



# METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

## MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **November 9, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **Las Cruces City Council Chambers**, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://MesillaValleyMPO.org).

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY:** 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. **CONSENT AGENDA\*** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
5. **\* APPROVAL OF MINUTES** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5.1. October 12, 2016 \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6.1. \*Resolution 16-12: A Resolution Adopting the 2016 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects  
\_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
  - 6.2. Resolution 16-13: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
  - 6.3. Resolution 16-14: A Resolution Recommending Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) projects to NMDOT \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
  - 6.4. Resolution 16-15: A Resolution Accepting the Missouri Study Corridor Phase A recommendations \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 7.1. NMDOT update \_\_\_\_\_ **NMDOT Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**

1                   **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
2                                   **POLICY COMMITTEE**  
3

4   The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning  
5   Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held October 12, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in  
6   the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.  
7

8  
9   **MEMBERS PRESENT:**     Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)  
10                           Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC) (arrived 1:12)  
11                           Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)  
12                           Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)  
13                           Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (arrived 1:19)  
14                           Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
15                           Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)  
16                           Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)  
17

18   **MEMBERS ABSENT:**     Trent Doolittle  
19

20   **STAFF PRESENT:**       Tom Murphy (MPO staff)  
21                           Andrew Wray (MPO staff)  
22                           Michael McAdams (MPO staff)  
23                           Dominic Loya (MPO staff)  
24

25   **OTHERS PRESENT:**     Aaron Sussman, Bohannan Houston  
26                           Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary  
27

28   **1.     CALL TO ORDER (1:10 PM)**  
29

30   Sorg:           We are now having a quorum so I'll call the meeting to order. You know,  
31                   did we used to call roll?  
32

33   Murphy:        Yes.  
34

35   Sorg:           Should we do that again just for the, just to do it?  
36

37   Murphy:        Okay, all right. Member Barraza.  
38

39   Barraza:       Here.  
40

41   Murphy:        Member Flores.  
42

43   Flores:         Here.  
44

45   Murphy:        Member Pedroza.  
46

1 Pedroza: Here.

2  
3 Murphy: Member Eakman.

4  
5 Eakman: Present.

6  
7 Murphy: Member Hancock.

8  
9 Hancock: Here.

10  
11 Murphy: Chair Sorg.

12  
13 Sorg: Here. Thank you.

14  
15 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**

16  
17 Sorg: Next item on the agenda is the Conflict of Interest. Is there any member  
18 of the Committee or staff that has a known conflict of interest on any item  
19 on the agenda?

20  
21 Hancock: None.

22  
23 Eakman: None.

24  
25 Sorg: Okay. Very good.

26  
27 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

28  
29 Sorg: We have Public Comment now. Is there any member of the public that  
30 wants to make a comment to the Metropolitan Planning Committee?  
31 Seeing none.

32  
33 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

34  
35 **4.1 September 14, 2016**

36  
37 Sorg: Let's go on to the Approval of the Minutes.

38  
39 Eakman: So moved.

40  
41 Hancock: Second.

42  
43 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman and second by Commissioner Hancock. Any  
44 corrections or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, a vote, let's call a  
45 roll call vote on the minute, approval of the minutes.

1 Murphy: Member Barraza.  
2  
3 Barraza: I will recuse myself. I was not at the meeting.  
4  
5 Murphy: Member Flores.  
6  
7 Flores: Yes.  
8  
9 Murphy: Member Pedroza.  
10  
11 Pedroza: I will also abstain because I was not at the meeting.  
12  
13 Murphy: Member Eakman.  
14  
15 Eakman: Yes.  
16  
17 Murphy: Member Hancock.  
18  
19 Hancock: Yes.  
20  
21 Murphy: And Chair Sorg.  
22  
23 Sorg: Yes. And Commissioner, oh, excuse me, yes. Commissioner Leticia  
24 Benavidez has just arrived.  
25  
26 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**  
27  
28 **5.1 Missouri Study Corridor**  
29  
30 Sorg: Going on to the next item on the agenda is the Discussion Item Missouri  
31 Study Corridor. Mr. Murphy.  
32  
33 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have Aaron Sussman from Bohannon Huston to  
34 give you an update on the, on the latest that, with our study. We had a  
35 public meeting the end of September at the Farm and Ranch Museum.  
36 Bohannon Huston is going to be putting, finishing up this month the Phase  
37 A report. We wanted to get this in front of you for some questions prior to  
38 that and we're hoping to have, have this back to you in November for a, for  
39 a vote. And with that I'll turn it over to Mr. Sussman.  
40  
41 Sussman: Okay. Good afternoon Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Again, my  
42 name is Aaron Sussman. I'm a planner with Bohannon Huston. It's been  
43 several months since I provided an update to this Board so at this point we  
44 wanted to follow up with some additional analysis that we've conducted.  
45 We're also at the point where we have largely concluded our outreach  
46 process. We've presented to the BPAC Committee, to the Technical

1 Advisory Committee, we've convened several meetings of our technical  
2 advisory committee of MPO staff and other technical staff from  
3 jurisdictions around the metro area. At this point we have a series of what  
4 we're calling "final draft recommendations." These are still of course  
5 subject to input and discussion. Your input in particular is, is what we're  
6 looking for at this point. Obviously this is a fairly small group today so we  
7 can keep this informal and if there's a question along the way please feel  
8 free to interrupt. I think that may, that's fine with me and that would be  
9 effective.

10  
11 Sorg: Thank you Aaron. That sounds great.

12  
13 Sussman: All right. So let me first begin by explaining and, or at least clarifying what  
14 this study is and, and what it is not. So the Missouri Avenue Corridor  
15 Study is what's called a Phase A Location Study. It's funded by the  
16 Federal Highway Administration through the Mesilla Valley MPO. There  
17 are multiple phases that take place in these kinds of studies that receive  
18 federal funding.

19 In a Phase A study we're looking at an initial set of alternatives and  
20 what that means is that we're screening for fatal flaws. We're not doing  
21 full design at this point. We're doing some limited engineering analysis,  
22 mostly in the feasibility at a general level of the potential alternatives. This  
23 results in a recommendation of a no-build scenario but then also a small  
24 number of, of potential alternatives for further analysis. A Phase A study  
25 does not produce exact costs. We look at the magnitude of costs to get  
26 an understanding of whether certain alternatives might be more costly or  
27 cost-efficient than others. Again we're not in, at the point where we're  
28 doing full engineering analysis or environmental analysis or design, and  
29 then obviously construction would take place at later phases as well.

30 This study is really in response to the, sorry, the lack of, of roadway  
31 infrastructure in the study area. Let me go back a couple slides to the,  
32 sorry my screen is blank now on me up here. To, so the study area  
33 shown on this map, the outlined area in blue which is bounded by City  
34 boundaries to the north and to the west, and then Sonoma Ranch  
35 Boulevard to the east is mostly BLM land. Obviously Centennial High  
36 School forms the southeast portion of the study area. This is, can I turn  
37 the, it's like blinking at me, it's, let me just turn it off. Okay. All right. My  
38 apologies. So we were, we've been considering a, a couple of roadways  
39 that are in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Missouri Avenue is  
40 included in the 2021 to 2030 period of the current Metropolitan  
41 Transportation Plan. Roadrunner Parkway is on the MPO Long-Range  
42 Thoroughfare Network which means that it's considered for analysis,  
43 potentially long-term implementation but it's not considered for  
44 construction implementation during the 2040 time frame, between now  
45 and 2040 as part of the MTP. So we're looking at some kind of long-range  
46 options here and part of this analysis is to understand: Given the lack of

1 network, do these options that are on the MTP Project List or on the Long-  
2 Range Thoroughfare Network, do they make sense to consider for further  
3 analysis at this point? We're also responding to the lack of bicycle and  
4 pedestrian connections to the high school. So there's a lack of roadway  
5 connectivity through the study area and there's also somewhat limited  
6 bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and we'll come back to those two points in  
7 particular. So I mentioned where these projects fall in terms of their  
8 presence in the MTP. Again, part of this study is to validate their current  
9 place, whether they belong in terms of funded projects and then also in  
10 the Long-Range Thoroughfare Network.

11 It's been important for us as we've presented this to the public in  
12 particular to clarify our land use assumption, so as I mentioned this land in  
13 the study area is owned and maintained by the Bureau of Land  
14 Management. Our operating assumptions are that there will be no  
15 changes in the status of the land in the study area in the near future, that  
16 it's currently BLM land, that it either remains as Bureau of Land  
17 Management land or that it becomes some form of park or open space  
18 and so any change in activity would be of similar low-intensity usage into  
19 the near future. So we're maintaining that current land use status as an  
20 underlying assumption for this study.

21 We have considered three types of alternatives. One is what we  
22 call a roadway typical which consists of not just the travel lanes but also  
23 bicycle facilities and a multi-use trail if that makes sense in a particular  
24 location. A non-motorized trail in which we look at no general-purpose  
25 lanes at the moment but we look at a facility that would accommodate  
26 pedestrians and bicyclists exclusively. And then of course there's the no-  
27 build alternative which is to maintain these projects where they are, or the  
28 roadways where they are in terms of the long-range network and in the  
29 MTP Project List but we don't recommend further analysis or steps  
30 towards construction at this time.

31 So let me go through the, the six alternatives briefly and then we'll  
32 talk about how we narrow down to our set of, of again final draft  
33 recommendations. So again the first alternative is the no-build scenario in  
34 which again the roads remain on the long-range networks, the long-range  
35 planning documents but we don't recommend any further activity at this  
36 time. The second alternative is an extension of Missouri Avenue. This  
37 would take the form of something like a two-lane collector facility so what  
38 this road looks like currently between Telshor and city limits, an, an  
39 extension of something that looks similar to that type of roadway in terms  
40 of the footprints, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and this would extend from  
41 again city boundaries to Sonoma Ranch to the west, skirting the north side  
42 of Centennial High School. The third alternative is an extension of  
43 Roadrunner Parkway from its existing terminal point to the south of  
44 Lohman Avenue proceeding southeast through the study area and then  
45 along the northern edge of Centennial High School and again terminating  
46 at Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. Roadrunner Parkway to the north of

1 Lohman is a four-lane minor arterial. This alternative, can see as either a  
2 two- or a four-lane minor arterial. That is something that could be decided  
3 at a later stage of analysis. But this is just to give you an idea of the, the  
4 scale or scope of the roadway that's called for in the long-range planning  
5 documents. The fourth alternative is an extension of both facilities,  
6 Missouri as the two-lane collector and Roadrunner as the minor arterial,  
7 so again a larger footprint roadway along the collector. These would  
8 intersect and then again follow that path along the north side of Centennial  
9 High School and terminate at Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. A fifth  
10 alternative that we examined is essentially each of those prior alternatives  
11 but following a northern alignment. The idea with this particular alternative  
12 was to avoid some of the topographical challenges that we face in this  
13 study area, but it does not provide immediate access to the high school so  
14 we'll come back to the implications of that. But this is a, a similar set of  
15 alternatives but following a slightly different path. And then finally the sixth  
16 alternative is a bicycle/pedestrian connection from again the existing  
17 Missouri Avenue where the bicycle facilities currently terminate again at  
18 city limits. This would include a multi-use trail not unlike some of the trails  
19 currently in the Las Cruces area. The exact alignment's not necessarily  
20 that blue line but it's more of a concept, but that would provide direct  
21 access to Centennial High School and ultimately connect to Sonoma  
22 Ranch Boulevard.

23 There were a large number of criteria that we considered as part of  
24 this evaluation and so one thing that I want to mention up front is that it's  
25 our job to make sure that we didn't weight any of these criteria more  
26 heavily than others. This, the evaluation in terms of the, the, the  
27 recommendations really comes out of the composite of whether a project  
28 meets this set of criteria and set of needs or not. So we considered things  
29 like: Do the alternatives meet the initial purpose and need of the project?  
30 Are they providing access to Centennial High School? Are they improving  
31 network connectivity? How feasible is the project from an engineering  
32 perspective or from a drainage perspective? What are the impacts to  
33 traffic both from a regional perspective but also to the existing  
34 communities? Again this is Bureau of Land Management land and it's  
35 used as open space currently so environmental impacts is an important  
36 consideration along with the impacts to the surrounding communities. As I  
37 mentioned, all of these alternatives are consistent with the long-range  
38 planning documents but some of them are prose for different phases or  
39 different time frame for implement, or for, for potential implementation, and  
40 then magnitude of costs. These are all of the sets of considerations that  
41 were, that were brought forward as part of this study.

42 There are a couple of updates and, and highlights that I want to  
43 speak to today before we get into the draft recommendations. The first is  
44 a bicycle level of service analysis and so I mentioned that a particular  
45 component of this study, the purpose and need is the lack of bicycle and  
46 pedestrian connections to the high school. And it's not just that there's a

1 lack of connections, it's actually, there are connect, there are facilities  
2 along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, along Dripping Springs, although east of  
3 the Farm and Ranch Museum there are no bicycle lanes, and then there  
4 are lanes on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard but we were able to evaluate the  
5 quality of those connections and how safely and, and comfortably students  
6 could access Centennial High School in particular. So this analysis looked  
7 at things like vehicle traffic, the speeds, the width of the travel lanes, the  
8 width of the bicycle lanes, pavement conditions, and it produces a level of  
9 service analysis and in short the, the darker the green color the higher the  
10 quality of the infrastructure. So what we see as we dug into this analysis  
11 is there are a few areas that we want to highlight. So this area shows as a  
12 Level of Service B, pretty high quality on Lohman but we have really high  
13 speeds and high traffic volumes. There's, there's no buffer and there's a  
14 five-foot bike lane so for, for most cyclists this is not the most comfortable  
15 ride that you might experience. Along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard there,  
16 again very high speed limit, 45 miles per hour and only four-foot bicycle  
17 lanes. That's pretty narrow so it's good that we have the facilities there  
18 but again not the most comfortable ride, not the kind of ride that's going to  
19 appeal to a lot of cyclists. And as I mentioned directly south of Centennial  
20 High School the bicycle lanes terminate at the city/county boundary so if  
21 you're approaching the high school from the southern side of the school  
22 the facilities are, are pretty, pretty modest for sure. So these are things  
23 that we could highlight through this particular analysis.

24 We also in the last several months were able to bring in results of  
25 an, a series of travel model scenarios. So we looked at four types of  
26 scenarios: Again the no-build so we have growth into the future but we  
27 have no additional roadways; what happens if we extend Missouri Avenue  
28 alone; a third scenario where we look at extending Roadrunner Parkway  
29 alone; and then a fourth scenario where we extend both facilities, and in  
30 each of these cases we compare the base year statistics for 2015 to 2040,  
31 the horizon year for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. So the most  
32 noteworthy scenarios in particular is the Missouri Avenue extension where  
33 we do see by extending that facility a, a large number, almost 5,000  
34 additional trips along Missouri Avenue and then proceeding through the  
35 study area. That corresponds with an increase in trips along Sonoma  
36 Ranch Boulevard, so what seems to happen is that there's a lot of vehicle,  
37 lot of vehicles and drivers that would utilize Missouri as an alternative to  
38 go east-west and then go north-south along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard.  
39 I'm not showing a map here for Roadrunner Parkway because it frankly  
40 doesn't show all that much. The predominant movement is east-west in  
41 order to go north-south so Roadrunner Parkway kind of provides an east-  
42 west alternative to Lohman. It doesn't generate all that many additional  
43 trips beyond what we see today so it's not showing much of a change in  
44 travel patterns with the extension of Roadrunner Parkway by itself. We  
45 also again looked at what happens if we extend both facilities. In this, in  
46 this scenario in particular we see a, an even larger increase in trips on the



1 existing Missouri Avenue, an increase of about 6,500 trips and then we  
2 seen an increase in north-south travel along both Sonoma Ranch and  
3 Roadrunner Parkway. So again we have this sort of predominant  
4 movement where vehicles are looking for an east-west alternative to go  
5 north-south.

6 So to make a few summary points, and if there are questions  
7 please, please feel free to, to raise your hand or chime in, but what we're  
8 observing in terms of this set of model analyses is that there are clearly  
9 some regional transportation challenges in, in Las Cruces that extending  
10 either of these facilities alone doesn't really solve in a vacuum. So there's  
11 a displacement of trips onto Missouri Avenue because that's an attractive  
12 alternative to the existing north-south facilities as a way to sort of skirt  
13 around some existing areas of congestion. So our take-away from this is  
14 that again extending either of these roadways in isolation doesn't really  
15 address the underlying regional transportation challenges in Las Cruces  
16 and that these alternatives really need to be considered as part of a  
17 regional set of potential investments rather than just looking at these two  
18 roadways in isolation. So again roadways through the study area are not  
19 going to address some of the underlying transportation challenges in the  
20 southeast Las Cruces area. Yeah.

21  
22 Sorg: Before you go any further, that clear displacement of trips onto Missouri  
23 Avenue does that, are you counting both the existing Missouri Avenue and  
24 the new Missouri Avenue, both of them together?

25  
26 Sussman: Right. So there aren't, because the existing Missouri Avenue terminates  
27 there are, of course there's, there's a limited number of trips the farther  
28 east you go along that corridor. When we talked about the 5,000 or 6,500  
29 additional trips, those are trips that are observed to the east of the  
30 city/county boundary if a roadway is extended. So we can make the  
31 assertion that that's, those are purely additional trips that would not have  
32 been there otherwise. And because we're not assuming any growth in the  
33 study area and most of the growth in Las Cruces in the projections that  
34 we've been utilizing that were developed through the MTP process is to  
35 the north of our study area, it's really, again it's sort of utilizing the same,  
36 the same types of trips utilizing different paths because different paths are  
37 available. So I do, I want to reiterate that ...

38  
39 Sorg: Could, Councilor Pedroza has a question.

40  
41 Sussman: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

42  
43 Pedroza: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair. In the little residential section just, I  
44 guess it's to the west of Centennial High School, do we know whether a lot  
45 of the students now are, are either delivered to, or you know driven to

1 school by their parents or they drive their own vehicles, how much traffic is  
2 there going to be from the school on, I guess it would be Missouri?  
3

4 Sussman: Sure. So one way that we can infer that information cause it, it's a little  
5 challenging to say ...  
6

7 Pedroza: Right.  
8

9 Sussman: Explicitly "This, these are the number of trips generated to Centennial  
10 High School along either Missouri or Roadrunner" is to look at the number  
11 of trips along Roadrunner and along Sonoma Ranch to the north of our  
12 new facilities as a result of those extensions. And so what we see is that  
13 there's a far greater increase in trips to the north of those roadways along  
14 Sonoma Ranch and Roadrunner Parkway than to the south. So we're not  
15 seeing a lot of vehicles utilizing those two roadways to get to Centennial  
16 High School. It's, again it's, it's a small displacement. You've got pretty  
17 much a similar number of total trips but some trips would take different  
18 paths. But what we see is a far larger number of, of trips that have  
19 nothing to do with the study area that then would utilize the roads inside  
20 the study area.  
21

22 Pedroza: Okay. One of the things that you know is kind of apparent is that right  
23 along Lohman you have the new Wal-Mart and then you have residences  
24 all up and down Sonoma going north and I don't know that there's any  
25 plan to develop any other area either east or south. Does, maybe Tom,  
26 do you know if there's any?  
27

28 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. If memory serves there is a, quite a few  
29 approved master plans in the city that, that are not fully built out as you  
30 extend north on Sonoma Ranch, north of, north of Lohman.  
31

32 Pedroza: Okay. But what about south?  
33

34 Murphy: South, I believe that most of that land is still owned BLM. It's not been, it's  
35 not been disposed of and so there are no master plans nor, nor  
36 subdivisions in that area.  
37

38 Pedroza: That's exactly what I wanted to know because there is a lot of newcomers  
39 north on Sonoma and Rinconada I guess it is. Is it Rinconada? Yeah.  
40 Yeah. And, but if there's not going to be, and the little mesh area where it  
41 says "BLM Land," what does that mean? Is it designated it, for no, no  
42 development?  
43

44 Sussman: Again our operating assumption is that that land is not disposed of for new  
45 developments.  
46

1 Pedroza: Okay.

2  
3 Sussman: That's the information that we've been provided by BLM, that they have no  
4 intention of doing that in the near term.

5  
6 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much.

7  
8 Sussman: Okay, thank you. I do want to reiterate that while the travel model  
9 analysis, we always have sort of a, a recency bias, the most recent  
10 information that we receive takes on kind of heightened importance and so  
11 the travel model information is, is recent data that we're bringing forward  
12 now. But I want to reiterate that that's not the only set of considerations  
13 for this study. So as part of the development of our recommendations we  
14 very much are looking to balance the improvements to regional travel flow  
15 with the environmental impacts, with the impacts to the residential  
16 communities, so I just wanted to take a moment to reiterate that point and  
17 we'll come back to that when we get into the, the draft recommendations.  
18 And then another set of analysis that I think provides less stimulating  
19 visuals are when we looked at the drainage considerations. And what's  
20 important to note here is that for those of you familiar with the study area,  
21 as we go farther south it, we move downhill, water of course flows down  
22 generally, and so there are potential drainage advantages to building  
23 facilities to the, farther to the north but we lose the access to the high  
24 school. So looking, sort of balancing those kind of considerations and  
25 ultimately our technical committee determined that the access to the high  
26 school was more critical than this, the modest cost savings that might  
27 have resulted from building an alignment that's farther north up the,  
28 upstream in terms of the arroyos.

29 So at this point let me walk through our draft recommendations. So  
30 as I mentioned at the beginning, a no-build is always carried forward. We  
31 also have two alternatives that we are recommending be carried forward  
32 for further analysis. The first is the non-motorized path connection and the  
33 second is an extension of Missouri Avenue but there's a number of  
34 caveats with that particular one so I'll come back to that one. I'll come  
35 back to both of those but I'll, I'll walk through the caveats in particular on  
36 Missouri Avenue. And at this point we've also concluded that three of the  
37 alternatives could be removed from further consideration: Roadrunner,  
38 the northern alignments, and the MTP scenario in which both facilities are  
39 constructed. So again this doesn't mean that these facilities are, cannot  
40 be pursued in the future but what we're saying by recommending that  
41 these be removed is that they're, that no further analysis is necessary at  
42 this particular moment in terms of moving, moving forward towards more  
43 near-term evaluation and, and steps towards implementation.

44 So in terms of the recommended alternatives, the non-motorized  
45 path, bicycle/pedestrian connection between Missouri Avenue and  
46 Sonoma Ranch with connections to Centennial High School was

1 something that received a lot of support along the way. The impacts to  
2 the existing residential communities are pretty minimal. The impacts to  
3 the, the local environments is also pretty minimal because we're following  
4 the edge of the study area, the, the open space as opposed to cutting  
5 through the middle of it. It's important to note that this is an alternative  
6 that could be implemented either as a standalone project or as the first  
7 phase of a larger project which looked at the non-motorized path near-  
8 term and then a roadway extension long-term. So there's some flexibility  
9 built into this one. Because of the, the minimal impacts we believe that  
10 this alternative is ready to proceed with environmental analysis with  
11 design and with construction if that's the desire of the local jurisdictions.

12 In terms of what this looks like I think there's some, some good  
13 local examples but also some opportunities for further pavement markings  
14 and, and, and further sort of design embellishments. One particular  
15 design that we really like for this kind of non-motorized path is something  
16 that could serve both recreational users, the gravel path on the side could  
17 be used by pedestrians, the paved trail to the left could be used by cyclists  
18 moving at higher speeds, a little more flexibility in this kind of design. So  
19 we've just been throwing this out there cause we particularly like this one.

20 The Missouri Avenue extension I mentioned is a recommendation  
21 with a number of caveats. So again this is recommended for further  
22 analysis. That could be conducted through a Phase B study either  
23 through funding from DOT or other local agencies pursuing that. But a  
24 really important consideration here is that we recommend that there be  
25 further analysis in terms of regional traffic flow as part of the Missouri  
26 extension if it's to be pursued, and that's because again extending  
27 Missouri Avenue highlights some of the regional traffic challenges in Las  
28 Cruces and extending that roadway in isolation doesn't fundamentally  
29 solve those challenges. So we would recommend that, that any further  
30 consideration of Missouri be conducted alongside further study into other  
31 facilities outside of the study area that were outside of the purview of this  
32 particular study. So it's, it's something of a cautious recommendation that  
33 we see benefits but it should be looked at as part of a, a broader scope  
34 than the roadways extend, or the roadway extensions that were  
35 considered through this particular study.

36 So our, our bottom-line recommendation: We feel that there's  
37 enough benefit in terms of regional traffic flow and access to the high  
38 school to warrant further study but not enough information to justify  
39 investing in a roadway at this particular time.

40 In terms of the facilities, or the alternatives that we are not  
41 recommending for further analysis, Roadrunner Parkway as a standalone  
42 alternative we believe is not something that warrants additional study at  
43 this time. It doesn't really meet the purpose and need in terms of the  
44 network connectivity benefits, the direct access to the high school. We do  
45 assert though in our draft recommendations that this roadway should  
46 remain on the Future Thoroughfare Map which is again a really long-range

1 network, not roads that are currently funded through the MTP but roads  
2 that would be considered for funding in the long-term.

3 The northern alignment is also an alternative that we recommend  
4 be removed from further consideration at this point. I talked about  
5 drainage briefly. This is an alternative that makes sense from a drainage  
6 perspective because the infrastructure, the drainage infrastructure  
7 requirements might be somewhat less expensive but you're losing not only  
8 the direct access to the high school but you're also cutting through the  
9 middle of what is currently utilized as open space and what our  
10 assumptions again call for continuation as open space, and so a roadway  
11 that cuts through the middle of that undermines some of the benefits of  
12 that open space usage.

13 And then lastly the MTP scenario in which both roadways are  
14 extended is after a lot of deliberation something that we are, that we can,  
15 believe does not warrant further consideration at this time. Again that  
16 does not mean that the roadways would be removed from the MTP or  
17 from the Future Thoroughfare Map but what we're identifying again is that  
18 when we develop both roadways we have a lot of trips displaced onto  
19 Missouri to make a north-south movement and whether they go north-  
20 south on Roadrunner or go north-south on Sonoma Ranch we're still  
21 seeing that same sort of general activity so to build both facilities is  
22 somewhat redundant and incurs additional costs and doesn't really  
23 alleviate the regional traffic challenges. Yet again we can diagnose but  
24 we can't solve with these particular alternatives in question. So not only  
25 are there costs in terms of building the roadway relative to the traffic  
26 benefits but there's also costs in terms of impacts to residential  
27 communities from both sides for relatively minimal benefit at this time. So  
28 again we're not saying that this, that both of these facilities not be  
29 considered in the future but if the purpose of this study is to validate where  
30 these roadways stand in the MTP and consider, "Are there roads that  
31 should be looked at further for near-term implementation?" Our opinion is  
32 that both facilities, this particular alternative in which both facilities are  
33 implemented does not warrant consideration at this time.

34 One important point, and this is something that came up quite a bit  
35 in our public meeting and I'll come back to this in just a moment, the, I, I've  
36 talked a lot about how there are considerations that fall outside of the  
37 purview of this particular study. This study at its heart is, is somewhat  
38 narrow in terms of looking at these finite set of alternatives. It's the MTP  
39 process where we can really look at the larger regional impacts of facilities  
40 and so it's, it's our hope and, and as we're structuring our report we're,  
41 we're trying to provide as much meaningful input to the MPO staff as  
42 possible in terms of further analysis that could be conducted as part of the  
43 next Metropolitan Transportation Plan where the, whose mission really is  
44 to look at those regional travel patterns and whether individual roadways,  
45 investments would address those regional travel patterns.

1 To summarize a few points from our public meeting a few weeks  
2 ago, we've had continued concern from residents along Missouri Avenue  
3 about the impacts of additional traffic. That's not surprising but there's  
4 also the reality that that roadway has been on the long-range planning  
5 network, the long-range transportation network for at least 20 years. And  
6 so there are some residents who acknowledge that. Commissioner  
7 Rawson was at the meeting and spoke to that effect, that that roadway  
8 has always been intended to be extended, and folks who tend to live  
9 outside of the Missouri Avenue corridor itself tend to see more regional  
10 benefits in terms of having additional transportation options. So there's no  
11 question whatsoever that there would be additional traffic on Missouri if  
12 that roadway's extended but we also try to put that in context as much as  
13 possible. So one recommendation could be that if the extension of  
14 Missouri Avenue is to be pursued that additional traffic-calming measures  
15 on the existing Missouri corridor be pursued to again discourage through  
16 traffic as much as possible. Again you're providing an option but that  
17 doesn't mean it needs to be a high-speed option. Again the recognition  
18 that there are regional traffic challenges, we had a number of questions  
19 about potential improvements on Sonoma Ranch, the choke-point or  
20 congestion around Centennial High School which was again not the initial  
21 objective of this study. We were looking at additional access from the  
22 west and from the north to Centennial High School but not necessarily the  
23 congestion around the school itself, around Dripping Springs and Sonoma  
24 Ranch Boulevard. A number of attendees brought up that point. There's  
25 also concern no matter how much we state our, again our assumptions  
26 that BLM land is not intended to be developed, there's some skepticism  
27 about that. So I feel compelled to mention that just as, as a concern that  
28 any, that adding access would incentivize or catalyze development in the  
29 study area even if that's not the intent from the Bureau of Land  
30 Management perspective.

31 So, and just in terms of the next steps, as I mentioned we're  
32 finalizing our recommendations. We'll discuss some funding options as  
33 part of our final document. This will go before not just the TAC but BPAC  
34 for a recommendation for approval before you hear about this study again  
35 and we are, have been asked to produce a final, or a, a draft copy of the  
36 final report in advance of the BPAC meeting next week, excuse me, and  
37 then we'll finalize the report before the end of this year. So with that I'm  
38 happy to answer any additional questions that you have.

39  
40 Sorg: Thank you Aaron. Very good. That was a good presentation. I'd like to  
41 note that Commissioner and Vice-Chair Garrett arrived here at 1:19 today.  
42 So with that I'll have the rest of the Committee ask questions. Councilor  
43 Eakman.

44  
45 Eakman: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to ask the staff of the MPO if they  
46 could schedule a meeting with me on this topic. I don't want to take up the

1 time of the other Members of the Committee but it, in talking about the  
2 constraints that are impending on some of these different alternatives, the  
3 other Members of the Committee seem to know what those are and I  
4 don't, and so if they could meet with me to particularly talk about the  
5 theory involved in the extension of Missouri and what those constraints  
6 are and things like that so I could better understand, I'd certainly  
7 appreciate it prior to the next meeting, if that's possible.  
8

9 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. We'd, we'd be happy to. And if, I don't  
10 know if you'd like to start off e-mail me some of your available times and  
11 we'll, we'll make that happen.  
12

13 Eakman: Thank you Tom. I will.  
14

15 Sorg: Trustee Flores.  
16

17 Flores: I like the idea of the bicycle/pedestrian path alone and then possibly being  
18 able to extend it but you said you wouldn't recommend the northern  
19 alignment because that would basically cut through the BLM land and it  
20 seems like the bicycle and pedestrian path alone would cut through, you, it  
21 was more of a you know cutting through the center of it and so if we  
22 eventually extend that, then you're putting a lot of heavier traffic in ...  
23

24 Sorg: I was going to recommend we go back to the map, yeah.  
25

26 Flores: So ...  
27

28 Sorg: It's a little hard to follow.  
29

30 Flores: I'm, I mean maybe I'm wrong but that was the, the feeling that I got.  
31

32 Sorg: Aaron that doesn't have the northern alliance, alignment, I, rather?  
33

34 Flores: Separated.  
35

36 Sorg: Oh, you separated them. Okay.  
37

38 Sussman: We have them separated out, correct.  
39

40 Flores: Okay.  
41

42 Sussman: Be, because of, so, it, it looks as if that entire stretch in the study area to  
43 the west of Centennial High School and north of Centennial High School is  
44 all undeveloped open-space land. Keep in mind of course that the Farm  
45 and Ranch Museum is due west of the high school and then to the north of

1 the high school is the proposed AdobeHenge development so there are  
2 already some plans or proposals ...  
3  
4 Flores: Okay.  
5  
6 Sussman: To introduce some limited impacts, uses and development in that area.  
7 Again that would be purely for recreational purposes so the alignment  
8 Number 6, the path that we're showing here would follow the northern side  
9 of the AdobeHenge development, could even provide access to that site,  
10 but that open-space area to the north of that alignment could remain  
11 essentially undisturbed by following the alignment along the northern side  
12 of the high school.  
13  
14 Flores: Okay. Thank you.  
15  
16 Sorg: Okay. Could you clear one thing up for me though, I and I think the rest of  
17 the Committee would like to know too, you have the tan/yellow color for  
18 the BLM land on the map yet there's, there's this hash, red hash marked  
19 land. What's the difference between the two?  
20  
21 Sussman: That is land that has been identified by the Bureau of Land Management  
22 for disposal.  
23  
24 Sorg: Okay.  
25  
26 Sussman: So potentially for some form of, of residential or commercial development.  
27  
28 Sorg: Okay.  
29  
30 Sussman: So we see that to the north of the study area.  
31  
32 Sorg: Okay.  
33  
34 Sussman: But all through the study area and then to the east of Sonoma Ranch  
35 Boulevard where we do not have that hatched area, those are BLM lands  
36 where there are no discussions for disposal at this time as far as we know  
37 in terms of the assumptions for the study.  
38  
39 Sorg: Okay. Well let me point out something that I, at least I know, I don't know  
40 if anybody else in the room knows this but with the designation of the  
41 Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument there is a significant  
42 amount of state land in that monument that at some point will be needed  
43 to be traded out for BLM land or federal land outside of the monument,  
44 and we don't know where that BLM land is but it's, it's, it's a possibility that  
45 this might be traded to the state.  
46



1 Sussman: Okay.  
2  
3 Sorg: Some land might be traded to the state. Okay. Just might put that out  
4 there. Trustee Flores. Councilor Pedroza.  
5  
6 Pedroza: Thank you. I just want to comment. I, I very much like the proposals that  
7 you have made because I think that there is a sizeable population that has  
8 moved here to Las Cruces and enjoy the outdoor, exactly. And keeping  
9 them in mind and, and increasing you know some of the facilities for bikes  
10 and pedestrians is very good. I think that it is, it, it improves the health of,  
11 of the community as well as the leisure time activities. I, I had the  
12 occasion to go, to travel down Interstate 28 last weekend and it's beautiful  
13 and it does, there were any number of bikes on there but the interstate is a  
14 pretty high speed, well you know in terms of bicycles it's high-speed. It's  
15 not you know like 80 or 90 miles an hour or anything like that but it does  
16 go to 45 some, some towns it, it goes down to 35 but that's still I think kind  
17 of hazardous for, for bikes and for families to be drive, or to be riding. And  
18 as long as we've got that land I applaud the, the plan to, to keep it  
19 available. Thank you.  
20  
21 Sussman: Thank you. If I could add one more comment to that, we had an  
22 interesting question and maybe a point of frustration from an attendee at  
23 the public meeting a few weeks ago about the pervasiveness of parents  
24 dropping their kids off at Centennial High School and the congestion and  
25 backups that that create. One of the real benefits of Alternative 6 is of  
26 course the safe non-motorized access and, and other means of accessing  
27 Centennial High School, that in and of itself won't eliminate the congestion  
28 challenges but, but to speak to your point about sort of the safe bicycle  
29 facilities we recognize that as a real benefit from this particular alternative.  
30  
31 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.  
32  
33 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you for the presentation. My apologies for  
34 being late. I would concur with the, the two, I, alternatives that have been  
35 identified as, as good alternatives to move forward with. I just want to  
36 underscore the need to look at the Missouri extension within a larger  
37 framework. When I think about the plans that I've seen that, that have to  
38 do with projected development in the City of Las Cruces and if you sort of  
39 look at the northern boundary of the, the what, the East Mesa in, in, in a  
40 certain sense as 70 going down to Dripping Springs, just talking about that  
41 segment between Dripping Springs and 70 there's a lot of projected  
42 development that has been assumed or projected or whatever, planned.  
43 We don't have all the details of that and there's BLM and state land and all  
44 those, private land. But it's really hard for me to imagine that there won't  
45 be increased pressure on having at least one more major east-west  
46 corridor beyond Dripping Springs/University, Lohman/Amador, and then

1 70, because you can't get through the, the big detention area that's to the,  
2 that's, that's between 70 and Lohman, right, I mean Spruce could go  
3 through except is, it can't go through and so you, you really have a very  
4 limited number of east-west corridors and I'm, I'm not sure about dumping  
5 a whole lot more onto Dripping Springs or onto Lohman. I think that those  
6 both would be, would be tough. It would definitely change the character of  
7 Missouri over time and, and I think that that's important. I went to Carl  
8 Conlee school when there was hardly anybody alive but I think I went  
9 there first year it was open, Conlee, yeah. So there has been change in  
10 the area and there's more change to come and I think that keeping that  
11 option open in terms of Missouri is really important starting with the  
12 pedestrian but, bicycle paths is a great idea but I just think that over time  
13 we're going to have a real need for another east-west corridor through into  
14 that area.  
15  
16 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.  
17  
18 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Have we discussed this, this particular  
19 bicycle/pedestrian connection, Alternative 6 with the school system or with  
20 Centennial, or is that later?  
21  
22 Sussman: The Las Cruces Public Schools did participate in our technical committee  
23 and did provide input, or rather, rather than participating necessarily in our  
24 technical committee we did reach out to them as a stakeholder early on in  
25 the, in the study. They were in favor of additional bicycle and pedestrian  
26 access to the high school. They were somewhat indifferent I think about  
27 additional roadway access, extending Missouri and providing access to  
28 the north because that would require additional connections within the  
29 campus and there were sort of circulation challenges that they identified  
30 there. But they've, my recollection is that they were pretty positive and  
31 pretty supportive of additional bicycle and pedestrian connection and  
32 pretty low-impact in terms of the school.  
33  
34 Hancock: Thank you.  
35  
36 Sorg: I, on that same note, so they did not provide any indication that they would  
37 provide a, an, a connection on the north side of their property directly into  
38 the school, school grounds instead of having bicyclists and, and  
39 pedestrians go all the way to Sonoma Ranch Boulevard and then down,  
40 enter in those places that I, they enter in now? Can you understand that?  
41 It's a little bit ...  
42  
43 Sussman: Sure.  
44  
45 Sorg: Awkward.  
46

1 Sussman: Yeah. I'm, I, I'm going to be cautious not to put words in their mouths.  
2 I'm, honestly I started working on this project following those meetings so I  
3 can't speak from firsthand experience. Perhaps MPO staff can recall ...  
4  
5 Wray: Mr. Chair.  
6  
7 Sussman: But ...  
8  
9 Wray: I was at the, the meeting that we had with the public schools. That level of  
10 design detail did not come up. I would presume though that if they're  
11 welcoming of the, the non-motorized facilities that they would, they would  
12 make some kind of accommodations. Mr. Sussman's characterization of  
13 their reaction to the, the motorized access as indifferent is, is, is right on.  
14 However, they could see the potential need in the future so they, they did  
15 want to keep that option on the table and again they would make  
16 accommodations within their own facilities for that should that need arise.  
17  
18 Sorg: Okay. Can we assume that the school will be a part of the next phase?  
19  
20 Wray: Absolutely.  
21  
22 Sorg: And that will be part of the plan?  
23  
24 Wray: Absolutely.  
25  
26 Sorg: Yeah. I, I don't want to make kids walk and bike any further than they  
27 have to. Okay. Can we, Councilor Pedroza you had something more?  
28  
29 Pedroza: Thank, thank you very much. I think my, my questions have been  
30 answered. I would just like to make one more comment and from my  
31 perspective from you know just driving around there, it seems as if the  
32 residential areas that already exist from between 70 and, and Dripping  
33 Springs, okay, are already there. There's a golf course, there's apartment  
34 buildings, there's houses, there's a store, there's a gas station, there's,  
35 there's already there. And I don't see that there's very much room for  
36 more residences or more commerce. I may be wrong but I, I just cannot  
37 picture that in my mind. There's never very much vacant land anymore.  
38 Thank you.  
39  
40 Sorg: Any other comments or questions? I just have one last, put my two-cents  
41 worth in. As you know, everybody here should know that I am a strong  
42 advocate for bicycle and pedestrian pathways all over the city and I think  
43 Alternative 6 fits that, that plan and that idea very well. My dream is to  
44 have everybody between Lohman and Dripping Springs and east of  
45 Telshor bike and walk to school, that go to Centennial High School and  
46 having a, a, a super-highway like the one photo you showed where the

1 bicycle lanes were there and the sidewalk was separate and so forth with  
2 nice little trees along the way would be perfect for that. But yet I do agree  
3 that the motorized road will have to be done eventually, either Roadrunner  
4 or Missouri. I don't know which is best. I, I couldn't see why you had  
5 picked Missouri over roadway, Roadrunner but some one of the two at  
6 least will have to be done eventually. But let's get the bicycle and  
7 pedestrian connection done first. And how soon could that be done, staff?  
8 What, what's a realistic timeframe?  
9

10 Murphy: Mr. Chair. We would, we would have to one, first find a, a jurisdiction that,  
11 that would do it. It would, right now that land is unincorporated though if  
12 anything were to happen I could see where it would get annexed so the  
13 City or the County could be players on it, the state DOT could be a, a  
14 player on it and then one of those entities would have to go and find  
15 construction funding so I think regardless of which, which path we're  
16 advancing it's not going to, not going to be anything that we see on the, or  
17 we're not going to see it anytime soon.  
18

19 Sorg: I see. Well, since NMDOT we, isn't here today let's ask them first. Thank,  
20 okay thank you. Thank you Aaron.  
21

22 Sussman: Thank you. Can I, I'm just ...  
23

24 Sorg: Sure.  
25

26 Sussman: Your, your question about Missouri versus Roadrunner, I think the  
27 Commissioner spoke to that eloquently that it's the east-west connectivity  
28 from a roadway perspective that we gain from extending Missouri that we  
29 do not gain from extending Roadrunner in isolation. That's really the key  
30 difference between the two.  
31

32 Sorg: Yeah, yeah but as you can see from this map on Alternative 6, you have  
33 Missouri connecting with Roadrunner and then they both go together over  
34 to Sonoma Ranch. Is that not true?  
35

36 Sussman: So those are, that's essentially the MTP scenario ...  
37

38 Sorg: I see.  
39

40 Sussman: That you're describing in which both those facilities are extended.  
41 Because the predominant movement is east-west in order to go north-  
42 south, that's why we felt that the Missouri extension was a more logical  
43 alternative to carry forward into the future rather than Roadrunner and why  
44 we feel that extending both at this time is probably redundant.  
45

46 Sorg: Okay.

1  
2 Sussman: But in terms of addressing those really long-term needs that all of you  
3 have, have spoken to and identified, it makes sense to keep both of those  
4 facilities on the long-range network maps.  
5

6 Sorg: Sure. I understand. Good. One, one more question now that you had,  
7 the, there's some dotted lines to the east of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard at  
8 the end of Roadrunner there on this particular map. Are those projected  
9 roads for the future?  
10

11 Murphy: Mr. Chair. Yes, those are projected future collectors.  
12

13 Sorg: Okay. Okay. Thank you.  
14

15 Sussman: All right. Thank you.  
16

17 Sorg: That concludes the Missouri Study Corridor.  
18

## 19 **5.2 NMDOT update**

20

## 21 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

22

23 Sorg: Staff comments or Committee comments? Anyone? Seeing none.  
24

## 25 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

26

27 Sorg: Last call for public comment. Seeing none.  
28

## 29 **8. ADJOURNMENT (2:03 PM)**

30

31 Sorg: I'll call for an adjournment.  
32

33 Hancock: So moved.  
34

35 Sorg: Moved by Commissioner ...  
36

37 Eakman: Second.  
38

39 Sorg: Hancock, second by Councilor Eakman. All in favor say "aye." MOTION  
40 PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
41

42 Sorg: None, and it's passed.  
43  
44  
45

46 \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

### **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 9, 2016**

#### **AGENDA ITEM:**

6.1 A Resolution Adopting the 2016 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects – Consent Agenda

#### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approval by MPO Policy Committee

#### **SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

Resolution 16-12 A Resolution Adopting the 2016 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects  
Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects

#### **DISCUSSION:**

United States Code 23 § 450.332 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects

- (a) In metropolitan planning areas, on an annual basis, no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the program year, the State, public transportation operator(s), and the MPO shall cooperatively develop a listing of projects (including investments in pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) for which funds under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 were obligated in the preceding program year.

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**RESOLUTION NO. 16-12**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016 LIST OF OBLIGATED PROJECTS**

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

**WHEREAS**, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.324); and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federally funded and regionally significant transportation-related projects within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee adopts a new TIP every two years and TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications as needed; and

**WHEREAS**, various stakeholders and citizens participate in the TIP process; and

**WHEREAS**, U.S.C. 23 § 450.332 requires the MPO to annually approve the list of projects obligated during the previous federal fiscal year; and

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



**(I)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's Federal Fiscal Year 2014 List of Obligated Projects is adopted as shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto 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 9th day of November, 2016.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

2016 Obligated Projects								
MPO #	Control #	Location	Termini	Work Description	Federal	State	Local	Total
<b>Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Lead Projects</b>								
		MPO Region		Planning Funds	\$522,655.65		\$76,098.65	\$598,754.30
		MPO Region		5303 Funds	\$68,543.03		\$13,708.58	\$82,251.61
TOTAL MPO LEAD PROJECTS					\$591,198.68		\$89,807.23	\$681,005.91
<b>New Mexico Department of Transportation Lead Projects</b>								
108	1100820	West Mesa Road	Santa Teresa POE	Phase B Study	\$358,270.89	\$61,053.99		\$419,324.88
81	LC00120	US 70	Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses	Intersection Realignment & Improvements	\$5,513,373.70	\$939,544.96		\$6,452,918.66
99	LC00140	US 70	Intersection with 17th Street	Traffic Signal Installation and Intersection Improvements - ROW Phase	\$32,706.00	\$5,574.00		\$38,280.00
102	LC00240	US 70	Organ to White Sands Exit, MP 162-170	Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Replacement, Drainage Design Phase	\$415,029.36	\$46,114.37		\$461,143.73
106	LC00250	I-25	University Interchange	Bridge Replacement, Ramp Modifications, Roadway Recon, & Multiuse path-Design Phase	\$1,231,324.58	\$209,832.47		\$1,441,157.05
107	LC00270	US 70	Intersection Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange	Capacity & Safety Study		\$1,500,000.00		
TOTAL NMDOT LEAD PROJECTS					\$7,550,704.53	\$2,762,119.79	\$0.00	\$8,812,824.32
<b>Doña Ana County Lead Projects</b>								

97	G100030	DAC	Reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Rd	Roadway Reconstruction	\$3,220,000.00			\$3,220,000.00
75	LC00110	DAC	El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Rd	Design and Construction for Intersection Realignment	\$3,150.00	\$350.00		\$3,500.00
TOTAL DAC LEAD PROJECTS					\$3,223,150.00	\$350.00		\$3,220,000.00
<b>City of Las Cruces Lead Projects</b>								
No federally-funded projects obligated								\$0.00
TOTAL CLC LEAD PROJECTS					\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>RoadRUNNER Transit Lead Projects</b>								
21	TL00013	CLC		Support Equipment/Facilities	\$319,977.00		\$56,467.00	\$376,444.00
TOTAL TRANSIT LEAD PROJECTS					\$319,977.00	\$0.00	\$56,467.00	\$376,444.00
<b>Las Cruces Public Schools Lead Projects</b>								
91	LC00171	LCPS	SRTS, TAP Funded	SRTS Administration	\$35,885		\$6,115	\$42,000
TOTAL LCPS LEAD PROJECTS					\$35,885	\$0	\$6,115.23	\$42,000
<b>Town of Mesilla Lead Projects</b>								
No federally-funded projects obligated								
TOTAL TOM LEAD PROJECTS					\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>								
					\$11,720,915.21	\$2,762,469.79	\$152,389.46	\$13,132,274.46

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

### MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 9, 2016

**AGENDA ITEM:**

5.1 Resolution 16-13: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

**SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

Email from Mike Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT

Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT

Spreadsheet of NMDOT Projects with the amendment

**DISCUSSION:**

On June 10, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00250	2017	NMDOT	University Ave. & Triviz	Bridge Replacement & Interchange Modification	Added \$1.6 Million in FY2017 for PE, construction in FY2018/FY2019
TL00011	2020	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$5,200,000 reduction in this project because of a grant awarded in another project – this effectively eliminates this project

TL00016	2017	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$1,134,750 increase in this project in 2017 because of grant award per request of RoadRUNNER Transit
TL00016	2020	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$4,065,250 transfer from TL00011 to this project per request of RoadRUNNER Transit
LC00300	2018	US 70	Elks to Del Rey	Bridge & Pavement Preservation, & ADA Improvements	New Project \$5,000,000

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

## MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

### RESOLUTION NO. 16-13

#### **A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.**

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

**WHEREAS**, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.324); and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federally funded and regionally significant transportation-related projects within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2016-2021 TIP on June 10, 2015; and

**WHEREAS**, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

**WHEREAS**, RoadRUNNER Transit has requested amendments to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its October 18, 2016 meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its November 3, 2016 meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

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

**(I)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Year 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

**(II)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley MPO's Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit "B", attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved

**(III)**

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

**DONE** and **APPROVED** this 9th day of November, 2016.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

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



ATTEST:

---

Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

City Attorney

**Exhibit "A"**

<b>CN</b>	<b>FY</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Project &amp; Termini</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Change</b>
LC00250	2017	NMDOT	University Ave. & Triviz	Bridge Replacement & Interchange Modification	Added \$1.6 Million in FY2017 for PE, construction in FY2018/FY2019
TL00011	2020	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$5,200,000 reduction in this project because of a grant awarded in another project – this effectively eliminates this project
TL00016	2017	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$1,134,750 increase in this project in 2017 because of grant award per request of RoadRUNNER Transit
TL00016	2020	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Grant	Capital Funding Grant	\$4,065,250 transfer from TL00011 to this project per request of RoadRUNNER Transit
LC00300	2018	US 70	Elks to Del Rey	Bridge & Pavement Preservation, & ADA Improvements	New Project \$5,000,000



# **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

## **Resolution 16-13 Exhibit “B”**

### **MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 450.334, the New Mexico Department of Transportation, and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

- (1) 49 U.S.C. 5323(l), 23 U.S.C. 135, and 23 U.S.C. 450.220;
- (2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;
- (3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);
- (4) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and U. S. DOT implementing regulation;
- (5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and
- (6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d)).

**POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**Date**

---

---

**NMDOT**

**Date**

---

---

**From:** Michael Bartholomew  
**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2016 3:56 PM  
**To:** Andrew Wray  
**Cc:** Tom Murphy; David Maestas; Amy Bassford; Richard Hanway; Gabriel Sapien; Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT  
**Subject:** RE: Adding FTA grant award to the TIP/STIP

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Andrew – Following on our discussion today with Jolene Herrera, I have some clarification to add to the TIP amendment request below:

I request an amendment that the full amount of the funding in the TIP Informational Year in Project TL00013 be transferred from to the TIP Informational Year in Project TL00016. Then, transfer the amount noted in the September 26 email from the 2020 Informational Year to the 2017 in year of Project TL00016. This will effectively make TL00011 an “empty” project, that I understand will be removed from the TIP.

Additionally, I anticipate that the NMDOT will continue to get Section 5339 funding designated for small urban systems in the state. The NMDOT intends to provide to FTA suballocation letters making it the responsibility of small urban systems to apply directly to FTA for these funds. Las Cruces will now have to have these projects in their TIP. For that reason, I request an amendment to TL00016 that the amounts noted in FY2016 be added to each of the programmed years funds for 2017, 2018, and 2019.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks.

**Mike Bartholomew**

Transit Administrator/Transportation Department/Transit Section  
Direct: 575-541-2537 Main: 575-541-2500, [mbartholomew@las-cruces.org](mailto:mbartholomew@las-cruces.org)



---

**From:** Michael Bartholomew  
**Sent:** Monday, September 26, 2016 1:52 PM  
**To:** Andrew Wray <[awray@las-cruces.org](mailto:awray@las-cruces.org)>  
**Cc:** Tom Murphy <[tmurphy@las-cruces.org](mailto:tmurphy@las-cruces.org)>; David Maestas <[damaestas@las-cruces.org](mailto:damaestas@las-cruces.org)>; Amy Bassford <[abassford@las-cruces.org](mailto:abassford@las-cruces.org)>; Richard Hanway <[ghanway@las-cruces.org](mailto:ghanway@las-cruces.org)>; Gabriel Sapien <[gsapien@las-cruces.org](mailto:gsapien@las-cruces.org)>  
**Subject:** Adding FTA grant award to the TIP/STIP

Hi Andrew –

Per our discussion last week, I would like to get the new bus grant awarded by FTA to be correctly reflected in the 2017 TIP/STIP.

FTA awarded the City \$1,134,750 for 85% of the purchases of buses under the FY2016 5339 (c) Bus and Bus Facilities Competitive Program Discretionary Grant. The local match would be \$200,250 for a total project of \$1,335,000.

Currently in the TIP is project TL00011 (see below) which shows \$5.2 M of funding for buses in 2020, an out year in a Section 5309 program. This amount is in an out year because there was no dedicated funding available previously for bus replacement. When this bus project was set up in the TIP, it was done under the Section 5309 program. Under MAP-21, this discretionary competitive capital funding was moved to the Section 5339 program.

We do have a 5339 program project in TL00016 (see below). This project reflects the appropriation of Section 5339 funds that were awarded to the State of New Mexico. I defer to your recommendation as to whether the new grant should be put in project TL00016, or whether TL00011 should be reclassified from a Section 5309 project to a discretionary 5339 project, or whether an entirely new project should be created for this grant.

I am requesting two related actions:

1. Reduce the Funds shown in Project TL00011 by the amount award amount noted above and put it into the 2017 "in" year of a Section 5339 project.
2. Reclassify the balance of the out year funds in TL00011 to the first out year of the same 5339 project.

Thank you, and let me know if you have questions. I understand that a new TIP/STIP amendment cycle starts in October.

Mike

**From:** Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2016 10:18 AM  
**To:** Andrew Wray  
**Subject:** TIP Amendments  
**Attachments:** TIP Amendments FY2017 1st Q.xls

Good morning Andrew,

Please see the attached TIP Amendments for inclusion in the upcoming committee meeting packets. It's just the one change, adding an additional \$1.6M to LC00250 (University Interchange) in FY2017 for Preliminary Engineering.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

**Jolene Herrera**  
**Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2**  
**NMDOT South Region Design**  
750 N. Solano Dr.  
Las Cruces, NM 88001  
O: (575) 525-7358  
C: (575) 202-4698

**From:** Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 14, 2016 1:22 PM  
**To:** Andrew Wray  
**Cc:** Tom Murphy  
**Subject:** Updated TIP spreadsheet  
**Attachments:** TIP Amendments FY2017 1st Q.xls

**Importance:** High

Good afternoon Andrew,

After I sent you the spreadsheet for TIP Amendments, D1 added a new project that I would like to include on this Amendment cycle if possible. Attached is the updated spreadsheet showing the new project, LC00300, US 70 from Elks to Del Rey.

Is it okay to bring copies of the updated spreadsheet to BPAC and just explain what happened?

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera  
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2  
NMDOT South Region Design  
750 N. Solano Dr.  
Las Cruces, NM 88001  
O. (575) 525-7358  
C. (575) 202-4698

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK





## METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

### MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 9, 2016

#### **AGENDA ITEM:**

6.3 Transportation Alternatives Program Recommendation

#### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

#### **SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

TAP Application from the Las Cruces Public Schools for Traffic Calming Projects

TAP Application from the Las Cruces Public Schools for the Safe Routes to School Coordinator

TAP Application from the Town of Mesilla for a Multi-Use Path along Calle del Norte, part of the Multi-Use Loop Trail

TAP Application from the City of Las Cruces for Green Infrastructure Projects

Due to size constraints, the TAP Applications are available online at the MPO website on the Meeting Calendar page for this Policy Committee Meeting. The Policy Committee received hard copies of the applications before the meeting.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a Federal reimbursement program originally authorized under section 1122 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21). TAP was reauthorized as a set-aside of the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program in section 1109 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) – signed into law in December 2015. Although TAP is not explicitly mentioned in the FAST Act, all of TAP's eligibilities have been preserved and are now codified under Title 23 of the United States Code, sections 133 (h)(3) and 101(a)(29). NMDOT chose to continue to refer to the program as TAP.

The Recreational Trails Program (RTP) is a Federal reimbursement program funded through section 1109 of the FAST Act as codified under Title 23 of the United States Code, sections 133(b)(6), 133(H)(5)(C), and 206.

In New Mexico both of these programs are administered by the New Mexico Department of Transportation. NMDOT requires that TAP applications for this cycle be submitted no later than November 30, 2016.

The Mesilla Valley MPO set a deadline of September 23, 2016 for local jurisdictions to submit applications for TAP. This item is for the BPAC to recommend approval to the Policy Committee of the projects submitted by the local jurisdictions.

At their October 18 meeting, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval of all of the TAP applications.

At their November 3 meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of all of the TAP applications.

**LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**RESOLUTION NO. 16-14**

**A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING TRANSPORTATION  
ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) PROJECTS FOR THE MESILLA  
VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION'S PLANNING  
AREA.**

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

**WHEREAS**, there are transportation alternative program funds codified under Title 23 of the United States Code, sections 133(h)(3) and 101(a)(29); and

**WHEREAS**, the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) has designated these funds as the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds; and

**WHEREAS**, NMDOT has developed a competitive process for awarding of TAP funds; and

**WHEREAS**, MPOs and RPOs are responsible for submitting TAP projects from their respective areas and submit selected FFY18 and FFY19 projects to the NMDOT TAP coordinator by November 30, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, the BPAC recommended approval on October 18, 2016 and the TAC recommended approval on November 3, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution adopting the selected TAP project list to be approved.

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

**(I)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's selected TAP project list is adopted as shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto 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 9th day of November, 2016.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

### **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 3, 2016**

#### **AGENDA ITEM:**

6.4 Resolution No. 16-15: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue Phase A Report

#### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Review and Adoption of Resolution 16-15

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Over the past year, MPO Staff in cooperation with the hired consultant, Bohannon-Huston, have been working on a Missouri Study Corridor.

There are two alternatives recommended by the Study for further examination. These alternatives will be discussed in the presentation.

## **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 16-15**

#### **A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING MISSOURI STUDY CORRIDOR PHASE A REPORT.**

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

**WHEREAS**, with the completion of Centennial High School, additional traffic was anticipated to be generated in the area; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a lack of transportation infrastructure in the area to support additional traffic; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a lack of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the area; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Las Cruces and Las Cruces Public Schools requested that the Mesilla Valley MPO conduct a study corridor to examine ways to improve safety along the corridor; and

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

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

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

**WHEREAS**, Mesilla Valley MPO Staff closely coordinated with the City of Las Cruces, Doña Ana County, Las Cruces Public Schools, and the New Mexico Department of Transportation during this process; and

**WHEREAS**, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval at their meeting held on October 18, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval at their meeting held on November 2, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for this resolution to be APPROVED.

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

(I)

**THAT** the Missouri Study Corridor Phase A Report be adopted.

(II)

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

**DONE** and **APPROVED** this 9th day of November , 2016.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

### **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE**

#### **EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE TPB MEETING OF October 21, 2016**

##### **INFORMATION REPORT:**

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

##### **DISCUSSION:**

The El Paso Metropolitan Transportation Board met on October 21, 2016.

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

Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer

Mayor Diana Trujillo, City of Anthony, NM

Representative Bealquin Gomez, New Mexico State Representative, District 34

Mayor Javier Perea, City of Sunland Park, NM

##### New Mexico Related Items

Agenda Item #3 – An item to approve for submission some TAP projects submitted by Doña Ana County: FFY 2018 Lisa Drive Connectivity Project phase 1 and FFY 2019 Lisa Drive Connectivity Project phase 2. The TPB Passed the item.

Agenda Item #4 – This item rescinded an action by the TPB of July 22, 2016 regarding the Railroad Crossing on O'Hara Road project to install new gates and flashing lights using \$375,000 of HSIP funds in FFY 2018. The TPB Passed the item.

Agenda Item #5 – This item was to approve a TIP amendment to fund a) a RR crossing improvements on O'Hara Road b) Phase III funding on NM 136 for road rehabilitation c) Phase II funding on NM 136 for road rehabilitation. The TPB Passed the item.

Agenda Item #12 – Administrative amendment to the TIP to adjust the NM 136 project limits.

Agenda Item #15 – The New Mexico Border Authority presented to the TPB on the Santa Teresa International Rail Study.