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1. CALL TO ORDER (1:10 PM)

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

Murphy: Yes.

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

Murphy: Okay, all right. Member Barraza.

Barraza: Here.

Murphy: Member Flores.

Flores: Here.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.
Pedroza: Here.

Murphy: Member Eakman.

Eakman: Present.

Murphy: Member Hancock.

Hancock: Here.

Murphy: Chair Sorg.

Sorg: Here. Thank you.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

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

Hancock: None.

Eakman: None.

Sorg: Okay. Very good.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 September 14, 2016

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

Eakman: So moved.

Hancock: Second.

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

Barraza: I will recuse myself. I was not at the meeting.

Murphy: Member Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: I will also abstain because I was not at the meeting.

Murphy: Member Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Member Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair Sorg.

Sorg: Yes. And Commissioner, oh, excuse me, yes. Commissioner Leticia Benavidez has just arrived.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Missouri Study Corridor

Sorg: Going on to the next item on the agenda is the Discussion Item Missouri Study Corridor. Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have Aaron Sussman from Bohannan Huston to give you an update on the, on the latest that, with our study. We had a public meeting the end of September at the Farm and Ranch Museum. Bohannan Huston is going to be putting, finishing up this month the Phase A report. We wanted to get this in front of you for some questions prior to that and we're hoping to have, have this back to you in November for a, for a vote. And with that I'll turn it over to Mr. Sussman.

Sussman: Okay. Good afternoon Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Again, my name is Aaron Sussman. I'm a planner with Bohannan Huston. It's been several months since I provided an update to this Board so at this point we wanted to follow up with some additional analysis that we've conducted. We're also at the point where we have largely concluded our outreach process. We've presented to the BPAC Committee, to the Technical
Advisory Committee, we've convened several meetings of our technical advisory committee of MPO staff and other technical staff from jurisdictions around the metro area. At this point we have a series of what we're calling "final draft recommendations." These are still of course subject to input and discussion. Your input in particular is, is what we're looking for at this point. Obviously this is a fairly small group today so we can keep this informal and if there's a question along the way please feel free to interrupt. I think that may, that's fine with me and that would be effective.

Sorg: Thank you Aaron. That sounds great.

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

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

This study is really in response to the, sorry, the lack of, of roadway infrastructure in the study area. Let me go back a couple slides to the, sorry my screen is blank now on me up here. To, so the study area shown on this map, the outlined area in blue which is bounded by City boundaries to the north and to the west, and then Sonoma Ranch Boulevard to the east is mostly BLM land. Obviously Centennial High School forms the southeast portion of the study area. This is, can I turn the, it's like blinking at me, it's, let me just turn it off. Okay. All right. My apologies. So we were, we've been considering a, a couple of roadways that are in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Missouri Avenue is included in the 2021 to 2030 period of the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Roadrunner Parkway is on the MPO Long-Range Thoroughfare Network which means that it's considered for analysis, potentially long-term implementation but it's not considered for construction implementation during the 2040 time frame, between now and 2040 as part of the MTP. So we're looking at some kind of long-range options here and part of this analysis is to understand: Given the lack of
network, do these options that are on the MTP Project List or on the Long-Range Thoroughfare Network, do they make sense to consider for further analysis at this point? We're also responding to the lack of bicycle and pedestrian connections to the high school. So there's a lack of roadway connectivity through the study area and there's also somewhat limited bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and we'll come back to those two points in particular. So I mentioned where these projects fall in terms of their presence in the MTP. Again, part of this study is to validate their current place, whether they belong in terms of funded projects and then also in the Long-Range Thoroughfare Network.

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

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

So let me go through the, the six alternatives briefly and then we'll talk about how we narrow down to our set of, of again final draft recommendations. So again the first alternative is the no-build scenario in which again the roads remain on the long-range networks, the long-range planning documents but we don't recommend any further activity at this time. The second alternative is an extension of Missouri Avenue. This would take the form of something like a two-lane collector facility so what this road looks like currently between Telshor and city limits, an, an extension of something that looks similar to that type of roadway in terms of the footprints, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and this would extend from again city boundaries to Sonoma Ranch to the west, skirting the north side of Centennial High School. The third alternative is an extension of Roadrunner Parkway from its existing terminal point to the south of Lohman Avenue proceeding southeast through the study area and then along the northern edge of Centennial High School and again terminating at Sonoma Ranch Boulevard.
Lohman is a four-lane minor arterial. This alternative, can see as either a
two- or a four-lane minor arterial. That is something that could be decided
at a later stage of analysis. But this is just to give you an idea of the, the
scale or scope of the roadway that's called for in the long-range planning
documents. The fourth alternative is an extension of both facilities,
Missouri as the two-lane collector and Roadrunner as the minor arterial,
so again a larger footprint roadway along the collector. These would
intersect and then again follow that path along the north side of Centennial
High School and terminate at Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. A fifth
alternative that we examined is essentially each of those prior alternatives
but following a northern alignment. The idea with this particular alternative
was to avoid some of the topographical challenges that we face in this
study area, but it does not provide immediate access to the high school so
we'll come back to the implications of that. But this is a, a similar set of
alternatives but following a slightly different path. And then finally the sixth
alternative is a bicycle/pedestrian connection from again the existing
Missouri Avenue where the bicycle facilities currently terminate again at
city limits. This would include a multi-use trail not unlike some of the trails
currently in the Las Cruces area. The exact alignment's not necessarily
that blue line but it's more of a concept, but that would provide direct
access to Centennial High School and ultimately connect to Sonoma
Ranch Boulevard.

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

There are a couple of updates and, and highlights that I want to
speak to today before we get into the draft recommendations. The first is
a bicycle level of service analysis and so I mentioned that a particular
component of this study, the purpose and need is the lack of bicycle and
pedestrian connections to the high school. And it's not just that there's a
lack of connections, it's actually, there are connect, there are facilities along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, along Dripping Springs, although east of the Farm and Ranch Museum there are no bicycle lanes, and then there are lanes on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard but we were able to evaluate the quality of those connections and how safely and, and comfortably students could access Centennial High School in particular. So this analysis looked at things like vehicle traffic, the speeds, the width of the travel lanes, the width of the bicycle lanes, pavement conditions, and it produces a level of service analysis and in short the, the darker the green color the higher the quality of the infrastructure. So what we see as we dug into this analysis is there are a few areas that we want to highlight. So this area shows as a Level of Service B, pretty high quality on Lohman but we have really high speeds and high traffic volumes. There's, there's no buffer and there's a five-foot bike lane so for, for most cyclists this is not the most comfortable ride that you might experience. Along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard there, again very high speed limit, 45 miles per hour and only four-foot bicycle lanes. That's pretty narrow so it's good that we have the facilities there but again not the most comfortable ride, not the kind of ride that's going to appeal to a lot of cyclists. And as I mentioned directly south of Centennial High School the bicycle lanes terminate at the city/county boundary so if you're approaching the high school from the southern side of the school the facilities are, are pretty, pretty modest for sure. So these are things that we could highlight through this particular analysis.

We also in the last several months were able to bring in results of an, a series of travel model scenarios. So we looked at four types of scenarios: Again the no-build so we have growth into the future but we have no additional roadways; what happens if we extend Missouri Avenue alone; a third scenario where we look at extending Roadrunner Parkway alone; and then a fourth scenario where we extend both facilities, and in each of these cases we compare the base year statistics for 2015 to 2040, the horizon year for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. So the most noteworthy scenarios in particular is the Missouri Avenue extension where we do see by extending that facility a, a large number, almost 5,000 additional trips along Missouri Avenue and then proceeding through the study area. That corresponds with an increase in trips along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, so what seems to happen is that there's a lot of vehicle, lot of vehicles and drivers that would utilize Missouri as an alternative to go east-west and then go north-south along Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. I'm not showing a map here for Roadrunner Parkway because it frankly doesn't show all that much. The predominant movement is east-west in order to go north-south so Roadrunner Parkway kind of provides an east-west alternative to Lohman. It doesn't generate all that many additional trips beyond what we see today so it's not showing much of a change in travel patterns with the extension of Roadrunner Parkway by itself. We also again looked at what happens if we extend both facilities. In this, in this scenario in particular we see a, an even larger increase in trips on the
existing Missouri Avenue, an increase of about 6,500 trips and then we
seen an increase in north-south travel along both Sonoma Ranch and
Roadrunner Parkway. So again we have this sort of predominant
movement where vehicles are looking for an east-west alternative to go
north-south.

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

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

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

Sorg: Could, Councilor Pedroza has a question.

Pedroza: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair. In the little residential section just, I
guess it's to the west of Centennial High School, do we know whether a lot
of the students now are, are either delivered to, or you know driven to
school by their parents or they drive their own vehicles, how much traffic is there going to be from the school on, I guess it would be Missouri?

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

Pedroza: Right.

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

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

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

Pedroza: Okay. But what about south?

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

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

Sussman: Again our operating assumption is that that land is not disposed of for new developments.
Pedroza: Okay.

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

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much.

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

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

So in terms of the recommended alternatives, the non-motorized path, bicycle/pedestrian connection between Missouri Avenue and Sonoma Ranch with connections to Centennial High School was
something that received a lot of support along the way. The impacts to the existing residential communities are pretty minimal. The impacts to the, the local environments is also pretty minimal because we're following the edge of the study area, the, the open space as opposed to cutting through the middle of it. It's important to note that this is an alternative that could be implemented either as a standalone project or as the first phase of a larger project which looked at the non-motorized path near-term and then a roadway extension long-term. So there's some flexibility built into this one. Because of the, the minimal impacts we believe that this alternative is ready to proceed with environmental analysis with design and with construction if that's the desire of the local jurisdictions.

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

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

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

In terms of the facilities, or the alternatives that we are not recommending for further analysis, Roadrunner Parkway as a standalone alternative we believe is not something that warrants additional study at this time. It doesn't really meet the purpose and need in terms of the network connectivity benefits, the direct access to the high school. We do assert though in our draft recommendations that this roadway should remain on the Future Thoroughfare Map which is again a really long-range
network, not roads that are currently funded through the MTP but roads that would be considered for funding in the long-term.

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

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

One important point, and this is something that came up quite a bit in our public meeting and I'll come back to this in just a moment, the, I, I've talked a lot about how there are considerations that fall outside of the purview of this particular study. This study at its heart is, is somewhat narrow in terms of looking at these finite set of alternatives. It's the MTP process where we can really look at the larger regional impacts of facilities and so it's, it's our hope and, and as we're structuring our report we're, we're trying to provide as much meaningful input to the MPO staff as possible in terms of further analysis that could be conducted as part of the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan where the, whose mission really is to look at those regional travel patterns and whether individual roadways, investments would address those regional travel patterns.
To summarize a few points from our public meeting a few weeks ago, we've had continued concern from residents along Missouri Avenue about the impacts of additional traffic. That's not surprising but there's also the reality that that roadway has been on the long-range planning network, the long-range transportation network for at least 20 years. And so there are some residents who acknowledge that. Commissioner Rawson was at the meeting and spoke to that effect, that that roadway has always been intended to be extended, and folks who tend to live outside of the Missouri Avenue corridor itself tend to see more regional benefits in terms of having additional transportation options. So there's no question whatsoever that there would be additional traffic on Missouri if that roadway's extended but we also try to put that in context as much as possible. So one recommendation could be that if the extension of Missouri Avenue is to be pursued that additional traffic-calming measures on the existing Missouri corridor be pursued to again discourage through traffic as much as possible. Again you're providing an option but that doesn't mean it needs to be a high-speed option. Again the recognition that there are regional traffic challenges, we had a number of questions about potential improvements on Sonoma Ranch, the choke-point or congestion around Centennial High School which was again not the initial objective of this study. We were looking at additional access from the west and from the north to Centennial High School but not necessarily the congestion around the school itself, around Dripping Springs and Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. A number of attendees brought up that point. There's also concern no matter how much we state our, again our assumptions that BLM land is not intended to be developed, there's some skepticism about that. So I feel compelled to mention that just as, as a concern that any, that adding access would incentivize or catalyze development in the study area even if that's not the intent from the Bureau of Land Management perspective.

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

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

Eakman: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to ask the staff of the MPO if they could schedule a meeting with me on this topic. I don't want to take up the
time of the other Members of the Committee but it, in talking about the constraints that are impending on some of these different alternatives, the other Members of the Committee seem to know what those are and I don't, and so if they could meet with me to particularly talk about the theory involved in the extension of Missouri and what those constraints are and things like that so I could better understand, I'd certainly appreciate it prior to the next meeting, if that's possible.

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

Eakman: Thank you Tom. I will.

Sorg: Trustee Flores.

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

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

Flores: So ...

Sorg: It's a little hard to follow.

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

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

Flores: Separated.

Sorg: Oh, you separated them. Okay.

Sussman: We have them separated out, correct.

Flores: Okay.

Sussman: Be, because of, so, it, it looks as if that entire stretch in the study area to the west of Centennial High School and north of Centennial High School is all undeveloped open-space land. Keep in mind of course that the Farm and Ranch Museum is due west of the high school and then to the north of
the high school is the proposed AdobeHenge development so there are already some plans or proposals …

Flores: Okay.

Sussman: To introduce some limited impacts, uses and development in that area. Again that would be purely for recreational purposes so the alignment Number 6, the path that we’re showing here would follow the northern side of the AdobeHenge development, could even provide access to that site, but that open-space area to the north of that alignment could remain essentially undisturbed by following the alignment along the northern side of the high school.

Flores: Okay. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Could you clear one thing up for me though, I and I think the rest of the Committee would like to know too, you have the tan/yellow color for the BLM land on the map yet there’s, there’s this hash, red hash marked land. What’s the difference between the two?

Sussman: That is land that has been identified by the Bureau of Land Management for disposal.

Sorg: Okay.

Sussman: So potentially for some form of, of residential or commercial development.

Sorg: Okay.

Sussman: So we see that to the north of the study area.

Sorg: Okay.

Sussman: But all through the study area and then to the east of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard where we do not have that hatched area, those are BLM lands where there are no discussions for disposal at this time as far as we know in terms of the assumptions for the study.

Sorg: Okay. Well let me point out something that I, at least I know, I don’t know if anybody else in the room knows this but with the designation of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument there is a significant amount of state land in that monument that at some point will be needed to be traded out for BLM land or federal land outside of the monument, and we don’t know where that BLM land is but it’s, it’s, it’s a possibility that this might be traded to the state.
Sussman: Okay.


Pedroza: Thank you. I just want to comment. I, I very much like the proposals that you have made because I think that there is a sizeable population that has moved here to Las Cruces and enjoy the outdoor, exactly. And keeping them in mind and, and increasing you know some of the facilities for bikes and pedestrians is very good. I think that it is, it, it improves the health of, of the community as well as the leisure time activities. I, I had the occasion to go, to travel down Interstate 28 last weekend and it's beautiful and it does, there were any number of bikes on there but the interstate is a pretty high speed, well you know in terms of bicycles it's high-speed. It's not you know like 80 or 90 miles an hour or anything like that but it does go to 45 some, some towns it, it goes down to 35 but that's still I think kind of hazardous for, for bikes and for families to be drive, or to be riding. And as long as we've got that land I applaud the, the plan to, to keep it available. Thank you.

Sussman: Thank you. If I could add one more comment to that, we had an interesting question and maybe a point of frustration from an attendee at the public meeting a few weeks ago about the pervasiveness of parents dropping their kids off at Centennial High School and the congestion and backups that that create. One of the real benefits of Alternative 6 is of course the safe non-motorized access and, and other means of accessing Centennial High School, that in and of itself won't eliminate the congestion challenges but, but to speak to your point about sort of the safe bicycle facilities we recognize that as a real benefit from this particular alternative.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you for the presentation. My apologies for being late. I would concur with the, the two, I, alternatives that have been identified as, as good alternatives to move forward with. I just want to underscore the need to look at the Missouri extension within a larger framework. When I think about the plans that I've seen that, that have to do with projected development in the City of Las Cruces and if you sort of look at the northern boundary of the, the what, the East Mesa in, in, in a certain sense as 70 going down to Dripping Springs, just talking about that segment between Dripping Springs and 70 there's a lot of projected development that has been assumed or projected or whatever, planned. We don't have all the details of that and there's BLM and state land and all those, private land. But it's really hard for me to imagine that there won't be increased pressure on having at least one more major east-west corridor beyond Dripping Springs/University, Lohman/Amador, and then
70, because you can't get through the, the big detention area that's to the, that's, that's between 70 and Lohman, right, I mean Spruce could go through except is, it can't go through and so you, you really have a very limited number of east-west corridors and I'm, I'm not sure about dumping a whole lot more onto Dripping Springs or onto Lohman. I think that those both would be, would be tough. It would definitely change the character of Missouri over time and, and I think that that's important. I went to Carl Conlee school when there was hardly anybody alive but I think I went there first year it was open, Conlee, yeah. So there has been change in the area and there's more change to come and I think that keeping that option open in terms of Missouri is really important starting with the pedestrian but, bicycle paths is a great idea but I just think that over time we're going to have a real need for another east-west corridor through into that area.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Have we discussed this, this particular bicycle/pedestrian connection, Alternative 6 with the school system or with Centennial, or is that later?

Sussman: The Las Cruces Public Schools did participate in our technical committee and did provide input, or rather, rather than participating necessarily in our technical committee we did reach out to them as a stakeholder early on in the study. They were in favor of additional bicycle and pedestrian access to the high school. They were somewhat indifferent I think about additional roadway access, extending Missouri and providing access to the north because that would require additional connections within the campus and there were sort of circulation challenges that they identified there. But they've, my recollection is that they were pretty positive and pretty supportive of additional bicycle and pedestrian connection and pretty low-impact in terms of the school.

Hancock: Thank you.

Sorg: I, on that same note, so they did not provide any indication that they would provide a, an, a connection on the north side of their property directly into the school, school grounds instead of having bicyclists and, and pedestrians go all the way to Sonoma Ranch Boulevard and then down, enter in those places that I, they enter in now? Can you understand that? It's a little bit …

Sussman: Sure.

Sorg: Awkward.
Sussman: Yeah. I'm, I'm going to be cautious not to put words in their mouths. I'm, honestly I started working on this project following those meetings so I can't speak from firsthand experience. Perhaps MPO staff can recall …

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sussman: But …

Wray: I was at the, the meeting that we had with the public schools. That level of design detail did not come up. I would presume though that if they're welcoming of the, the non-motorized facilities that they would, they would make some kind of accommodations. Mr. Sussman's characterization of their reaction to the, the motorized access as indifferent is, is, is right on. However, they could see the potential need in the future so they, they did want to keep that option on the table and again they would make accommodations within their own facilities for that should that need arise.

Sorg: Okay. Can we assume that the school will be a part of the next phase?

Wray: Absolutely.

Sorg: And that will be part of the plan?

Wray: Absolutely.

Sorg: Yeah. I, I don't want to make kids walk and bike any further than they have to. Okay. Can we, Councilor Pedroza you had something more?

Pedroza: Thank, thank you very much. I think my, my questions have been answered. I would just like to make one more comment and from my perspective from you know just driving around there, it seems as if the residential areas that already exist from between 70 and, and Dripping Springs, okay, are already there. There's a golf course, there's apartment buildings, there's houses, there's a store, there's a gas station, there's, there's already there. And I don't see that there's very much room for more residences or more commerce. I may be wrong but I, I just cannot picture that in my mind. There's never very much vacant land anymore. Thank you.

Sorg: Any other comments or questions? I just have one last, put my two-cents worth in. As you know, everybody here should know that I am a strong advocate for bicycle and pedestrian pathways all over the city and I think Alternative 6 fits that, that plan and that idea very well. My dream is to have everybody between Lohman and Dripping Springs and east of Telshor bike and walk to school, that go to Centennial High School and having a, a, a super-highway like the one photo you showed where the
bicycle lanes were there and the sidewalk was separate and so forth with nice little trees along the way would be perfect for that. But yet I do agree that the motorized road will have to be done eventually, either Roadrunner or Missouri. I don’t know which is best. I, I couldn’t see why you had picked Missouri over roadway, Roadrunner but some one of the two at least will have to be done eventually. But let’s get the bicycle and pedestrian connection done first. And how soon could that be done, staff? What, what's a realistic timeframe?

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

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

Sussman: Thank you. Can I, I'm just …

Sorg: Sure.

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

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

Sussman: So those are, that's essentially the MTP scenario …

Sorg: I see.

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

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

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

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

Sorg: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Sussman: All right. Thank you.

Sorg: That concludes the Missouri Study Corridor.

5.2 NMDOT update

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

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

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Last call for public comment. Seeing none.

8. ADJOURNMENT (2:03 PM)

Sorg: I'll call for an adjournment.

Hancock: So moved.

Sorg: Moved by Commissioner ...

Eakman: Second.

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

Sorg: None, and it's passed.

______________________________
Chairperson
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

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

26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Subcontract 1</th>
<th>Subcontract 2</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>G100030</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Rd</td>
<td>$3,220,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Rd</td>
<td>$3,150.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DAC LEAD PROJECTS**
$3,223,150.00 $350.00 $3,220,000.00

**City of Las Cruces Lead Projects**
No federally-funded projects obligated

**TOTAL CLC LEAD PROJECTS**
$0.00 $0.00 $0.00

**RoadRUNNER Transit Lead Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Subcontract 1</th>
<th>Subcontract 2</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL00013</td>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Support Equipment/Facilities</td>
<td>$319,977.00</td>
<td>$56,467.00</td>
<td>$376,444.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL TRANSIT LEAD PROJECTS**
$319,977.00 $0.00 $376,444.00

**Las Cruces Public Schools Lead Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Subcontract 1</th>
<th>Subcontract 2</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>LC00171</td>
<td>LCPS</td>
<td>SRTS, TAP Funded SRTS Administration</td>
<td>$35,885</td>
<td>$6,115</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL LCPS LEAD PROJECTS**
$35,885 $0.00 $6,115.23 $42,000

**Town of Mesilla Lead Projects**
No federally-funded projects obligated

**TOTAL TOM LEAD PROJECTS**
$0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00

**GRAND TOTALS**
$11,720,915.21 $2,762,469.79 $152,389.46 $13,132,274.46
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
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:

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

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

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


(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 21st 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);


(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

__________________________________________  ______________________

NMDOT

__________________________________________  ______________________
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
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
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
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
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 21st 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.
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 FFY18 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
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, Bohannan-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
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.