Action Agenda because in, upon reviewing the State's
21 Planning Procedures Manual we're not, we're not scheduled to adopt it
22 until the, your June meeting.

23
24 Sorg: Okay.

25
26 Murphy: So we'll just have a discussion on this, give me more time to look for typos
27 and everything in it, and get further input. But it is posted on our website
28 for public com, for public review and comment and, and public comments
29 always can be given to any MPO staff member. This pretty much put,
30 outlines, outlines the timetable for the adoption of it. As I said I, I recently
31 remembered upon reviewing it that we're not supposed to adopt it till next
32 month and then it'll go into effect at, on October 1st, the beginning of the
33 federal fiscal year.

34 It's organized as an introduction where it, it, introduction gives
35 background on the MPO, what, what committees we have, very, various
36 other information. The meat of the document is in Section 2 which is the
37 Work Program Tasks which are divided up into five task areas. This is
38 consistent among MPOs throughout the state so we're following um an,
39 we're following an adopted format in that.

40 Task 1 probably handles a, a big majority and big part of what we
41 do is the administration, getting ready meeting materials, getting, putting in
42 advertising for the meetings, putting together trainings for staff and for, for
43 yourselves, maintaining a website, conducting our public participation, and
44 coordinating with state and federal agencies.

45 Task 2, um something that you probably see every, every quarter
46 here, we work on the TIP, we amend the TIP, we get, get different

1 projects, changing and adding and coming onto it and then each year we
2 do a report of what has been obligated.

3 Task 3, general development data collection analysis, I think
4 through recent federal, federal transportation authorizations, this is the,
5 this really becomes the meat of the transportation planning process. This
6 is, you know collecting the data in the, in the past year and hopefully
7 continuing on. We've been identifying ways in which to gather data for
8 what we want to measure. We're looking at, at ways to, to count
9 pedestrians, count bicycles, count transit users, better ways of, of counting
10 our vehicles. In our traffic count program the last few years we've recently
11 added the capability to, that we, every count that we do we have an, we
12 do a classification count so we know what percentage of trucks that are
13 driving on our roadways and, and all that information gets used and it
14 ultimate, you know it's used in various things like the transportation model
15 Mr. Kartchner referred to in his presentation. So we collect data to help,
16 help us, help us do the planning process.

17 Task 4, generally aligned with the general transportation planning,
18 the maintaining of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan, if we have any
19 amendments for that. The discussions we've had on the Trail Plan would
20 be an MTP amendment so we'd have the work under, under that. We're
21 also going to be working under this work item on a coordinated human
22 services and transportation plan, help identify opportunities where human
23 services agencies can combine leverage or even just coordinate their
24 transportation dollars to help, help serve, help serve the people, people in
25 need you know transportation to and from medical services. We also do
26 safety planning in this, we coordinate with the schools so their, the Safe
27 Routes to School, and we also, we also provide staff, on the staff report
28 we'll make maps. We'll, we'll give assistance to the Regional Transit
29 District, help them out in their planning efforts.

30 Task 5 is where we have a specific item, items that are, are large
31 enough to be called out on their own. Our participation in the Regional
32 Leadership Consortium is, is proposed to be continued. We're going to
33 continue in a lot of the data collection, good points towards this is
34 developing an asset and safety management plan. We have requested
35 through the state some extra funding to conduct participatory mapping.
36 That's a, a citizen, a citizen-level activity where hopefully we'll be able to
37 work with some, with some group that'll be on the ground with citizens and
38 they'll be mapping their transportation concerns, and we'll be able to map
39 that and use that to help identify needed projects within the area. And
40 then last time we, we talked about this at, here Members of the Committee
41 suggested we take a look at what's happening in the A Mountain, A
42 Mountain area. We've also requested some additional monies from
43 NMDOT to conduct that study and then we got a couple other items if we
44 need to, if something else crops up we can amend into the UPWP.

45 Like I said we'll be taking, come, we'll be refining the document
46 based on any input we receive moving forward and we'll bring this back to

1 your June meeting for, for your, hopefully for your adoption which will then
2 transmit to the DOT, have included in the Statewide Work Program,
3 approval by FHWA, and then begin implement, or begin working on this
4 program October 1st. And with that I'll stand for any questions.
5

6 Sorg: Some questions? Councilor Pedroza and then Mr. Doolittle.
7

8 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Tom do you regularly attend the El Paso MPO
9 meetings?
10

11 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. Yes. MPO staff attends the, the El Paso
12 meeting each month and most times we, we do a, a summary sheet in
13 your packet.
14

15 Wray: Mr., Mr. Chair. I was not able to attend the meeting in April. That's why
16 there's no report this month.
17

18 Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Okay. So ...
19

20 Murphy: But most times someone from our office is there.
21

22 Pedroza: And how do you, besides, it, is it just the page summarizing what they
23 were discussing or, or is there some other way that you can let us know if
24 there's anything that should be of interest to us being discussed un, in that
25 forum?
26

27 Murphy: We think the best manner of is we provide the page of what's ...
28

29 Pedroza: Okay.
30

31 Murphy: Been discussed and, and of course if we think, if we think anything rises to
32 the, to that level we'll certainly bring it up but this, providing you the
33 summary allows you to, to look at it and say, "Hey can you find me more
34 information on this," you know Subject A or Subject B and then at that
35 point we can do it. We also do have you know regular communication
36 with the El Paso MPO staff as, you know it's, you know I ...
37

38 Pedroza: I remember that we had been discussing whether or not there should be
39 some kind of a, a meeting ground or some, some sort of cooperation
40 between Mesilla Valley MPO and El Paso and I don't know that anything
41 has happened with that.
42

43 Murphy: We do have that MOU which Councilor Sorg had referenced just last item
44 um and like I say we do communicate with the, their staff on a, on a
45 regular basis. We make them aware of what's going on in our area. They
46 make us what's going on in our area and should there be a crossover, I

1 mean the, the presentation by Molzen Corbin's an example. A majority of
2 that work geographically is happening in the El Paso MPO area yet they,
3 they come here to, to brief this Board on that work. So when there is,
4 when there is a item of common interest we certainly do bring that up to
5 both Boards.
6
7 Pedroza: Thank you very much Tom.
8
9 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.
10
11 Doolittle: Tom thank you for that information. I just, I don't know if this is the, the
12 time or the place to do it but we specific, we had some specific comments
13 tied to the UPWP that was included in our packet. I don't know if you'd
14 like us to give those to you now or I can have Jolene or I summarize those
15 and shoot them to you on e-mail just to make sure they're included in the
16 one that comes before the Board.
17
18 Murphy: If we could, we could do both so that the rest of the Committee can hear
19 them and then we could have the written documentation of it.
20
21 Doolittle: Okay. Just real quickly, on page 89 on Task 5 it shows an estimated cost
22 for Task 6 so it's actually got a typo there. You have a total of \$45,000 but
23 recently I believe the MPO asked for an additional \$250,000 that's not
24 showing anywhere. So maybe that's um going to be included in your
25 updates that you referenced a little bit tied to the costs and then we just
26 need to make sure that when you include that additional money that it's
27 carried over to your appendices and is reflected there on the total cost.
28
29 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle. You said that's on page 89?
30
31 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. That's correct. It's on page 89 of the handout under Task 5:
32 Special Studies and Miscellaneous Activities.
33
34 Sorg: Okay. Very good. Each page has two numbers and so I ...
35
36 Murphy: Right.
37
38 Sorg: Believe it's also number 24.
39
40 Doolittle: Oh yes. I'm sorry.
41
42 Murphy: It's page 24 of the UPWP and page 89 of the entire packet.
43
44 Sorg: Right. Okay, very good. And so those numbers you were referring to is
45 near the top of that page?
46

1 Doolittle: That's correct.
2
3 Sorg: Yeah. Okay, thank you.
4
5 Doolittle: And then specifically the \$250,000 that I referenced earlier is for items
6 five, or, yeah items 5.3 and 5.4 and those are on page 90 of the package
7 or 25 of the UPWP.
8
9 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. We'll, I'll, I'll consult with Jolene on that. I wasn't
10 sure about including those, that \$250,000 until such time I, I received
11 notice of whether we're going to get it or not.
12
13 Doolittle: Okay.
14
15 Murphy: But again I'll consult with her and see which is the preferred way to do it.
16
17 Doolittle: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.
18
19 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. Any other questions about the Unified Work
20 Program? If not we'll move on.
21

22 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

23
24 Sorg: Is there any comments by staff and Committee? Mr. Doolittle.
25
26 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll give you just a real quick update on our normal
27 projects that we have in the area. This actually will be very brief this
28 month. The Missouri project, we are working on the final items. We're
29 working on some seeding, some guard rail, some cleanup. For the most
30 part we've got all of the paving operations completed. We expect to meet
31 substantial completion as of Friday, May 20th and you may see some
32 small impacts to traffic while we do some minor repair work but for the
33 most part we will be finished with that project by the end of next week. So
34 another one that we're real happy with. I know I've made that comment
35 before but I'm real pleased with all the traffic and you know we've met with
36 the, with the City to discuss the medians and I think we've got some, some
37 ideas on how to move forward with that, but ultimately at this point I'm real
38 pleased with the overall project itself on an extremely ...
39
40 Pedroza: Oh yeah.
41
42 Doolittle: Busy part of our, our city.
43
44 Sorg: I think Councilor Pedroza ...
45
46 Pedroza: Yes.

1
2 Sorg: Has a question for Mr. Doolittle.

3
4 Pedroza: Yes Mr. Doolittle. I, and I know you're aware of it because we've talked
5 about it. If you could uh keep me informed as to what the, the progress on
6 those medians because there certainly has been a little bit of a concern
7 and, and interest in there and I would like to be able to, to communicate
8 accurately with the people in my district. Thank you.
9

10 Doolittle: Councilor Pedroza, Mr. Chair. Just, just to summarize very briefly, Deputy
11 Secretary Anthony Lujan who is my boss came down last weekend. We
12 went and met with Assistant City Manager Daniel Avila and Loretta just to
13 discuss those medians. We do have an MOU with the City that very
14 clearly defined where those medians were going to be placed. As part of
15 that MOU it also incorporates the cost and the money that we were going
16 to spend to include those medians had other work tied to that MOU, for
17 instance, the signals, the paving of the roadway, those types of things.
18 But ultimately it's in the City's hands what they're going to do with it but the
19 expectation is if they start removing things that were included in the MOU
20 there will be some sort of reimbursement to Federal Highway. I do not
21 have the specifics tied to that dollar amount or, or the reason for that
22 reimbursement yet. I'm having that discussion with Federal Highway but
23 we'll continue to have that discussion with Mr. Avila and ...
24

25 Pedroza: Thank you very much.

26
27 Doolittle: And Ms. Reyes.

28
29 Pedroza: Yes, and I would, I believe would like to see the MOU but I will get that
30 from ...
31

32 Doolittle: Okay.

33
34 Pedroza: Staff. Thank you.

35
36 Doolittle: Sure. Mr. Chair. The other one that I wanted to provide just a very quick
37 update on is on our Union Bridge project on I-10. We should be finished
38 with that project the first week of June at least through substantial
39 completion. Those of you that have driven over there, we have traffic
40 shifted right now we, while we work on some sidewalk on the east side of
41 the roadway to improve ADA and sight distance coming off of Sam Steele.
42 But we should be finished with that project um again the first week of
43 June.

44 Just real briefly the other ones that we have in the area, we've done
45 the mill, the mill and inlay two projects that I mentioned last month that
46 basically run from Corralitos to the Texas-New Mexico state line. Those

1 are actually working very well since we're doing the paving at night
2 between Las Cruces and El Paso. They're currently working on the
3 sealcoat on the west side of town and then will start working on final
4 application of striping. But ultimately impacts of those should be fairly
5 minimal with some simple lane closures or night work. With that Mr. Chair
6 I believe that summarizes my project update for this month.
7
8 Sorg: Thank you.
9
10 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
11
12 Sorg: Any other comments?
13
14 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
15
16 Sorg: Where are you?
17
18 Barraza: Right here.
19
20 Sorg: Oh. Mayor Barraza. Yeah.
21
22 Barraza: Yes. I, I just, I have a concern I guess or maybe I just need clarification or
23 if there's a misunderstanding is yesterday Ashleigh Curry came to meet
24 with me and, regarding the bike, what are we calling this project?
25
26 Flores: The multiuse path.
27
28 Barraza: Multiuse path. And she said that her Committee, the BPAC meeting, that
29 they had stated that the Town of Mesilla was against one of the plans as
30 was EBID or EBID and the Town of Mesilla were not in favor of using the
31 laterals and I don't know where they got that information from because the
32 Town of Mesilla has never said, or I have never said to anyone that I've
33 talked to that we do not want the path on the, on the laterals in the Town
34 of Mesilla. I think the last time that we spoke and I think we met with DOT,
35 and I think Trent and Jolene were also there and Harold, and we
36 discussed that for a bit. I've talked to Gary Esslinger, not just but, about
37 this particular project but other issues but this project did come up and
38 how we are in agreeance that using the laterals would be a good idea. So
39 I need someone to clarify to me and to Trustee Flores also what exactly is
40 going on with this.
41
42 Murphy: Certainly Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. Well from our meetings with, with
43 staff of, from the Town of Mesilla as well of, as Dona Ana County we've,
44 come to the realization that there's a, a, basically a sticking, a sticking
45 point in either the Town or the County developing a Memorandum of
46 Understanding with EBID to enable further, you know further discussion of

1 those trails for use. Meaning that um for example the, the City had, had,
2 has one expired but they're, but they've told us that they aim to renew it,
3 but they have a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the liability
4 and maintenance of those, of those trail, of, of those lateral portions that
5 are used within the trails. So really what it needs to be is, is the, the
6 County and the Town, County or the Town or one or the other, in order to
7 use one of the, the EBID facilities within the trail system they need to
8 develop that MOU that addresses the, the liability and the maintenance
9 concerns. And from what our understanding from talking with your staffs
10 is that um those two groups have not been able to come together in order
11 to get that document formed.

12
13 Barraza: Who in particular in the staff because I, Debbi sat in that conversation with
14 us yesterday, our Public Works Director and she said that's not what she
15 said. And so I, I, that's why I'm saying I'm not sure where this information,
16 I mean if our staff member's saying that I need to know who did and why
17 they say that because ...

18
19 Murphy: Okay.

20
21 Barraza: We have been, we had worked with EBID and we never were told that we
22 needed to put together an MOU with EBID. That, this is the first I've heard
23 about it, it, well it's not the first. I heard in discussions that we would have
24 to, you know if this is the way the trail was going to go that we would
25 eventually have to do the MOU, but I didn't think we were that far in the
26 process to even bring, for EBID and the Town of Mesilla to sit at the table
27 to put together any type of MOU. So I, I, I, there's confusion obviously
28 because it is something that we have supported and I think when Trustee
29 Flores, myself sat down with your staff, well we were just very adamant
30 that we wanted to hopefully see that path and we had a, an idea with the
31 options that were given to us what we would like to see.

32
33 Murphy: Then thank you Mayor. I, it was Ms. Lujan that, that we had heard that
34 from. Perhaps we had misinterpreted what she had said but I, I do know
35 and it was at, on, on the record at the TAC that County staff was, said that
36 they have reached an absolute impasse as far as developing an MOU.
37 But if the Town's able to develop an MOU with, with EBID I think it would
38 probably be, I think it'd be great for us to be able to put those trail
39 segments you know within the Town back onto that map as a top priority
40 and I think probably what we would ask of you is to keep us informed on
41 how those discussions with EBID goes as far as developing, developing
42 that document which allows us to move to the next step.

43
44 Barraza: Okay, very good. Because I do know that one part of the trail would be
45 coming down Calle del Norte which is basically a DOT road but the Town

1 of Mesilla would be involved and I think there's some funding, a funding
2 grant that needs to be submitted I think by August ...
3
4 Flores: September.
5
6 Barraza: September that we need to work on so maybe what I need to do is
7 schedule a meeting between EBID, ourselves, and with your office to
8 figure out and to see if it's even still an option. I don't know how far in the
9 process you all are in this path so we definitely need to get together. And
10 I don't know if Trustee Flores want, wanted to make a comment about this
11 also.
12
13 Flores: I, I ...
14
15 Sorg: Go ahead Trustee.
16
17 Flores: Was just going to say that I, at the meeting with staff I did say that I had a
18 concern about EBI, EBID's request for maintenance, you know that I knew
19 that they had some things that they wanted in return, that it wasn't just a
20 free ride of being able to use the acequias and the trails there, that we
21 would have to maintain it and, and I you know didn't know if we could
22 accept what EBID wanted. But I didn't say we weren't willing to look at it
23 and you stated at that time that you were willing to look into it and ask
24 them about it so.
25
26 Barraza: Okay. Okay.
27
28 Sorg: Mr. Murphy. Do you have a copy of that MOU with the City and EB, EBID
29 in your files?
30
31 Murphy: We've, we do have it somewhere.
32
33 Sorg: Okay. Could you send it to the City, or Town of Mesilla?
34
35 Hancock: And the County.
36
37 Sorg: And the County.
38
39 Hancock: Commissioner Hancock.
40
41 Sorg: Hancock.
42
43 Murphy: Yes.
44
45 Barraza: Okay. And Mr. Chair if I may.
46

1 Sorg: Sure.

2

3 Barraza: For clarify, just repeat this again to me Tom. But the County said that they

4 would not want to participate, the impasse?

5

6 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. And this is, this is from the County staff that

7 represents on, on the Technical Advisory Committee and, and they, they

8 said it was their understanding that, that County Legal, or County Legal or

9 EBID Legal were unable, are unable to, to come to terms on that and it's

10 probably a maintenance and a liability you know, that, that's usually where

11 these things break down. But they told us not, not to expect it to be within

12 the county and I think at that time that Debbi had, Debbi had indicated that

13 the Town was also you know, had questions about being able to, to do the

14 you know the maintenance portion, portion that EBID requests. But if it,

15 you know certainly if you, if that's something that can be worked out you

16 know the MPO can adjust its plans accordingly.

17

18 Barraza: And, and then the other is I think the plan that Ms. Curry mentioned to me

19 yesterday that I, I know she is not in favor of is using Avenida de Mesilla

20 and it, putting a bike lane on Avenida de Mesilla. Is that what was

21 discussed or can someone elaborate on that?

22

23 Murphy: There was a portion, I guess based on our discussion here last month the

24 Policy Committee told us you know to you know concentrate on, on in-

25 roadway facilities due to this, you know due to the impasse that we've

26 been observing with EBID. So we developed a routing that did not, did not

27 need to go onto a lateral. It does not preclude any laterals from be, or

28 laterals or drains from being used in the future but it would identify a

29 priority corridor using only roadway, only existing roadways.

30

31 Barraza: Okay. And so is it something that you all would have to work, since

32 Avenida de Mesilla is a DOT road is, you would have to go through New

33 Mexico DOT versus through the Town? I, I'm not sure how that works.

34 And who picks up the liability there?

35

36 Murphy: I, Mayor Barraza, I believe that the, I'm not an attorney, I can't discuss

37 liability. I can just discuss what my, my, or my experience are. Avenida

38 de Mesilla currently has bike lanes on it if I'm not mistaken, from ...

39

40 Barraza: That is correct.

41

42 Murphy: And ...

43

44 Barraza: I know we've had some issues and problems with the, the grates, the,

45 where the sewer lines go in that we've had ...

46

1 Murphy: Some ...
2
3 Barraza: A couple of bicycle, well maybe one or two since I've been Mayor that I'm
4 aware of, where their tire has gotten stuck there and DOT has gone and
5 fixed that.
6
7 Murphy: So ...
8
9 Barraza: But ...
10
11 Murphy: So I'd say whoever has ...
12
13 Barraza: There are two, they, but they're not identified are they, as bike lanes,
14 Trent?
15
16 Murphy: I do know it's got a designation of State Bike Route 1 but I, I don't know if
17 there's actual bike lane signs.
18
19 Barraza: I don't think so.
20
21 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. I, I think that's correct. It's designated but I don't, I don't
22 even think we have the bike emblems ...
23
24 Barraza: No, they're not there.
25
26 Doolittle: Signing or anything like that on the roadway itself.
27
28 Murphy: Well as far as the liability question I would, I would imagine whoever has
29 liability over that today would have liability at such point when it's
30 designated as a, a, a, a loop.
31
32 Barraza: Okay. Okay, thank you.
33
34 Sorg: Thank you Mayor.
35
36 Barraza: Okay. Thank you.
37
38 Sorg: Last, last comment by Commissioner Hancock.
39
40 Hancock: If we recall in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, it calls for the laterals to be
41 used as bike trails throughout the county. And that was approved by the
42 County Commission. Part of the issue, if not the biggest part of the issue
43 is the maintenance cost and the liability issue. The County is not insured
44 by the Municipal League and so we have to deal with our own separate
45 pool and it creates other issues that we have yet to resolve. But it is in the
46 Comprehensive Plan. It is an, it is a, an, an important element of the

1 livability principles of all of Dona Ana County including all the
2 municipalities and we will work out the problem somehow, so that's kind of
3 where we are.
4

5 Murphy: I, Mr. Chair and if I, if I may add on to that, um our MTP amendment
6 regarding the trails will not take the EBID facilities off of our Trail Plan. All
7 it does is reducing its, its priority because of, because of question, of these
8 questions that have answers but we've not yet found out those answers.
9

10 Sorg: Okay. Very good.
11

12 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**
13

14 Sorg: All right. If, the last item on the agenda is Public Comment. I see no
15 public unless Jolene wants to say something. Okay.
16

17 **10. ADJOURNMENT (2:54 PM)**
18

19 Sorg: Then I'll entertain a, adjournment motion.
20

21 Barraza: So moved.
22

23 Doolittle: Second.
24

25 Sorg: Okay. Moved and second. All those in favor say "aye."
26

27 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
28

29 Sorg: Meeting adjourned.
30
31
32
33
34

35 Chairperson
36
37

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 8, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 16-06 Approving the 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program

Draft copy of the proposed 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is available on the MPO website and will be provided at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-06

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 2017- FY 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

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

WHEREAS, preparation of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.308.b & c) ; and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for developing and maintaining the UPWP to reflect the planning activities and funding within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, MPO staff has developed a two-year UPWP as permitted by federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval of the UPWP at their meeting on April 19, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the UPWP at their meeting on May 5, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution adopting the FY 2017- FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program to be approved.

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

(I)

THAT the Unified Planning Work Program of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is adopted.

(II)

THAT staff is authorized to submit the final Fiscal Year 2017 and Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program to the New Mexico Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

DONE and **APPROVED** this 8th day of June , 2016.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Sorg	
Vice Chair Garrett	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Eakman	
Commissioner Hancock	
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Arzabal	
Trustee Flores	
Mr. Doolittle	

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 8, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 Resolution 16-07: A Resolution Amending the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Transport 2040)

DISCUSSION:

For several years, the MPO has been working with its member agencies to develop a multi-use trail loop around the urban core of Las Cruces. The loop currently exists on the western, northern, and eastern sides of Las Cruces. Currently the loop is incomplete on the southern leg.

Through 2016, MPO Staff has engaged in a process to evaluate alternatives for the southern leg. Staff has solicited feedback from the Policy Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico State University, Town of Mesilla, Doña Ana County, and the City of Las Cruces during this process.

Through this process, Staff arrived at two alternatives to present to the Technical Advisory Committee for their recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Option A proceeds along University Avenue.

Option B proceeds along Union Avenue.

Option C proceeds along University Avenue, utilizing the Mesilla Lateral.

Option D proceeds along Union Avenue, utilizing the Mesilla Lateral.

At their April 19 meeting, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended Option B to the Policy Committee for approval.

At their May 5 meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended Option B to the Policy Committee for approval.

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-07

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2015 TRANSPORTATION PLAN (TRANSPORT 2040).

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the transportation planning agency for the City of Las Cruces, the Town of Mesilla, and the urbanized area for Doña Ana County; and

WHEREAS, Title 23 CFR §450.322 requires that all MPO's throughout the country adopt a minimum 20-year Metropolitan Transportation Plan for their respective jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Transportation Plan, Transport 2040 Update, was approved by the Policy Committee on June 10, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Transportation Plan designated University Avenue as the southern leg of the Multi-Use Loop Trail in the Trail System Priorities Plan which is part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, community concerns prompted the MPO to revisit this classification; and

WHEREAS, MPO Staff has performed outreach to various concerned stakeholder groups; and

WHEREAS, the attached Trail System Priorities Plan Amendment has been developed by MPO Staff and submitted to the MPO Policy Committee for approval; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee has

reviewed this amendment at their April 19, 2016 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee has reviewed this amendment at their May 5, 2016 meeting; 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 Trail Plan Amendment, attached to this resolution as Exhibit “A” be adopted as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, replacing the prior version of the Trail System Priorities Plan.

(II)

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

DONE and **APPROVED** this 8th day of June , 2016.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Sorg	

Vice Chair Garrett	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Eakman	
Commissioner Hancock	
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Arzabal	
Trustee Flores	
Mr. Doolittle	



ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

Option A Proposed Multi-Use Connection




- Legend**
- +— Railroad
 - Streets Background
 - Current Multi-Use Facility
 - Rio Grande River
 - Mesilla Boundary
 - Municipal Boundary
 - NMSU Boundary
 - County Boundary

- Proposed Multi-Use Facilities**
- Option A using the University Corridor
 - NMSU Route
 - Extension of Triviz Trail

Mesilla Valley
Metropolitan
Planning Organization

Option B Proposed Multi-Use Connection

Union Inset



Triviz Trail Extension
Transportation Improvement
Plan # LC00250

See Union
Inset

- Legend**
- Railroad
 - Streets Background
 - Current Multi-Use Facility
 - Rio Grande River
 - Mesilla Boundary
 - Municipal Boundary
 - NMSU Boundary
 - County Boundary


- Proposed Multi-Use Facilities**
- Option B Route Using NM 28 and Union Ave
 - Extension of Triviz Trail
 - NMSU Route



0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles

Mesilla Valley
Metropolitan
Planning Organization


Option C Proposed Multi-Use Connection



- Legend**
- +— Railroad
 - Streets Background
 - Current Multi-Use Facility
 - Rio Grande River
 - Mesilla Boundary
 - Municipal Boundary
 - NMSU Boundary
 - County Boundary

- Proposed Multi-Use Facilities**
- Option C using University and Mesilla Lateral
 - NMSU Route
 - Extension of Triviz Trail

Mesilla Valley
Metropolitan
Planning Organization




Option D Proposed Multi-Use Connection

Union Inset



See Union Inset

Triviz Trail Extension
Transportation Improvement
Plan # LC00250



0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles

Legend

- Railroad
- Streets Background
- Current Multi-Use Facility
- Rio Grande River
- Mesilla Boundary
- Municipal Boundary
- NMSU Boundary
- County Boundary

Proposed Multi-Use Facilities

- Option D Route Using Union and Mesilla Lateral
- Extension of Triviz Trail
- NMSU Route

Mesilla Valley
Metropolitan
Planning Organization



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 8, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Committee Training

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff will give a presentation on the Federal Aid System.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF May 20, 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 May 20, 2016.

The New Mexico members of the Transportation Policy Board who were present:

Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer

Mayor Diana Trujillo, City of Anthony, NM

Representative Bealquin Gomez, New Mexico State Representative, District 34

Mayor Javier Perea, Sunland Park, NM

There were no New Mexico related items on this meeting's agenda.