The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held September 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 North Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the Mesilla Valley MPO website.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER_________________________________________________________Chair

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY 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. ______________________________________________________Chair

3. PUBLIC COMMENT____________________________________________________Chair

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES_________________________________________________Chair

4.1. August 10, 2016_____________________________________________________Chair

4.2. August 24, 2016 Special Meeting____________________________________Chair

5. ACTION ITEMS_______________________________________________________Chair

5.1. Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the Camino Real Consortium ____________MPO Staff

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS____________________________________________________Chair

6.1. Missouri Study Corridor______________________________________________MPO Staff

6.2. Committee Training________________________________________________MPO Staff

7. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS____________________________________Chair

8. PUBLIC COMMENT____________________________________________________Chair

9. ADJOURNMENT_______________________________________________________Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held August 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:02)
                  Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
                  Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
                  Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
                  Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
                  Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (arrived 1:02)
                  Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
                  Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
                  Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

STAFF PRESENT:  Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
                 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
                 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
                 Marcus Lopez (MPO Co-Op)
                 Cody Sensiba (MPO Co-Op)

OTHERS PRESENT:  Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:02 p.m.)

Sorg:  It's time for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee to begin so I'm calling the meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Sorg:  The first order of business is the Conflict of Interest Inquiry. Is there anybody on the Committee or staff that is in conflict with any item on the agenda?

Pedroza:  No.

Hancock:  No.

Eakman:  None.

Doolittle:  No.

Benavidez:  No.
Flores: No.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Is there any, any member of the public that wishes to make a comment to the Committee? Raise your hand and come forward. Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: We'll move right on to the agenda, the rest of the agenda. We have a couple corrections to make here and changes before we make an approval. There's the date on the agenda sheet was the wrong date for the minutes of the last meeting. It is, shows to be April 13th but the last meeting was in June.

Murphy: June 8th.

Sorg: Eighth, June 8th it is. That change.

Murphy: The June 8th minutes were in the packet.

Sorg: And it, that's, the packet had the right date on it. The other change we're going to do is pull Action Item 6.1, the Resolution concerning the Unified Planning Work Program to an item for discussion. Any other changes by the Committee?

Benavidez: Could you repeat that one.

Sorg: We are going to pull Action Item 6.1 from the Consent Agenda to the Agenda for Discussion. Pull it off the Consent.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We do wish that it, it still remain an Action Item, just not on the Consent Agenda.

Sorg: Yes. Right. Okay, with that I'll accept a motion to approve the agenda.

Flores: So moved.

Pedroza: Move that they are as amended. Second.

Sorg: Moved by Trustee Torrez, Lopez, Flores, and a second by Councilor Pedroza. Thomas, a roll call vote.

Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.
Barraza: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Here.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: We're not calling roll, we're not calling roll. We're actually voting on the motion to accept the, yes. Yes.

Sorg: That's very good. Thanks for the correction.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair Sorg.

Sorg: Yeah, the Chair votes yes too.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *June 8, 2016

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
6.  ACTION ITEMS

6.1  Resolution 16-08: A Resolution Amending the Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Sorg:  So the first item on the agenda for discussion would be Action Item 6.1. Mr. Murphy would you please …

Murphy:  Yes Mr. Chair. This resolution is a resolution to amend the upcoming Work Program for Fiscal Years' 2017 and Fiscal Years' 2018. Currently a, a handout detailing the budget amounts and details are being passed out to you. This involves two amendments to the Work Program. The first amendment that we're aware of was we found out we are not going to be able to get State Planning and Research money in FY17 for the A Mountain Study Area so we have moved $250,000 from FY2017 to FY2018.

The second, second amendment will be on, on, shows, it starts to show on page three of the handout, we're adding back, or we're adding into this Work Program the Missouri Avenue Study Corridor which is currently under, undergoing. We do not anticipate its completion by October 1st so we need to amend the next year's UPWP to include that in there and the UPWP begins on October 1st. And with that we added $40,000 of FY16 money into the FY17 budget that's shown on the last page and those would be the, the amendments for this resolution. I'll stand for any questions.

Sorg:  Yes.

Pedroza:  Thank you. When do we anticipate the, the Missouri project to be finished if it's not going to be finished by October 1st?

Murphy:  It's, Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It is currently ongoing. Essentially I, I, I, December 31st would be the drop-dead date for the funds but we, we are near the end of it. We just won't get to the finish line by October 1st.

Pedroza:  All right. Thank you very much.

Sorg:  Any other questions on this amendment? I think we need a motion don't we to make this amendment? Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez:  No I wasn't …

Sorg:  Your light is on.

Benavidez:  I wasn't going to, sorry.
Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I move approval of Resolution 16-08.

Flores: I'll second the motion.

Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Garrett, second by Trustee Flores.

Murphy: Roll call. Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Chair Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

6.2 * Resolution 16-09: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

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

Sorg: Next item on the agenda is 6.3, Resolution to Amend the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Is there a motion to approve?

Pedroza: Move to approve.

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Pedroza.

Hancock: Second.

Sorg: Second by Commissioner Hancock. Mr. Wray.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the Committee to page 59 of the packet. The amendment that's being proposed today is a RoadRUNNER Transit amendment. This is a brand-new project although it's not brand-new money. The reason why we are, or why RoadRUNNER is requesting this amendment is …

Murphy: Item 6.3. That was (inaudible) …

Wray: Oh. Never mind. I apologize. I'd, I was, I had gotten behind myself.

Sorg: Yeah. Wrong page.

Wray: Wrong thing. Anyway, so rewinding, starting again. Thank you Mr. Chair. As the Committee will no doubt recall, at the June meeting the Committee continued the discussion item regarding the Metropolitan Transportation Plan amendment, the multi-use loop trail.

Sorg: Mr. Wray. Could I refer the Committee to page 54. I think it begins on page 54 of the packet.

Wray: No, Mr. Chair. That is, that's the wrong action item. That's actually the TIP amendment that we already did. The information for the multi-use loop trail starts on 64.

Sorg: Thank you, 64.

Wray: Sixty-four, yes. As, as this Committee has already had one presentation regarding this particular item, I'm only going to briefly touch on the options that were considered previously by the Committee and then go into further
detail regarding the options that the Committee requested that the Advisory Committees look at in greater detail. The ones that the, that this Committee has already seen: Option A would be to designate the route primarily following University, in fact I'm just going to switch to the map because that's probably easier to visualize for everyone. Option A is going to proceed down from Calle del Norte, proceed down NM-28 to connect with University and then across the campus along this path. Option B is to go from Calle del Norte down to Union and proceed across and then across the campus along that path. Option C which is one of the new options that we just discussed at the last meeting, that one is to follow the Mesilla Lateral down to Union and then across Union along the same trajectory as University, excuse me University along the same alignment as Option A. And then Option D is to follow the Mesilla Lateral all the way down to Union and then across, and then across the campus. The option that this Committee specifically requested that be analyzed before a decision is taken is now so-called Option E. That one follows along from La Llorona along Calle del Norte, stops at the intersection with the Mesilla Lateral due to right-of-way issues, and then resumes here at the intersection of Avenida de Mesilla and the Laguna Lateral, then follows down the Laguna Lateral to Union where it connects the existing Union trail facility, stops just barely short of the intersection with Laguna, and then would proceed along the same alignment.

Again, Option A, I've already gone over this in some detail so I'll just mention some of the, the high points there. If, if at any point during the Committee's discussion I'm more than happy to go and discuss any of the options in greater detail. But just, I want to note that the, the, one of primary advantages of Option A is that it directly connects the heart of Town of Mesilla with NMSU campus and it improves non-motorized access past Zia Middle School. The most significant disadvantage to Option A is the very difficult crossing of the Main Street/I-10 intersection, would be substantial infrastructure improvements that would be required in order to put a trail through, along this alignment. There are substantial right-of-way issues and ownership issues additionally which are impediments to the implementation of this trail, and due to the right-of-way utilizing NM-28 it would not be possible for there to be a contiguous multi-use trail along Option A alignment.

Option B, the significant advantage is that there are fewer right-of-way issues along the length of this corridor than Option A. It is a shorter distance to cross the Main Street and I-10 with more direct access to NMSU. The disadvantage is this option does not connect as closely as Option A does with the core of Town of Mesilla. There would be a greater coordination required between more jurisdictions and the existing EBID, excuse me, the, oh excuse me, yeah. I apologize, the, yeah, the existing EBID lateral would require coordination with Dona Ana County, the, the, the signing of the MOU in order to implement. And again due to the use of NM-28 the, the multi-use trail would not be able to be contiguous.
Option C, this is where we bring in the options along the Mesilla Lateral. It substantially parallels the same advantages and disadvantages for Option A with the exception that a contiguous multi-use facility would be possible given the fact that this will be, this proposal would be built on EBID facilities and there would not be the conflict with NM-28. This would require the MOU between the Town of Mesilla and EBID for this use of the Mesilla Lateral.

And then Option D, this is an option that proceeds from Calle del Norte and Mesilla Lateral all the way down the Mesilla Lateral to Union and then across. Again substantially similar advantages and disadvantages to Option B and again would not, would be able to be a, a complete contiguous multi-use facility due to use of the lateral and again this option would require the agreement between Town of Mesilla and EBID for the use of that lateral.

And this is illustrative of the right-of-way that exists along the, the path. Not going to recite all of the, the rights-of-way at, but I, our, our intent with this slide is to show that there is enough room along all points of the right, or along all points of the lateral to include a multi-use facility. The greatest pinch points are up here. The east bank is only eight, eight feet wide and again the east bank at this spot is also eight feet wide. While that is a little bit constrained that is still enough room to get a facility constructed.

And these are some pictures of the, the proposed areas. This is the Mesilla Lateral at Calle de Colon looking northwards. And this is the same, the same spot looking to the south. This is at Calle de Parian, do want to note there is some, some obstruction on the east side here but that could easily be cleared in the event of construction. And this is the same intersection looking to the south and I do want to note here that there is this wall that is existing along the, the, a potential selection that does pinch the right-of-way down somewhat but again staff believes that a, a multi-use facility could be constructed on either bank of the lateral. And this is Calle de Santiago looking to the north, again there is some vegetation in the way along the east side but that could easily be cleared. And then this is the same, same spot looking to the south and again there is vegetation present.

Option E, and this is the one I'm going to go into a little bit more detail because this is the one that the Policy Committee requested that staff take back to the, the Advisory Committees for their consideration. I do want to note that we do terminate the, the proposed trail here at the intersection with the Mesilla Lateral and then resume it at this point at the intersection of the Laguna Lateral and Avenida de Mesilla. The reason why we terminated it and why we did not terminate it on Options A and B, and I mention this because the, the Advisory Committees asked us about this, on Options A and B the presumption is that the trail going along NM-28 would simply be an in-road facility. And so on that basis we thought it appropriate to continue to highlight this portion of Calle del Norte as a, a
part of the trail. The intent of this alignment is to have as much of a contiguous facility as possible and so for that reason we went ahead and, and showed accurately what would have to be because there's no, there's no right-of-way along this stretch to construct any sort of facility. The only thing that would be possible would be a "Share the Road" sign whereas along Laguna Lateral we'd be able to resume the trail at this point and continue it all the way down.

Option E, this does have the advantage of having the fewest conflicts with vehicular traffic of all the considered options. As I'll show in a slide in just a minute, there are very few potential right-of-way issues along the length of the Laguna Lateral. The disadvantages, this would require again substantial coordination between multiple jurisdictions. This would require EBID and Dona Ana County signing the multi, or excuse me, the Memorandum of Understanding to allow this use. And again a disadvantage is that the multi-use facility would not be able to be contiguous utilizing this option.

And again this is, this is illustrating the right-of-way. There is plenty of right-of-way all along the Laguna Lateral to allow for the construction of a multi-use path. And just a couple of pictures here but this is the Laguna Lateral at the intersection with Union looking north, plenty of right-of-way on both sides, just some vegetation that needs to be cleared on the west bank.

The, this is a proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The adopted option would be entered into the Trail Plan as a Tier 1 facility. Due to the ongoing uncertainty about other EBID facilities listed on our Trail Plan, those would be downgraded to Tier 2 or Tier 3. This does require a minimum 30-day public comment period as we have already had a meeting where we, we believed we were going to reach a decision that, that, that requirement has already been well-met. At the June meeting as this Committee will recall, the Policy Committee directed staff to return to the Advisory Committees with additional options. At their July 9th meeting the BPAC under, with the new information endorsed Option D. And at their August 4th meeting last week the TAC also endorsed Option D. And I'll stand now for any questions. Would you like me to move back to one of the previous slides that has a map, one of the maps on it? I'll go back to the one that has all of the options on it if that is preferred.

Sorg: That would probably be the best. I would say one thing though. I wish you had labeled those paths or those, those, those structures that you're using there. We know a, Highway 28 well and Calle de Sur, del Sur, and Union but the, the laterals aren't, aren't labeled.

Wray: Oh.
Sorg: We’ll get it, we’ll get it. That’ll be all right. Any questions from the Committee? Councilor Eakman and then Mr. Trent and then (inaudible).

Eakman: Thank you so much for this presentation and I’m looking forward to discussion on it. I’m …

Wray: Oh. I’m sorry Councilor, if I could just interrupt. Mr. Chair we do have Mr. Steve Howie from EBID who is in the audience who is here to, to answer any questions should the, the Committee want to, to ask them. I apologize again, Commissioner, or Councilor.

Eakman: Fine. Thank you. I just have a possible perception question from those who live outside of our community. When they look at a, a couple of these options, I’m going to show off my Spanish here and use the term “mosquitoes.” When people from out of, yeah, I know, that’s impressive, isn’t it? I know when people look at a couple of these depictions and they’re going to see running right by the arroyos, I think in this day and time talking about some of what’s happening in our country, I’m just going to bring it up to the rest of the community how we can possibly if we choose such a thing educate the public about the real risk of riding bicycles through those areas. I guess I’m not looking for an answer but if anyone has one I’d be very willing to listen. Thank you.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: I, I think what you’re seeing, the water that you’re seeing, those are EBID ditches and those do not have water most of the time, and the water that, when the water is there it’s running and you don’t get mosquitoes in running water. So I think that’s the, that’s the, the short answer. There’s really not a big problem. Now the portion that is within the City and the County, I believe our Vector Control takes care of those issues because there are hot spots where water does stand. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Eakman: I agree. I’m just wondering how we can be forward-thinking in how we educate the public and not have them right away think something different. I, I live by those arroyos and I second what you’re saying but I’m just thinking of public perception at this time. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Commissioner Hancock did you, you said you had your …

Hancock: Yeah. I, I had mine on too. Your third from the last slide, and you mentioned the west bank and some vegetation but I see a lateral coming off of that one with a drainage port.

Wray: Yes.
Hancock: It looked like it'd have to have a bridge over it or something.

Wray: If it's consistent, let me see if I can …

Hancock: Third, third from the last slide. There's a picture.

Wray: Actually let me do this the easy way.

Hancock: There you go. That one.

Wray: There, there would, there's in fact another lateral on …

Hancock: Yeah. You see there, the one going off to the …

Wray: Yeah. There, there are a couple of places where some, some additional infrastructure might be required depending on which, when we get to actual design should, should a lateral option be selected depending on which side of the lateral is selected there might have to be some, some, some type of facilities as that included as part of the design. Yes.

Hancock: The City was kind enough to, thank you, the City was kind enough to provide to me the MOU that the City has with EBID. I'd forwarded that to New Mexico Association of Counties for an analysis as to the risk and liability to the County because that seemed to be the biggest factor for the County and the answer that I got back was that the, with caveats naturally depending upon changes that do occur but that that would not require additional insurance on the part of the County for an MOU of that type, so now that MOU has been forwarded on to County Legal Department for analysis to see how it meets with County standards. So it is in process, the issue with the MOU with the EBID and the County, and the County is looking at it. But that's where it stands at the moment, as a matter of information. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Benavidez: Mr. Chair. I'm over here.

Sorg: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Thank you. I'd like to ask a question regarding, can you please explain to us why Option E was implemented? What's the reason behind that?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. I'm not totally sure I understand the question. We, we included Option E because this Committee asked us to do so. It was during the discussion month before last …

Benavidez: Okay.
Wray: Laguna came up in the conversation and this Committee directed us to …

Benavidez: Okay.

Wray: Send it back to the Advisory Committees with Option E as part of the conversation.

Benavidez: So the Option E, was it to do, create a like a shortcut or to avoid the Town of Mesilla or …

Wray: Option E was selected because of the lack of vehicular conflicts along the, that particular alignment. It was also mentioned by Ms. Curry at the, a previous meeting where she was in attendance as a member of the public as being one of the things that the BPAC had considered earlier in the process but had discarded because of the, the issues regarding surround, or signing the, the MOU.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. No more questions.

Sorg: Okay Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, Option D was the recommended from both, correct?

Wray: That was the recommendation from both Advisory Committees the second time around.

Doolittle: Okay.

Wray: The first time around it was Option B.

Doolittle: Okay. One other comment that I have is I just want to remind the Board that even though specifically Option A wasn't recommended the, the Department along with the Town of Mesilla is still pursuing the, the pedestrian facilities and multi-use path and those types of things along University. So I only bring that up because just if this Board approves or, or, or votes to support the Advisory Committees and go with Option D we are still pursuing additional facilities along University itself. So I just want the Board to make sure they, they remember that.

Sorg: Thank you. That was good to point out. And that University Corridor is of course very important for the school, Zia Middle School there, as we all know.

Doolittle: And Mr. Chair just again to clarify, that's only, that, it's only that section between Main and New Mexico 28.
Sorg: Right.

Doolittle: So it won’t address any of the crossings across the railroad tracks, across Main itself, under the bridge at University and I-10.

Sorg: Yeah. Yeah.

Doolittle: So just keep in mind that that corridor is, is shorter but again we’re pursuing those kinds of facilities ...

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: In the area.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett, did you have something in a ...

Garrett: Thank you.

Sorg: Then ...

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Garrett: I, as a matter of fact I, I was interested in making sure that the work on University would continue and it seems to me that there’s plenty of reasons for us to support that and to have that continued while at the same time looking at other criteria in terms of the multi, what is it called, the, the, it’s, it’s the big loop.

Wray: Multi-use loop trail.

Garrett: Yeah, the multi-use loop trail, thank you which seems to me to have the potential of a much larger audience and, and slightly different needs that need to be addressed by, by people going through the area. You know it wasn’t until you had these up that I, I wondered about the connection between Laguna Lateral at University and then running down University to intersect with the Mesilla Lateral and going north on the Mesilla Lateral up to Calle del, del Norte.

Wray: Is there a particular slide you’d like me to have up for this?

Garrett: Yeah, the one with all the, all the routes. I think this is actually a hybrid, yeah. So I think that the discussions that we’ve had with this group and listening to input at the last meeting, the idea of being able to go along
Union made a lot of sense in terms of overall traffic and this big loop through the, the area. So part of the question was how do you get from Union up to Calle del Norte. The idea of get, going onto New Mexico 28 isn't ideal in many respects and so we were looking at going with the laterals. But what we didn't talk about was the idea of using the southern part of the Laguna Lateral and the northern part of the Mesilla Lateral as it shows on our map. Because what that would do is allow for there to be a connection that goes from Union through sort of the western part of Mesilla Park and into Mesilla, connecting in with University and then even picking up on some of the work that's going to go along on University, going down to 28, going across 28 at the Spotted Dog, past the Mesilla Elementary School, and then picking up the lateral and going north. And what you do by doing that is you have a lot of action through a potentially very crowded area by keeping the bikes on the, and the hikes and hikers and all that stuff, on the laterals for the majority of that distance and what you do is you avoid the problems that we have where Calle del Norte comes past that lateral and gets to Avenida de Mesilla. That's where it necks down and there's no, there's no shoulders, there's no nothing. And then you have a very awkward connection trying to figure out how to get from the lateral around The Bean down to connect with the other area. And what this actually does is to bring people who are driving through that area very close to the downtown of Mesilla on a less crowded side of that if you will. Seems like it might be, it, presuming that that section of University between the Mesilla Lateral and Highway 28 is a viable option, I mean we haven't said, nobody has said we can't do that option because that's a bad stretch, stretch of road. It's, it's narrow, I understand that, and you've got some issues but at the same that's a 20 mile per hour area. It's very slow through there and it's a short distance. So I just wanted to raise that as a possibility for a better connection through Mesilla that would tie Union to University and to Calle del Norte by using two parts of the lateral.

Sorg: Yeah. I'm trying to digest what he just said. We'll go on to …

Flores: Yeah.

Sorg: Trustee … do you want to add something Commissioner Billie Garrett?

Garrett: Do you have a way of showing what I just indicated by, with your mouse?

Wray: Just utilizing the mouse …

Garrett: That would be helpful.

Wray: Commissioner if I, if I'm understanding correctly what you are proposing is utilizing Mesilla Lateral …
Garrett: To there.

Wray: To this point.

Garrett: Yep.

Wray: Utilizing Calle del Sur to …

Garrett: No.

Wray: Oh.


Wray: Along this alignment to this spot here with Laguna and then utilizing Laguna down to Union. Is that …

Garrett: That is what I was …

Wray: Is it correct?

Garrett: I was suggesting as a possibility. It's a hybrid of two of the, well, well three of the options.

Sorg: Okay. So the other Committee Members want to weigh in? Trustee Flores.

Flores: I just want to say I think that's a great idea. On the side that's by Mesilla Farms I know that there's very little ROW. That's where we have the least amount I think because I know one of the residents there is very concerned. He's already given up some of his property. But on the other side there should be plenty of room, correct me if I'm wrong, Mayor.

Barraza: Are we talking University?

Flores: Right. You know that Mesilla …

Barraza: We're talking west of University, west of Highway 28?

Flores: Right.

Barraza: Okay. My, if I may just put in my two cents' worth. Currently the bus, what is, Las Cruces, the buses.

Wray: RoadRUNNER Transit.
Barraza: RoadRUNNER Transit has put up two stops for the buses right across Mesilla Farms, one very close to the intersection there heading east and one a little bit further up by Zia Middle School and there's not a lot of shoulder there for them. If we have buses, the City buses stopping there and we also have them across the street on the opposite side, on the northern side of it they've added an additional stop there, that's going to limit, if you have a bus there and bicyclists there it could be dangerous.

Sorg: Mayor, could you point out where Mesilla Farms is?

Barraza: I sure would. It is right in the corner of University, and let me just say Calle del Sur south, I mean west of Highway 28 is Calle del Sur, where Spotted Dog is, that's Calle del Sur. If you cross the Highway 28 it becomes University, okay. So right in the corner there of University and Highway 28 there's a small park on the north side, and the subdivision is right next to that little park. That is Mesilla Farms and so, oh, okay. Right where you see Teresita Street. Do you see that Andrew?

Wray: Yes. Yes.


Wray: Yes.

Barraza: All that subdivision in there.

Sorg: There's a bus stop there, the little blue square.

Barraza: And now they have added another one closer to the intersection.

Sorg: Oh.

Barraza: Further down, further east, a little bit up, maybe right under the word, under the R and S for "University" on the south side.

Wray: Right in there?

Barraza: Yeah, on the south side.

Wray: Oh. Here.

Barraza: Right there. They have a stop right there. Then they have the one where you have the blue and then they have one a little bit further east by the …

Wray: So …
Barraza: By Zia Middle School.

Sorg: Mayor, could you explain one more time the pros and cons of, of what you're saying here again?

Barraza: In terms of …

Sorg: Of the …

Barraza: Of what …

Sorg: Of the path, of the multi-use path. Yeah.

Barraza: My opinion or what Commissioner Garrett mentioned?

Sorg: Your opinion.

Barraza: In my opinion. In my opinion I would like to see probably Option D because of the Mesilla Lateral, and for those of you that are not familiar with Mesilla, that Mesilla Lateral is north of the Post Office. It's right between the Post Office and the Plaza. If you have been there, there's a lateral. That's that lateral that they're talking about.

Sorg: Right.

Barraza: And that lateral is especially I think from the park that the Town of Mesilla has all the way to Calle del Sur past that to Union, the roads are pretty clear. There are a few areas there that the brush, the foliage is coming over but nothing that can't be fixed. I think the roads are much better there. Now if we were to go with that other option that Commissioner Garrett just spoke about, my only concern would be coming off Calle del Sur we only have a small sidewalk on the south side of Calle del Sur that people that are walking to school or to the Spotted Dog or the store use, that's about the only space that we have available there. Once you cross over to Highway 28 and get on University, we are working with the New Mexico DOT for that multi-use, to widen the street and to add those multi-path, the bike paths and the walking paths on that. Once that is in place that would be great, but for right now I think Option D would be our best option.

Sorg: Is that D as in dog?

Barraza: D as in dog.

Sorg: Okay.
Barraza: Spotted Dog.

Sorg: Okay.

Barraza: Advertising here for Spotted Dog.

Sorg: But it, so you're saying that using Calle del Sur and University to connect the laterals, Mesilla with Laguna, is it ...

Wray: Yes, Laguna.

Barraza: Yeah, Laguna.

Sorg: Is not as good as going all the way with D which continues on the Mesilla to what is it?

Wray: Union Avenue.

Sorg: Union, Union Avenue, right.

Barraza: In terms of traffic I think the safest route right now would be going down Mesilla Lateral.

Sorg: But in the future?

Barraza: In the future, once the DOT, that would be great. It would be an awesome trail.

Sorg: How ...

Barraza: And the other is I do want to also say right in the corner of Calle de Parian and that lateral, there is a public restroom there where bicyclists, it's right there by the lateral so perfect place for them to take a break, a potty break, the public restrooms are also right there. But I think, and you know Trustee Flores step in whenever you'd like, I think at this time probably Mesilla Lateral will be the best option right now.

Wray: And Mr. ...

Sorg: Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Trustee, Mayor.
Wray: If I, I could say at this time, nothing, we’re not taking anything off any trail plans. We’re only potentially downgrading. So everything that, that we’re discussing, they'll still be on the trail plans and certainly eligible for any, any sort of improvements or for funding applications in the future.

Sorg: I, I, I just have a quick question. Whatever trail is picked, will there be signage telling people that this is the trail?

Wray: Mr. Chair. That would certainly be staff's hope. I mean that's getting to beyond what we're really talking about right here but I, personally speaking, personally I'd certainly hope that there would be signs …

Sorg: Okay.

Wray: And, and pointing out that this is the trail.

Sorg: Okay. Trustee Flores, you have any more to add? Oh yes, Councilor Pedroza, I'm sorry.

Pedroza: That, that's okay. Thank you. My question is kind of going back at, beyond a couple of the discussions that we've had but I like the idea that New Mexico DOT is thinking regardless of what we choose to make some improvements to the interchange with I guess it's that really really bad intersection, the one that we've talked about and my mind is just slipping right now, where I guess it's University goes under the highway. No? Where …

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Pedroza: The ones that you're going to be making.

Doolittle: The, the current University project will only run from New Mexico 28 to the intersection itself at University. There will not be any improvements or proposed …

Pedroza: Oh.

Doolittle: Improvements …

Pedroza: For the intersection.

Doolittle: Across the railroad tracks …

Pedroza: I see.

Doolittle: Across South Main, along University, and then over to the Valley Drive.
Pedroza: And ...

Doolittle: So it was improved ...

Pedroza: Those in the future or anything?

Doolittle: At this point ...

Pedroza: No.

Doolittle: The, again the only portion is right there in front of ...

Pedroza: Right.

Doolittle: Zia.

Pedroza: Okay. Well you've shattered my hopes. Okay. Thank you.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. And I understand the, the concerns that the Mayor's brought up in terms of, of sequencing. It seems to me that the section that we're talking about from the Laguna Lateral to 28 is critical to get done, be, in, because of safety issues, but because of traffic and school kids and, and all that sort of thing. I just, I would also suggest that, that what the Laguna Lateral south of University connecting to Union does is actually to go through an area that there are a lot of bicycle riders and although putting the designation for the multi-use loop trail somewhere else doesn't preclude the possibility of some improvements there, certainly if that was a part of the loop trail itself it would give it more likelihood, I would think, of being funded and getting built, at least sooner. So I, notwithstanding the issue of what happens on Calle del Sor, Sur on the, on the west side of 28, this is I think supposed to be a long-term picture and by, by finding a way through this sort of sector of the region that allows for more people to connect in with the trail, use the trail, develops and reinforces the trail sooner, that gives higher priority to the, these construction projects. It seems to me that, that it's, it's really worth considering that as a, an alternative way of, of designating this alignment. Certainly, I mean I can live with any of these things that we've come up with and it's all about safety and, and, but it's also about experience and, and the quality of the experience coming through the, the area. So I just, seems to me that a good strong case was made for the Laguna Lateral at the last meeting and I, I hate to see that we lose that entire connection as, as part of this because nobody was arguing strong for the southern part of the Mesilla Lateral between Calle del Sur and, and Union as being a great
experience. I understand it's pretty clear but it's, it's not, doesn't have the other advantages and attributes that you have with Laguna going through, over where it does.

Barraza: Okay. Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Commissioner.

Barraza: Mr. …

Sorg: Mayor.

Barraza: Okay. And I just want to say I strongly agree with what Commissioner Garrett said. When you’re looking for funding we’re trying to find the best possible use of the funds we have to get the project started as soon as possible and get it completed and useable for people to go out there and actually start using that trail and I, I sincerely agree with him because you know it would be less money and people can start using that trail. But it, I mean if we look at it in long-term also bicyclists are going to have three options trying to get to Union, following Mesilla Lateral all the way down, going down Calle del Sur through Highway 28, and then they could also go, and I'm hoping we’ll have that University multi-use trail and the road all fixed within, in my lifetime anyway, through the Laguna Lateral also. So eventually they will have three different ways of getting to Union if we just, you know from Calle del Norte at least to Calle del Sur use that lateral there …

Sorg: Right.

Barraza: For the trail.

Sorg: Excellent point Mayor. Excellent point.

Barraza: Thank you.

Sorg: Variety. We like variety. I just had one more question for staff. In the big picture, to get this trail completed from La Llorona trail along the river all the way over to the university, there's going to be, how many projects are we going to need? How many things are we going to have to work on to get the trail complete besides deciding where it's going here?

Wray: Mr. Chair. I can't really answer that question. I don't know. Nobody knows the answer to that question. If I can go back to my PowerPoint, NMSU has indicated that they are planning to do this portion. Town of Mesilla is currently working on a TAP application for this cycle to connect the end of the La Llorona trail to Calle del Norte. So all of this portion in
between right now is, does not have any potential funding identified for the current …

Sorg: Well I'm just getting at the point that there will be work done on, let me get the right name, Calle del Sur, no Calle del Norte. There will have to be work done on that road, right?

Wray: Yes, there …

Sorg: Yeah.

Wray: The, there's only the road there right now. There's no …

Sorg: Right.

Wray: There's no trail facility.

Sorg: Yeah, and narrow road at that. Okay. Okay, that's, that's what I wanted to be clear was there's going to be several projects here to get this whole path completed. Thank you.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Any other questions? Oh.

Barraza: Yeah. Go ahead.

Sorg: Commissioner Eakman.

Eakman: Thank you Mr. Chair. There's also the possibility that this is going to connect to the Rio Grande trail which is proposed by Steinborn at this time and will come before the City pretty soon. And so I think that will have to also be considered and it'll be interesting to see how all this connects bilaterally. Thank you.

Sorg: Good point Councilor.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mr. …

Barraza: Just one more comment.

Sorg: Mayor.
Barraza: I’m sorry. I just, Calle del Norte is a DOT road. It is a state road and there are no shoulders at this time on either side of Calle del Norte.

Sorg: Right.

Barraza: And Debbi gave me, or showed me, or told me a figure what it would take to get the path going there and we’re talking close to $700,000.

Sorg: Wow.

Barraza: So, and the Town of Mesilla needs to come up with a percentage of a match, I think 14%, something like that so …

Wray: If it's for TAP funding then it's 14.56%.

Barraza: Percent, correct. So that's what we're looking at right now.

Sorg: I see.

Barraza: Okay?

Sorg: Yeah. It'll be a little ways in the future here at least. Okay. Any other discussion on this? How do you want to go ahead and decide?

Wray: Mr. Chair. For the purposes of clarity it would probably be best if someone makes a motion specifically endorsing one of the options and then have a yes or no vote on, on that would be our recommendation.

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: I have a question.

Sorg: Is there a motion?

Flores: I just have one more question. Are we including Commissioner Garrett's option as like an F of going through Union, University that, connecting the two acequias or laterals?

Sorg: If Commissioner Garrett wants to do that, yes.

Baum: Mr. Sorg. I wanted to let you know that you already have a motion and a second on this. Your motion was made by Ms. Pedroza and your second was made by Mr. Hancock.

Sorg: Okay.
Pedroza: However, it was not targeted to a choice between the, the options which is I believe what we're talking about right now.

Sorg: So I would say we have to have a motion on the choice and then a motion on the whole resolution, and then a vote on the whole resolution rather.

Wray: Yes, I, I think, I think so.

Sorg: I think we'll go that route.

Wray: Sound, sounds reasonable.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: Let's do that.

Sorg: Yeah. That's fine, if you want to propose Option F it's fine with me. Just keep in mind it doesn't really matter if, if we have all three ways to go like the Mayor mentioned. But if you want to do F that's fine. Go ahead and make a motion.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I just have a question. Maybe I'm putting the cart before the horse but I, I would be in support of Option D only because of the Advisory Committees had made that recommendation so I don't, not fully understanding the process if Commissioner Garrett makes the recommendation for Option E I just want to make sure that I have a mechanism to either share Option D or, or say no with my comments. Again, not understanding the process so maybe that can be clarified for me personally.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: And I think I'm confused as to, I thought the, the particular one that Commissioner Garrett had been talking about was E and now I hear that it's F and so I need to be clarified as to which is E and which is F so that I can choose. Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza, and Mr. Doolittle. I, I'll, I'll deal with Councilor Pedroza's question first. Option E is the, the full extent of Laguna from Avenida de Mesilla down to Union. Commissioner, Commissioner Garrett's proposal is, is University, Laguna down. Mr. Doolittle …

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Wray.
Wray: It's my understanding that what, assuming someone makes a motion endorsing let's say Option F then if you feel called upon to vote against that in support of Option D then you vote no on the, on the, or on the motion supporting Option F and then afterwards you make the motion in, endorsing Option D would be how that would proceed.

Sorg: Thank you Mr., Mr. Wray for that clarification.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I'd like to move an amendment to the motion to specify Option F as discussed at this meeting.

Flores: I'd like to second the motion.

Sorg: Okay. Motion made by Commissioner Garrett, or an amendment made by Commissioner Garrett and a second by Trustee Flores. Unless there's something else that has to be said we'll go ahead and take a vote.

Barraza: Mr. Chair. Clarifying.

Sorg: Yes.

Barraza: And that is supporting, Commissioner Garrett is putting on the floor Option F.

Sorg: F.

Barraza: Okay.

Sorg: Yeah.

Barraza: I just have one question. Since Option F just came up does that mean it needs to go to the other Boards with another option?

Sorg: Good question.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. No. The Policy Committee may do what it sees fit.

Barraza: Okay. Very good.

Wray: Yes.
Barraza: Thank you.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: I'm, I'm assuming then that the amendment is to the current motion on the table as it relates to the, the "I," that would be after the, now there are four and the "I" being the Trail Plan Amendment and, as shown in the Exhibit A would be specifying then the direction as outlined in what is being termed "F."

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: If I could clarify. We were not able to include an Exhibit A attached to this motion because we did not know what the selection of the Policy Committee was going to be. There will be attached to the Resolution when it is signed and sealed for eternity a, a map. There will be a map that will be included as Exhibit A as part of this resolution.

Hancock: Okay. So the amendment then is, is that point in the discussion in the original motion.

Wray: Yes.

Hancock: So we'll vote on the amendment first and then vote on the full motion.

Sorg: That's right.

Hancock: Very good. Thank you.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. And, and because questions have been raised about the relationship with, of this proposal with the other Advisory Groups I, I just would say I have the greatest respect for them. As a matter of fact I think that this builds on their recommendations as far as I'm concerned and the considerations that we've had in terms of people coming and talking to us. This isn't a completely different alignment. I mean it, it basically takes some parts of some other things so it's trying to build on the strengths rather than just come up with something completely different. If, for example if we hadn't had Laguna Lateral at all and that came up this time I would think that would not be as appropriate but we've
had the discussion about both the Mesilla Lateral and the Laguna and about Union and about University and about all these other roads so it's, it's simply tying them together in a slightly different way. So …

Sorg: Okay.

Garrett: I just want it to be clear that I'm respectful and mindful of their input.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Good point. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Could, could we review one last time that path that …

Sorg: Route.

Hancock: Is being, the route that is being described as F so that if we could follow your mouse so that we are all totally clear.

Wray: Certainly.

Hancock: Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair. The, the proposed Option F starts here at the, the current termination of the La Llorona trail, continues down to connect with Calle del Norte, proceeds along Calle del Norte to the intersection with the Mesilla Lateral. Would then proceed down the Mesilla Lateral to the intersection with Calle del Sur, would go along Calle del Sur till it crosses NM-28 and becomes University, would proceed along University until it intersects with the Laguna Lateral, would proceed down the Laguna Lateral until it reaches Union, would, would follow Union crossing Main Street and I-10 until it reaches what’s, what street is this on campus. Stewart, we'll call Stewart. Along Stewart until it reaches Espina, proceeds down and then across to the proposed connection of the Triviz trail extension that will be part of the currently on the TIP University, putting Triviz under University.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I just have one …

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: One last comment. So based on the motion I just want to clarify, I'm going to vote no on the motion only because I support Option D, not because I don't support the resolution or itself or what the MPO staff or the advisory committees have, have done. I just want to clarify that that is why I'm voting no, not that I don't support the resolution.

Sorg: The resolution or the amendment?

Hancock: I'm sorry. The amendment.

Sorg: Okay. One last question. On your map that you have there, the routes that are in dash form instead of a solid color are routes that aren't built yet. Is that correct?

Wray: That's correct. Yes.

Sorg: Okay. So we know on Union there is trail there now and that is why that is solid blue.

Wray: That's, that's correct. That trail terminates just not very many feet from the intersection …

Sorg: Right.

Wray: With the Laguna Lateral.

Sorg: Right. And if you continue on Union to the west, southwest there's, there's missing trail there.

Wray: Yes. That is correct. The, that trail does terminate there. There's no, the, there's no continuation of that trail at any point to the west.

Sorg: And just to clarify one more thing, if we do take this Option F and, and, and go with that, it would eliminate building a trail on Union from where, what lateral is that where, where …

Wray: Laguna Lateral.

Sorg: Laguna, right, to, all the way to the other lateral in Mesilla there.

Wray: Mr. Chair. No. What it would do is it would eliminate that particular portion being considered part of the multi-use loop trail for the present. If in future the, the MPO or the Town of Mesilla or Dona Ana County choose to continue that facility to the west of where it currently terminates they're more than able to do so.
Sorg: Of course.

Wray: It's just a question …

Sorg: Yeah.

Wray: A question of getting …

Sorg: But it's …

Wray: The money and going even further from that, if let's say that that portion is constructed, the Policy Committee could then make that a portion of the multi-use loop trail as well.

Sorg: As well, okay. Thank you very much. You made that very clear. If there's no further discussion we'll take a vote.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: I knew you were going to start over here.

Wray: I always do. I can't see them.

Barraza: No, and I just want to echo what Mr. Doolittle said and so I will, I will vote nay.

Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: No. For the same reasons. I think that the people that, that know the, the area pretty good understand what's necessary. Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: No.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.
Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Interesting. The Town of Mesilla is split. I'll vote yes.

Wray: The, the amendment passes.

Sorg: Okay then, a, a, a vote on the original resolution.

Wray: Madam Mayor.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.
Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: The resolution is passed.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Committee Training

Sorg: Okay. Moving on to the rest of the agenda, we have Discussion Item 7.1, Committee Training. MPO staff please.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I borrowed a FHWA module on highway safety training that several of us staff were presented to a couple months ago and I thought there, there's some good, good information in it for you in your role as, as elected officials, not all pertinent but, so I'm going to kind of fly through it a little quickly but I'll stop for any questions along the way. This is ... Okay so we had a training on highway, highway safety from the FHWA. They outlined their history, rules of the, the Highway Safety Program, imparted upon us the, the four Es of highway safety from the FHWA. They outlined their history, rules of the, the Highway Safety Program, imparted upon us the, the four Es of highway safety, and they discussed countermeasures and gonna to repeat it.

Kind of, the important of highway, highway safety and this is from the FHWA standpoint: Nationwide 34,000 people a year die in, in crashes and over three million, over 3.4 million people are injured each year so as those of us who are responsible for planning the transportation system this is a very, this is one of our, our prime tasks that we're, we're, we're, one of our duties to look at. We get our safety guidance through, through the United States Codes, MAP-21 at the time. Now it's the FAST Act that has the Highway Safety Improvement Program in it which is what funds safety improvements for highways and these are codified in the United States Codes. Part of the MAP-21 and the FAST Act are actually developing standards of, standards for highway safety measures. We also have many resources available to us and these manuals come from FHWA, they come from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials otherwise known as AASHTO. There are roundabout guides developed, all sorts of, all sorts of best practices assembled together to allow, allow us to help design better transportation facilities.

From the AASHTO manuals this is our three contributing factors towards unsafe conditions: Drivers factors, roadway factors, and vehicle factors. And then the four Es that we go over: Engineering, Education, Enforcement, and EMS. Primarily at the MPO we are, we're concerned
with the engineering aspects of it, where our roadway, you know where our roadway's not safe and what can we do, you know what can we fix in order to make them less dangerous. We also have some hand in education through some of our public outreach. And then of course a lot of safety is handled through enforcement and then when all goes wrong we have emergency medical.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program or HSIP, it authorizes lump sums to the, to the states. And the state, each state has developed a process for which that money is disbursed around, around the state whether it be to highway districts or to local governments to do safety projects. As the time we had the training $2.4 billion portioned to the states, what they want is data-driven and I know you've, we've, probably have gotten tired of me talking about the importance of data in the MPO's work programs but this is, this is, you, everyone else is shaking their, their heads the other way Councilor Sorg. The, that's where you know why, why we are so in, intent on collecting data so that we know where our problems are, where we can help make the best decisions.

There's also a State Strategic Highway Safety Plan that's developed at the statewide level. MPOs and RTPOs do have, we're, we're part of the process with the developing that so we take the, we take the local concerns and, and hope that they are heard into, into the safety plan.

And the other big thing that I've been talking about and we're still, we're still anticipating it is the Performance Management. We, the State and the MPOs are supposed to set targets and measures and report on our performance and then there will be consequences. If we adopt, if we adopt our measures and we don't meet them we do, we will be risking having less funding moving forward in the future. So as we develop our, our performance measures, specifically in this case safety performance measures, we need to have realistic goals set for ourselves.

The big take-away from the training was the fatal crash locations are random. The crash types are not. Through the study of the data these are the leading causes of crashes from 2007 through 2011 which I believe is the latest time that, that the data was available. A lot of those, lot of those have to do with aggressive driving. We addressed it in enforcement level. You'll notice that "curves" is on there. That's, that's something that we can address from an engineering and planning standpoint. And so when, what we have to is as transportation professionals focus on the predictable. We can, we can address lane departure crashes, you know I'll let you go ahead and read the things. So enforcement's been a big, big part of safety belt use, increasing the safety belt use and I think we've had, if I, it's probably in here but the fatalities have decreased from the all-time high in 2005, they decreased every year to 2012, kind of gone up a little bit. We've worked about changing the, the traffic safety culture. There's a lot of public service out there, "Do not
text," "Do not use the phone as you drive." These help deal with inattention to driving.

FHWA has safety initiatives. Let me check, I have to refresh myself on the notes on this one. So they, they devote resources to crash testing. The National Cooperative Highway, National Cooperative Highway Research Program establishes testing protocols and thresholds, safety, safety measures. So the key is that the FHWA's had a long-term commitment to research to improve highway safety, to, to create safer roadways. These reports are available.

Another, another great tool is the Highway Safety Manual, well that gives us predictive tools, gives us methods to integrate qualitative estimates into plans, and helps us prioritize projects.

Roundabouts, another relatively, the modern roundabout relatively recent, we've only seen that past 15, 15 years or so and they're becoming more ubiquitous. They, they help with safety. They help reduce the conflict points at intersections from 32 to eight. They lower speeds through the intersection so when there are crashes those crashes are less dangerous, will result in less fatalities.

Left, left turns have observed to be the, some of the most dangerous activities for you know, you know driving out there. So they've, they've come up with some direction and some recommendations on how to modify left turns. What this picture represents is a, a separate the, the left-hand turns so that they're not blocking each other's view and they can judge gaps in the oncoming traffic better. They've developed J-turn intersections to reduce left turns onto, onto busy roadways. A vehicle comes, comes out of a crossing intersection, proceeds down there and is allowed a U-turn downstream a little bit so that they can proceed to what would've been a left-hand turn. There's also information on the effectiveness of red-light cameras. So the roadway departures are a third of all traffic fatalities. They happen at night and they happen for many different reasons.

FHWA's also working to improve roadway visibility, larger signs, curve chevrons, eliminate drop-offs so that leaving the road does not you know result into, into rollovers. Breakaway, breakaway signs kind of reduce the, reduce the hazard of, of crashes and collisions. They advocate tree removal in some certain, some instances. And then there is a list of the FHWA safety initiatives and, and these are some other, other initiatives eligible for safety money.

They do have a, a reporting system for fatal crashes and reporting on it helps, helps provide objective funding, or to target the funding objectively to where there are problems seen. These information's available on the web.

And I'll show you those last slides. I just wanted to present to you some of the overview of safety. We'll make this presentation available on the website so you can review it at, view it at your leisure and also look, look on any resources you'd wish to follow up with.
Sorg: Thank you Mr. Murphy. Very good. I would like to point out a new guest in the, in the room tonight, today. That is former Committee, Policy Committee Member and Chairperson and Mayor Pro-Tem Emeritus Sharon Thomas. Any questions on the safety slides? Yes, Trustee Flores.

Flores: So I know one of the things that when we gather this data is we're going to try and, the purpose is to try and improve on it from the next year. But it occurs to me when I see older drivers and I know that it, you know we're expecting to have a larger percentage of older drivers, so is that going to be used when we're calculating whether we're doing better or not? Because it seems like you're running uphill because you're going to have even more older drivers on the road so when we calculate to see whether we're doing better do we consider the fact that the number of older drivers is increasing? And I'm saying, cause you're not, it's apples and oranges as years progress.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Trustee Flores. That is a very good point and it speaks to why when we, when we do get the, the measures from the, from FHWA and the State and us develop our targets, we probably need to keep those sort of things in mind when we select our targets to make sure things, the, the targets that we select are achievable realizing that we are having an aging population and you know I think we probably want to put some of our, our resources you know in, into the larger signage, that was one of the examples on there, say, "Okay you know the older population …"

Flores: Worse, yeah.

Murphy: This is a more effective countermeasure for us to implement than this other thing." So …

Flores: Yeah.

Murphy: I think those are, they, those are very important points we need to keep in mind as we move forward.

Sorg: Any others? Mr. Trent.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Early on in Tom's presentation he talked about you know the, the safety features being data-driven and in the past I frequently have heard the comment, you know we don't do anything with our safety money until we have a severe accident or we even have fatalities. I am happy to say that you know we do seem to have more flexibility to being proactive as opposed to reactive. I mean it is still data-driven but they're allowing you know engineers and, and department staff to actually take
that data and look at it, even share our opinions and discussions on what's
taking place in some of these areas and actually submit some of these
applications for safety funding to be proactive instead of waiting for
something to happen. So you know that's one change that I've seen that's
been better than it has in the past. Because ultimately you know it's
always been our opinion that the intent is to prevent the accident, not
address it after something happens. So it is still data-driven but I just
wanted to clarify that it does seem to allow us to be more proactive.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes. I'd like to respond to my younger colleague, Trustee Flores. I am
aware that in just a few years I'm going to have to, have to requalify for my
driver's license annually. That is what we do here in New Mexico. I'm
going to have to have 20/40 vision and be able to prove it and I really
applaud New Mexico on taking that step. I've not lived in another state
that is, is so proactive in making sure that folks are continually qualified to
drive. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Councilor Eakman. Councilor Pedroza, I saw you first.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you. Tom, is there any like a connection, say for instance
that staff here in the City were to want to pick Trent's brain about some
particular safety measure. Is, is there some way to do that in terms of like
engineering, safety, things on that, on the streets of the City?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Councilor. I, I would be open to having any of those
discussions that, that you, that you would like to. I would also tell you that
your engineering staff also has a lot of that same information but anytime
feel free, and I can you know if there's something specific or a safety
device …

Pedroza: It was just general.

Doolittle: You want to discuss, absolutely. Feel free …

Pedroza: Okay.

Doolittle: To come visit with, with …

Pedroza: All right.

Doolittle: Our staff.

Pedroza: Thank you very much.
Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Does anyone know if there is a Highway Safety Week? I mean we have all kinds of, it'd be helpful if someone could find out an appropriate date for recognition of highway safety specifically. And it occurs to me that the education, one of the four Es is something that we might all be able to partner around. I know that we have talked about projects that had safety dimensions to them but I don't know that I've ever seen a list that said, "Here are the things we've accomplished that have to do with it, road work that has directly improved, reduced accidents and fatalities and this is why we're doing, at least it's one of the major reasons we're doing some of these things." So if, if it would be possible to find out if there's a time for us to, between the City and the Town and, and the County to actually pass resolutions, go on local media, have newspapers run articles, and really highlight so that we understand the, for example the roundabouts, that a major part of that has to do with safety. And, and just kind of go through some of the projects. I think the Highway 70 dividers of course jump out but there's other things that have been, been done and some of them I think are fairly subtle. I will say until I saw this presentation and had you walk it, walk us through it I thought crash-worthiness actually had to do with cars being able to sustain crashes as opposed to the way that roads were designed and what went into the roads were designed in order to reduce the effect of crashes. And that's, I mean there's a lot of, this, this is a different way of looking at the work that we do and I think that it'd be something that would be worthwhile for the public to better understand and appreciate.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett. That's good. Commissioner, or Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Commissioner Garrett. I did just real briefly pull up on the internet and, and I couldn't remember the dates but we do actually have a National Work Zone Awareness Week which is in April of each year. I also pulled up from the, it is the National Work Zone Awareness. Typically that's focusing more on our construction zones to you know make sure our workers make it home safe, you know "Slow down through work zones," those types of things. I also pulled up the National Highway and Transverse, Transportation and Safety Administration's website and there are probably three dozen safety-related …

Sorg: Events.

Doolittle: Awareness items, you know Alcohol Awareness Month, National Work Zone Awareness Week which I already mentioned, Police Week, Ride to Work Safely Week, so there's, there's several that maybe we could
piggyback off of but I know for the Department the big one is the Work Zone Awareness Week.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. I saw that too. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. Since I brought this up I'd be willing to work with one or two members of the Policy Committee to bring together some, some ideas, talk with Mr. Doolittle and our MPO staff, and come forward with a proposal if, you know at least to consider whether it'd be worthwhile highlighting the work that's done that is about improving safety in terms of the projects that we do.

Sorg: Thank you. That sounds great.

Garrett: So if I have any volunteers, it we'll take some volunteers.

Sorg: Yes. Understand. Any other questions? Trustee Flores.

Flores: I was just going to go ahead and volunteer to be on that committee.

Sorg: Thank you. Looks like he's got a couple volunteers. Very good. Not you. I, I just had one little question about the, the presentation. It was on the slide that had "Fatal Crash Types Aren't Random," and you have the years 2007 to 2011 and I just, just want to be clear on this cause I, I didn't quite get it as you went through it. Are they ranked in the frequency of those kind of crashes, the fatal crashes, the seat belts being the most and inattentional being the least?

Murphy: Mr. Chair. I believe that is the implication …

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: From the, from the, from the way they ordered them.

Sorg: Okay. I, it just doesn't …

Murphy: Cause …

Sorg: Seem like, well I suppose if we carried on from 2012 to 2016 they might change …

Murphy: This …

Sorg: In order.

Murphy: An, inattention and impaired swapped a couple of times.
Murphy: So …

Sorg: But they're at the bottom of the list anyway. Okay. Just saying current data might change that. I, that's all we have here I think.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Sorg: And the next item on the agenda is staff comments or Committee comments. Is there anyone that has comments? Mr. Trent. Yes, you have a report.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I do if you'll allow. I just want to touch real briefly on our construction projects. We're actually in the process of finishing up most of the work here in, in town which I think a lot of people will be happy that we're going to get the orange barrels off the road, at least for a little while.

The Missouri bridge and the Union bridge projects are both for the most part finished. We're working on some final clean-up punch-list items but for the most part we are substantially complete and working on closing the projects so you shouldn't see any kind of interference in those two areas.

The other two big projects that we had were the mill and inlays, again two projects but really by the same contractor so it seems like one big project but that's the one on I-10 basically from Corralitos all the way to the Texas state line. We are finished with the pavement. All of the straight-line striping is finished. The only thing we have left to do is striping of the gores but for the most part that one is finished. I'm happy to say that Mountain States, our contractor's going to get 100% payment on the smoothness so they're typically one of our state competitors when it comes to the Statewide Smoothness Award. Hopefully that won't allow people to fall asleep cause it's a nice ride between here and El Paso now.

Ultimately those are the only four ongoing projects we have in the area. I just wanted to touch real briefly on some, on one thing that happened at the, in the border area. We had been pursuing rather aggressively a concrete overlay of NM-136 which is the Pete Domenici Highway between the port of entry and the Texas state line. Ultimately we submitted a TIGER application, I, I mean a FASTLANE application, I'm sorry for about $40 million. We're still awaiting that but in the meantime we were pushing forward on the design of that project. We should be finished sometime in December or January with the design. While we were doing that, executive staff ultimately found some funding and we've currently been notified that the District will receive about $31 million to fund Segment 1 and Segment 3. We need …
Barraza: You found that much money?

Doolittle: That is, that is correct Mayor. What they're doing is every year they go through a redistribution process at the General Office. So what happens is let's say I have a project that bids, we allocate $20 million in our STIP for whatever reason and it comes in at $15 million, which is happening right now quite frequently because of the drop in price of oil. So what they then do is they take that $5 million of savings from that specific project, they put it into a big pot, and then at the end of the fiscal year they look at you know which projects are ready, ultimately who's been managing their projects well, those kinds of things and New Mexico 136 because we had been aggressively pursuing it because of the FASTLANE, we're going to be ready to meet those timelines. So again we received $16 million in Fiscal Year 17, $15 million in Fiscal Year 18 which we're going to try to do advance construction and build it all as one project. So ultimately I'm pursuing an additional $5 million or so which will allow us to complete that entire corridor. Just to give you an idea, my normal STIP budget is right at $30 million. This project is going to add about $35 or $36 million to the District so in one year I've doubled my budget on one project. So it's a little bit out of this area but it's really good news for us in the border, basically maintaining our current infrastructure. It's not going to expand. We're going to do some improvements along with the County specifically at Airport and 136 but it's just to maintain our current infrastructure with concrete overlay. But that's exciting for us. I, I honestly never thought it would happen before I retired but it's good news for us. I'll keep you in the loop on, as I get information on the studies that we're doing you know in the area, US-70 for instance, we've had a few public meetings on the study for the six-lane you know that Councilor Sorg has been interested in. I don't have any updates yet because we're in the very preliminary stages but I just wanted to share that bit of good news at least for the District and for southern Dona Ana County. And with that I'll stand for any questions.


Eakman: Yes. Thank you Mr. Doolittle. I was wondering, would the news that the State is going to claw back funds of 5% probably from other projects through the end of this fiscal year, it would be my understanding that fuel taxes pretty much are the revenue sources for a lot of road improvements. So for the sake of my education, are the road improvements and the planning for road improvements insulated from that 5% cut?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. Purely by coincidence this morning I had a conversation with Deputy Secretary Anthony Lujan very specifically related to that and you're absolutely correct. Right now it seems like the Department will continue to do business as usual. We do honestly have a
little bit of a surplus because of, of we're not, we're not out of the General Fund, we're based on, on gas tax. So ultimately we as a department are actually doing better than usual but at the same time if the rest of the state tends to fall into revenue problems or, or those kinds of things they tend to look at our budget to, to borrow from or steal from, whatever terminology you want to use. But at this point the discussion I had with Deputy Secretary Lujan this morning is we're to continue doing business as usual and District 1 honestly has benefited greatly the past few years. So we'll be busy down here.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. Any other comments from Committee or staff?

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Okay. Any public comments? Any public comments from the public here? We have two members of the public here that, no comments from them? Okay.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:34 p.m.)

Sorg: That's it. There's no more items on the agenda. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Pedroza: So move.

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Pedroza.

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Second by Councilor Eakman. All in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: Meeting is adjourned.
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The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held August 24, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. in City Hall Council Chambers, 700 N. Main St., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**
- Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
- Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
- Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
- Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
- Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
- Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
- Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
- Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
- Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. **CALL TO ORDER (11:05 a.m.)**

Garrett: Meeting will come to order. This is a special meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. This is August 24th, 2016 and the time is 11:05. Can I get a roll call?

Baum: Board Member Benavidez is not here. Board Member Barraza is not here. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.

Baum: Board Member Eakman is not here. Ms. Flores.

Flores: Here.

Baum: Mr. Garrett.

Garrett: Here.

Baum: Mr. Hancock.

Hancock: Here.
Baum: Ms. Pedroza.

Pedroza: Here.

Baum: Board Member Sorg is not here and Board Member Arzabal is not here.

Garrett: Mr. Murphy do we have a quorum?

Murphy: Yes we have a quorum.

Garrett: Thank you very much.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Garrett: Does any Member of the Committee 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 they can be impartial we will put the participation up to a vote by the rest of the committee. Are there any conflicts of interest?

Hancock: No.

Pedroza: No.

Doolittle: No.

Flores: No.

Garrett: And I do not have one either.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Garrett: Do we have any public comment? Thank you.

4. ACTION ITEMS

4.1 Resolution 16-10: A Resolution Amending the Federal Fiscal Year 2015 and 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Garrett: In that case we will move onto the only item we have for Action on, at this special meeting. Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Action Item 4.1 Resolution 16-10 is a resolution to amend our current, the fiscal year 2015 and the fiscal year 2016 Unified Planning Work Program. What we need to do is move a little over
$200,000 from the special studies plans projects and programs from FY15 into FY16. This, these monies are mainly budgeted towards the university, university/Missouri study projects that we had anticipated completing in FY15 but due to various reasons and, and lengthening of the schedule they've extended well into FY16 and maybe a little bit into '17 which we amended last month. Due to the program, the program policies and procedures established by NMDOT we're not allowed to just simply slide that over in the two year UPWP, we need to distinctly move it from one fiscal year to the other fiscal year, so we're asking for your approval of this amendment so that we may seek reimbursement for funds expended on, on this, on these projects and other MPO activities.

Flores: So moved.

Hancock: Second.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Murphy. And we have a, a motion to approve Action Item number 4.1 which is a resolution amending the FY15 and '16 Unified Planning Work Programs. Any discussion by members of the Committee? Any public input? Would you please poll the Committee? Those in favor say "yes", those opposed "no."

Baum: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Baum: Ms. Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Baum: Ms. Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Baum: Mr. Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Baum: Mr. Garrett.

Garrett: Yes. The vote is unanimous.

5. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Garrett: Do we have any committee or staff comments at this point?
Murphy: No sir.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

7. ADJOURNMENT (11:08 a.m.)

Garrett: In that case without objection we are adjourned.

______________________________
Chairperson
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MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 14, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
RESOLUTION NO. 16-11: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIR TO SIGN A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM.

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 16-11

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
1. Copy of draft MOA
2. Copy of Camino Real Consortium Bylaws

DISCUSSION:
Committee Discussion
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIR TO SIGN A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM.

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

WHEREAS, the MPO is a public agency and is empowered to enter into this MOU; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of New Mexico designated the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization as an MPO pursuant to Section 112 of the Federal Highway Act of 1973. The results of said action allowing the MPO to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. §134, Metropolitan Planning, 23 U.S.C. §104(f)(3), to include participating in a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Camino Real Consortium is comprised of other public, private, and non-profit agencies that are dedicated to coordinating planning at the regional level.

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

(I) THAT the MPO Chair is authorized to sign the attached MOU, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made part of this Resolution.

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

DONE and APPROVED this 14th day of September, 2016.

APPROVED:
Chair

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

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

ATTEST: 

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between [Insert Name of Agency] and the Camino Real Consortium

1. **Purpose**
The Camino Real Consortium (Consortium) commits to advancing regional development consistent with the Program Goals and Long-Term Desired Outcomes listed in Attachment A.

2. **Background/Introduction**
Leaders from public and private sectors and community members of Doña Ana County recognize the importance of working together to maintain and improve the region’s strengths in economic opportunity, excellent natural resources, and quality of life. Challenges – such as efficient and equitable transportation, improving water quality, providing housing options near jobs and transit, increasing capital investments and jobs, and fostering career opportunities for all – are interrelated and span municipal, state and international borders. They cannot be solved by individual municipalities or organizations acting alone or through single-focus methods. They require public-private collaboration and multi-pronged approaches. As a result of a HUD-funded project, the Viva Doña Ana (VDA) Initiative began. The Consortium-lead VDA Initiative continues on to promote regional collaboration and sustainable communities through a range of planning and implementation activities.

3. **Commitment to the Consortium**
In pursuit of the VDA Initiative’s long-term desired outcomes, Consortium members commit to work together to carry out the activities of the VDA Initiative as described in Attachment B.

4. **Benefits to Members**
Through participation in the VDA Initiative, the Consortium member may realize the following benefits:

   A. Greater opportunity to contribute to a shared understanding, vision, and goals for sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County and the neighboring region.
   
   B. Better alignment of organizational goals with broader regional goals.
   
   C. Increased understanding of sustainable communities’ issues and regional approaches to address those issues.
   
   D. Increased capacity of members and the region to accomplish goals and achieve desired results.
   
   E. More access to funding and investment opportunities from public and private sources that recognize the value of coordinated approaches to regional challenges.
   
   F. Enhanced connections with others across sectors and disciplines.
G. Greater recognition for leadership and involvement in regional sustainable community efforts.

5. Common Responsibilities of Consortium Members
Members work to achieve the following:

A. Appoint a representative and an alternate to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) – the voting body of the Consortium – who are responsible for: 1) informing other key people within the municipality, agency, or organization of the Consortium’s activities and, 2) relaying information to the Consortium about relevant work being contemplated or completed by their entity.

B. Advance sustainable communities initiatives through their commitment to the program goals and long-term desired outcomes; the activities of the VDA Initiative; and, where feasible, the recommendations established by the RLC.

C. Participate in the Consortium. Effectiveness of the Consortium depends on full participation. Member representatives or their designees to the RLC will attend and actively participate in RLC meetings or Subcommittee meetings or other Consortium events. The appointed representative and/or alternate will notify the RLC in advance if they are both unable to attend meetings, and will seek to designate someone else to attend the meeting in their place. Representatives should expect to participate in Subcommittees as established by the RLC.

D. Agree to share appropriate and relevant technology and data with the intent of creating a comprehensive regional set of data that promotes the goals of the VDA Initiative, including but not limited to, traffic and transportation models, GIS data, demographic information, etc.

E. Explore grants and address each grant’s reporting and administrative requirements.

F. The Consortium will identify a lead agency to be responsible for entering into grant agreements to carry out projects as described in the grant application and work plan.

G. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.

H. The Consortium will identify a lead agency to host and maintain a VDA Initiative website as well as an email listserv to provide information related to the VDA Initiative for Consortium members and interested members of the public.

I. In addition to the common responsibilities listed above, individual members may have specific responsibilities as the VDA Initiative work plan evolves.
6. **Consortium and Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) Membership**

The Consortium is comprised of member organizations that have entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Each member organization has a designated representative and alternate that together comprises the RLC. These members are individual signatory members to this MOU with the Consortium as established in Attachment C. It is the intent of the Consortium to be inclusive and broadly representative. Consortium members will seek to encourage new members as needed to ensure broad representation. Any organization seeking Consortium membership shall submit in writing a formal request for membership to the Chair and Vice Chair. Memberships may be added subject to the approval of the current RLC membership in accordance with the Consortium Bylaws. Participation in the Consortium is voluntary. Members may withdraw from the Consortium at any time by submitting a letter to the Chair and Vice Chair stating the reasons for the withdrawal, in accordance with the organization’s established procedure. The Consortium reserves the right to expel a Consortium member. If a consortium member has missed three consecutive meetings without the approval of the Chair or Vice Chair, or if the Consortium member has not substantially fulfilled its obligation, the Chair or Vice Chair shall alert the Consortium member in writing and present the issue to the RLC for discussion and action. The Chair or Vice Chair may initiate discussion and action to expel the member in accordance with the bylaws.

7. **Meetings**

The RLC will meet monthly, unless determined otherwise. The designated lead agency will send meeting notices, agendas, and any meeting materials by email to RLC members at least five days in advance of the meetings. A quorum, in accordance with the bylaws, must be present to hold a meeting requiring formal action.

8. **Subcommittees**

The RLC will form subcommittees to focus efforts on specific projects or tasks of the VDA Initiative, and make recommendations to the RLC. RLC and subcommittee members will discuss and refine, as necessary, recommendations with the goal of reaching consensus. Subcommittees will be responsible for appointing a project lead, setting a meeting schedule, establishing goals, deliverables and a timeline for completion, and reporting to the RLC.

9. **Decision-Making**

The goal of the RLC is to make decisions, where possible, by consensus. Members commit to seeking consensus through a mutually respectful give-and-take of thoughts and ideas with the intent of reaching a decision acceptable to all. RLC members also recognize that dissent is a healthy component of constructive dialog; however, final decisions of the RLC will be made in accordance with the bylaws. Decision/action items must be included on the meeting agenda distributed to RLC members in advance. The Consortium acts through its RLC.
10. Term of MOU
This MOU is effective upon the day and date last signed and executed by the duly authorized representatives of the parties to this MOU. This MOU shall remain in effect until formal termination of the MOU. This MOU may be terminated, without cause, by either party upon written notice, which shall be delivered by hand or certified mail.

11. Signatures
In witness whereof, the parties to this MOU through their duly authorized representatives have executed this MOU on the days and dates set below, and certify that they have read, understood, and agreed to the terms and conditions of this MOU as set forth herein.

The effective date of this MOU is the date of the signature last affixed to this page.

[INSERT NAME OF AGENCY]

[Insert Name of Authorized Representative] [Insert Date]
Signature Date

[Please Print Name and Title]
Name and Title

CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM

[Insert Name of Authorized Representative] [Insert Date]
Signature Date

[Please Print Name and Title]
Name and Title
Attachment A

The Camino Real Consortium’s
Program Goals and Long-Term Desired Outcomes

Program Goals
The goals of the Camino Real Consortium are to do the following:

1. Foster the development of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County that are consistent with the following Doña Ana County Livability Principles:

   A. Support Existing Communities
      Target funding and resources toward existing communities—through strategies like transit-oriented, mixed-use development, and land recycling—to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.

   B. Preserve Our Heritage
      Recognize and integrate local traditions and culture into planning goals and process as appropriate.

   C. Provide More Transportation Choice
      Develop safe, reliable, and affordable transportation to broaden the range of choices beyond exclusive reliance on privately owned automobiles. Promote transportation options that decrease household transportation costs, reduce energy consumption, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

   D. Promote Affordable Communities
      Develop a range of tools to enhance community affordability to lower energy and transportation costs, promote innovations in housing design and construction, implement zoning that reduces barriers and promotes a full range of residential and commercial alternatives within walking distance, expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to lower the combined cost of housing and transportation and enhance communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.

   E. Enhance Economic Opportunity
      Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services, and other basic needs of residents, as well as expanded business access to markets. Coordinate economic development strategies with regional partners including neighboring counties, states and countries. Plan with an eye to integrating economic development goals with other Livability Principles including those aimed at promoting affordable communities and expanding transportation choice.
F. Coordinate Policies and Investment.
Seek ways to plan collaboratively with agencies, departments and organizations at every level – federal, state, regional, local, private sector, non-profit, etc. – to maximize public investments and funding opportunities and better align policies. Align policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth.

2. Support urban, suburban and rural areas and multijurisdictional partnerships that commit to adopt integrated plans, strategies, and management tools to become more sustainable.

3. Facilitate strong alliances of residents and regional interest groups that are able to maintain a long-term vision for a region over time and simultaneously support progress through incremental sustainable development practices.

4. Build greater transparency and accountability into planning and implementation efforts.

5. Expedite implementation of the Doña Ana County Livability Principles through changes in local zoning and land use laws and regulations that remove barriers to sustainable development for housing, economic development, transportation, infrastructure and environmental quality issues.

6. Work to align local, state, national, and bi-national capital improvement programs with the Livability Principles.

7. Assist the region to move toward sustainability and livability, and, for the regions that have shown a long-term commitment to sustainability and livability, prepare them for implementation to demonstrate results.

Long-Term Desired Outcomes
The outcomes of the ongoing Viva Doña Ana Initiative will be an implementation of regional plans that are configured to produce the following:

1. Creation of shared elements in regional transportation, housing, water, and air quality plans tied to local comprehensive land use and capital investment plans.

2. Aligned planning and investment resources for local and regional strategies in achieving sustainable communities.

3. Increased participation and decision-making in developing and implementing a long-range vision for the region by populations traditionally marginalized in public planning processes.

4. Reduced social and economic disparities for the low-income and marginalized communities within the region.
5. Decreased per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and transportation-related emissions for the region.

6. Decreased overall combined housing and transportation costs per household.

7. Increase in the share of residential and commercial construction on underutilized infill development sites that encourage revitalization, while minimizing displacement in neighborhoods with significant disadvantaged populations.

8. Increased proportion of low and very low-income households within a 30-minute transit commute of major employment centers in urban, suburban, and rural settings.

9. Increased protection of natural resources, rural areas and preserve farmland and agriculture in the region.

10. Increased proportion of affordable housing units that have good access to services including fresh foods, health care, employment and education.

11. Increased options in mobility – walking, biking and transit.
Attachment B

Viva Doña Ana Initiative Activities

Activity A
Develop a broad partnership to advance regional sustainable development. The Camino Real Consortium will work together to identify shared long-term desired outcomes for regional sustainable development, provide guidance for the Viva Doña Ana Initiative and associated projects, provide leadership to advance desired outcomes through engagement and education, and promote implementation of the desired outcomes through their incorporation into local plans, policies and practices, and by using sustainability indicators to measure progress.

Activity B
Assist with the implementation of current and future regionally developed and accepted plans that integrate land use, transportation, housing and economic development. The Initiative will take a comprehensive look at the challenges faced throughout Doña Ana County including within municipalities, colonias, and other unincorporated areas.
Attachment C

Viva Doña Ana Initiative

The following jurisdiction, agency, or organization submitted a Letter of Interest/Commitment to join the Camino Real Consortium and support the Viva Doña Ana Initiative.

The entity listed below agrees to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Camino Real Consortium to carry out the Viva Doña Ana Initiative.

[INSERT NAME OF AGENCY]

Point of Contact:

[Insert Point of Contact] ____________________________  [Insert Date] ________________
Name                                              Date

[Insert Phone Number] ____________________________  [Insert Email] ____________________________
Phone Number                                        Email

Designated Representative:

[Insert Designated Representative] ____________________________  [Insert Date] ________________
Name                                              Date

[Insert Phone Number] ____________________________  [Insert Email] ____________________________
Phone Number                                        Email

Designated Alternate:

[Insert Designated Alternate] ____________________________  [Insert Date] ________________
Name                                              Date

[Insert Phone Number] ____________________________  [Insert Email] ____________________________
Phone Number                                        Email
The Camino Real Consortium Bylaws
A Doña Ana County, New Mexico Organization Committed to the Viva Doña Ana Initiative

Adopted March 23, 2012
Revised May 9, 2014
Revised March 25, 2016
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Attachment 1 Voting Requirements Matrix
Article I—Name

The name of this organization shall be the Camino Real Consortium (Consortium). A revision to the formal name of the Consortium is subject to a majority vote of the membership of the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC).

Article II—Purpose & Membership

Section 1: Purpose

The Consortium was established in 2011 to oversee the application and work plan for the Viva Doña Ana Initiative (VDA Initiative). The Consortium serves to advance and integrate regional planning in an effort to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County.

Section 2: Establishing Membership

Membership in the Consortium consists of those organizations that have entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Any additional organizations who support the purpose of the Consortium as set forth in Article II Section 1 may seek Consortium membership by submitting in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC a formal request for membership including a description of the specific activities that it is prepared to provide toward the VDA Initiative.

Additional members may join the Consortium subject to the approval of a majority vote of the membership of the RLC.

Consortium membership is effective upon execution of the MOU between the requesting agency and the Camino Real Consortium.

Article III—Governance of the Consortium

The Consortium shall comply with all applicable Local, State, and Federal laws.

This document establishes the bylaws for the Consortium and is in accord with the membership and responsibilities set forth in the Camino Real Consortium MOU.

Section 1: Regional Leadership Committee (RLC)

The RLC is comprised of the designated voting membership of the Consortium. The voting membership of the RLC shall perform the governance responsibilities of the Consortium.

A. Membership of the RLC shall consist of one representative and designated alternate from each of the Consortium members in accordance with procedures of their respective organizations. Names of the representatives and alternates shall be formally transmitted in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC by each Consortium member.
B. The representative has voting authority, whereas the designated alternate has voting authority in the absence of the representative.

Section 2: Committees and Subcommittees
The RLC shall create, appoint, and oversee subcommittees, including but not limited to the following: Steering Committee and Project Support Teams (PST). The RLC shall appoint both voting and non-voting members as deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes of Consortium supported projects.

Section 3: Regional Leadership Committee Representative Withdrawal or Termination
Any representative seeking withdrawal from the RLC shall submit in writing notice of such to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC. Failure of a representative to properly fulfill the specific activities that he or she commits to provide may result in his or her suspension or termination of the representative seat by a majority vote of the quorum of the RLC. In either case, the respective Consortium member shall appoint a replacement to serve on the RLC.

Section 4: Consortium Member Withdrawal or Termination
Members may withdraw from the Consortium at any time by submitting a letter to the Chair and Vice Chair stating the reasons for the withdrawal, in accordance with the organization’s established procedure.

The Consortium reserves the right to expel a Consortium member. If a Consortium member has missed three (3) consecutive meetings without the approval of the Chair or Vice Chair, or if the Consortium member has not substantially fulfilled its obligation, the Chair or Vice Chair shall alert the Consortium member in writing and present the issue to the RLC for discussion and action. The Chair or Vice Chair may initiate discussion and action to terminate the membership by a majority vote of the RLC membership excluding the Consortium member in question.

Article IV—Officers and Duties
The officers of the RLC are a Chair and a Vice Chair.

Section 1: Roles and Responsibilities
The roles and responsibilities of the officers are as follows:

A. The Chair presides at all meetings, coordinates with staff to prepare the agenda for the meetings, calls special meetings, and sets the time and place of meetings in consultation with the membership. The Chair officially represents the RLC before other groups and agencies and carries out other duties as designated by the Consortium.

B. The Chair and Vice Chair positions must be occupied by a designated representative of their respective organizations (See Article III Section 1).

C. The Vice Chair serves in the Chair’s absence.
D. The Chair and Vice Chair shall communicate as needed regarding all relevant administrative matters of the RLC to ensure proper and thorough coordination to carry out their responsibilities.

Section 2: Election of Officers
Officers are elected from among the representatives of the voting members. Officers are elected by a majority vote of the quorum of the RLC.

If either the Chair or Vice Chair cannot fulfill the term for any reason, the RLC shall nominate and approve by a majority vote of the quorum a new officer from the representatives of the RLC to complete the term of the vacated position.

Election of officers shall occur at the first meeting upon adoption of the bylaws and annually thereafter. Subsequent annual elections shall be held in the same month as the original adoption of the bylaws.

Article V—RLC Responsibilities, Authorization, and Meetings

Section 1: Responsibilities and Functions
The RLC is the policy making body of the VDA Initiative. Its responsibilities and functions include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Use the Doña Ana County Livability Principles to guide and inform the planning process
B. Provide and promote meaningful participation opportunities in the planning process for regional planning partners, stakeholders and the public (especially by under-represented/underserved communities)
C. Develop, recommend for adoption and implement the plans resulting from the VDA Initiative as well as other regionally significant plans that align with the Doña Ana County Livability Principles and VDA Initiative
D. Ensure that work plan outcomes are successfully met
E. Create, appoint, and serve on subcommittees, including delegation of other staff or representatives of the members, as deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes of the VDA Initiative (See Article III, Section 2)
F. Explore and pursue funding opportunities and ways to leverage resources for the Consortium
G. Resolve disputes as appropriate

Section 2: Representatives and Authorization to Vote
Each Consortium member shall have one (1) vote and shall designate in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC a representative and alternate representative who have the authority to vote on behalf of the Consortium member (See Article III Section 1).
Section 3: Meetings
The RLC shall meet monthly or more frequently as deemed desirable, appropriate, or necessary by the RLC. Notice of all RLC meetings shall be communicated via electronic and/or regular mail to all representatives and alternates. Notices of meetings are transmitted to all representatives and alternates at least five (5) days prior to the date of the meeting. Robert’s Rules of Order will be observed at all meetings. Cancelation of specific RLC meetings may be determined by consensus of a quorum or by the Steering Committee. Cancelation notices of meetings are transmitted to all representatives and alternates at least five (5) days prior to the date of the meeting.

Section 4: Special Meetings
Special Meetings of the RLC may be called by the Chair or by request of 25 percent of the member representatives of the RLC.

Section 5: Participation
In the event that the designated representative is unable to attend an RLC meeting the designated alternate shall serve in his or her absence. In the event that both the designated representative and alternate are unable to attend they shall notify the Chair and/or the lead agency point of contact responsible for Consortium logistics at least 24 hours in advance.

Participation in-person is preferred and encouraged as it is most advantageous for all members; however, telephonic or electronic participation at meetings is permitted as necessary and appropriate. The representative shall contact the lead agency point of contact at least 24 hours in advance to request participation telephonically or electronically. The lead agency will make every reasonable attempt to accommodate the request; however, there is no guarantee of participation via telephone or other technology.

Article VI—Quorum and Voting
All actions before the RLC require a quorum. A quorum will consist of the presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one. Actions will be decided by a simple majority of the quorum unless prescribed otherwise.

Article VII—Lead Agencies
The RLC will designate a lead agency for certain functions including but not limited to facilitating Consortium logistics, operating and maintaining the VDA Initiative website, serving as the fiscal agent for grant agreements and managing individual planning initiatives/projects.

Section 1: Consortium Logistics
The designated lead agency will send meeting notices, agendas, and any meeting materials electronically to RLC members at least five (5) days in advance of the meetings. A quorum must be present to hold a meeting requiring formal action.
Section 2: Viva Doña Ana Initiative Website
The designated lead agency will host and maintain a VDA Initiative website as well as an email listserv to provide information related to the VDA Initiative for Consortium members and interested members of the public.

Section 3: Grant Applications and Agreements
The designated lead agency will be responsible for entering into grant agreements to carry out Consortium supported initiatives/projects as described in the grant application and work plan. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.

Section 4: Planning Initiatives/Projects
The designated lead agency will be responsible for project management of Consortium supported planning initiatives. The lead agency will work with the RLC to develop and formalize project scope of work and approach to community engagement including participation of planning partners, stakeholders and the public. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.

Article VIII — Amendments
These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the RLC membership. Amendments shall be by written notice outlining the proposed amendment(s) and reasons thereto and sent to each member via electronic and/or regular mail at least 15 days prior to the meeting. Such amendment(s) shall be consistent with the purpose of the VDA Initiative.

- Adopted by unanimous vote of the RLC on March 23, 2012
- Amended bylaws adopted by the RLC on May 09, 2014
- Amended bylaws adopted by the RLC on March 25, 2016

Article IX — Definitions

A. Camino Real Consortium (Consortium): The member organizations that serve to advance and integrate regional planning in an effort to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County

B. Consortium Member: Organization that has entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

C. Designated Alternate: Individual appointed by a member organization to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) in the absence of the Designated Representative; has voting authority in the absence of the designated representative

D. Designated Representative: Individual appointed by a member organization to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC); has voting authority
E. **Majority Vote:** More than half the votes cast; minimum of 50% plus one

F. **Planning Partners:** Organizations and/or individuals with a strong commitment to the VDA Initiative

G. **Project Support Teams (PST):** Organization comprised of any variation of project staff, RLC members, consultants, key planning partners and stakeholders

H. **Quorum:** The presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one

I. **Regional Leadership Committee (RLC):** Governing body for the Consortium that provides oversight and guidance of the VDA Initiative; composed of designated representatives and designated alternates (who have voting authority) along with staff from member organizations and planning partners (non-voting participation)

J. **Stakeholder:** A person interested in the outcome of a particular initiative/project; participates and provides input into the process

K. **Steering Committee:** Advisory group that coordinates administrative functions of the RLC; composed of the RLC Chair and Vice Chair, key RLC members and key staff from Consortium members

L. **Viva Doña Ana Initiative (VDA Initiative):** Regional planning initiative focused on advancing and integrating planning efforts to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County
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Attachment 1 – Voting Requirements Matrix
Camino Real Consortium

Voting Requirements Matrix

Article VI – Quorum and Voting
“All actions before the RLC require a quorum. A quorum will consist of the presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one. Actions will be decided by a simple majority of the quorum unless prescribed otherwise.“

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>VOTING REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>ARTICLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name change of Consortium</td>
<td>Majority vote of RLC membership</td>
<td>Article I – Name</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New members of Consortium</td>
<td>Majority vote of RLC membership</td>
<td>Article II – Purpose and Membership</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of RLC representative</td>
<td>Majority vote of the quorum</td>
<td>Article III – Governance of Consortium</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Consortium member</td>
<td>Majority vote of RLC membership</td>
<td>Article III – Governance of Consortium</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of officers</td>
<td>Majority vote of the quorum</td>
<td>Article III – Governance of Consortium</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling vacant officer seat</td>
<td>Majority vote of the quorum</td>
<td>Article IV – Officers and Duties</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment of Bylaws</td>
<td>Majority vote of the RLC membership</td>
<td>Article VIII – Amendments</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 14, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Presentation on the Missouri Study Corridor

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will present on the progress of the Missouri Study Corridor.
AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 Committee Training

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will discuss crash data from 2012-2014 in terms of crash rate, severity and type.