



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 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **December 1, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers 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. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. November 3, 2016 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program ___ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. CIP Project Update _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 6.1. NMDOT Projects Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 6.3. MPO Staff Update _____ **MPO Staff**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the
5 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held November 3,
6 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
10 Bill Childress (BLM)
11 Todd Gregory (LCPS)
12 John Gwynne (DAC Flood Commission)
13 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
14 Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)
15 Harold Love (NMDOT)

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Armijo (SCR TD)
18 Dale Harrell (NMSU)
19 Stephen Howie (EBID)
20 Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
21 Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
22 Daniel Sambrano - proxy for Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
23 Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
24 Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)

25
26 **STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
27 Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)
28 Dominic Loya (MPO)

29
30 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

31
32 **1. CALL TO ORDER (4:03 PM)**

33
34 Gwynne: Good afternoon. It is 4:03 p.m. Let's get started with the Mesilla Valley
35 Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee
36 meeting. Let's start with a roll call. I think I forgot this last time. So we'll
37 start all the way over here on the right and just introduce yourself real
38 quick. Thank you.

39
40 Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

41
42 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planning Division.

43
44 Gregory: Todd Gregory, Las Cruces Public Schools.

45
46 Lee: Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew, City of Las Cruces RoadRUNNER Transit.

Gwynne: John Gwynne, Dona Ana County Flood Commission.

Childress: Bill Childress, Bureau of Land Management.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Gwynne: Okay. First let's have approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? I'll accept a motion to approve the agenda.

Bartholomew: I move we approve the agenda.

Love: Second.

Gwynne: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Gwynne: Motion carries.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 October 6, 2016

Gwynne: Let's move on to approval of the minutes. Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes? Are there any questions, comments, changes? I'd like a motion to approve.

Bartholomew: I move to approve the minutes of October 6, 2016.

Herrera: I second.

Gwynne: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Gwynne: Motion carries.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Gwynne: Public comment. Do we have any comment from the public? Seeing none.

5. ACTION ITEMS

1
2 **5.1 Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**
3

4 Gwynne: We'll move on to item number five on the agenda and the first item is
5 amendments to the 2016 through 2021 Transportation Improvement Plan.
6 Andrew.

7
8 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
9

10 Wray: MPO staff actually had a question for NMDOT staff; What exactly are the
11 ADA improvements proposed along that stretch?
12

13 Herrera: Upgrading ramps and fixing any sidewalk that's broken currently. We're
14 not adding new ADA; we're just upgrading what's already there.
15

16 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.
17

18 Bartholomew: In Project TL00011 it's actually a, it, although it says it's a 5339(c) that's
19 where we're getting the money now. It was designated in that project as a
20 5309 project. We no longer get the, our capital funding through the 5309
21 anymore under, since MAP-21 I think went into effect actually. And it's all
22 coming through the 5339 and so we're just getting it so it matches to the
23 correct federal program. The \$1 million, \$1.31 million that's going in to
24 2017 relates to a State of Good Repair grant that the City got for bus
25 replacement so we we're essentially moving money that was in a out year
26 into a budgeted year. Anybody has questions I'll take them.
27

28 Gwynne: Okay. Are there any questions or discussions about any of the items on
29 the TIP? I'll take a motion to approve.
30

31 Love: So moved.
32

33 Bartholomew: Second.
34

35 Gwynne: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?
36

37 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
38

39 Gwynne: Motion carries.
40

41 **5.2 Missouri Ave. Study**
42

43 Gwynne: Okay. The next item on the list is the Missouri Avenue Corridor Study.
44 Andrew.
45

46 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

1
2 Gwynne: Okay. Does anyone on the Committee have any questions about the
3 study? Keep in mind this is a level A study and doesn't really do much
4 more than push things a little bit further forward down the road. Policy
5 Committee could look at the items that are recommended and agree to it
6 or not, so any other questions?
7
8 Bartholomew: Just a comment.
9
10 Gwynne: Yes sir.
11
12 Bartholomew: I did attend the public meeting at the Farm and Ranch Museum and I
13 thought that the study that was done by Bohannon Huston was a very well
14 done study and I would support the, recommending the study.
15
16 Gwynne: Okay. Do we have any public comment? Please state your name,
17 please.
18
19 Pruet: Yes. I'm J. B. Pruet, homeowner at 783 Warm Sands Court and I've
20 attended the last three meetings, public meetings on this and I think
21 there's been a lot of input. I know that there was a lot of concern even
22 about Roadrunner for a time and I think its well that it's pushed off into the
23 future when it can more beneficially serve the area. Recognizing that
24 even though my property backs up to it, at some point in time it will
25 probably be a necessity after BLM decides what the disposition is of that
26 piece of property. The one comment that I would make, and I've made it
27 several times but it actually extends outside the Missouri study area, and
28 that is to take a look at Paseo de Onate with the idea of extending it to
29 Sonoma Ranch. There is a little road that I'm not certain is even legal that
30 goes out of a subdivision there, it's called Canyon Point which was a
31 developer's dump road at the time and it has been sort of upgraded over
32 time to keep the dust down and that's the one that is becoming used. But
33 if Paseo de Onate could be extended I think it would do a tremendous
34 amount for reducing the traffic in that neighborhood area, doesn't have
35 anything to do with Missouri but it's an option to avoid a problem in the
36 future by doing it sooner rather than later, realizing that it is not a part of
37 this study. But I think there was a lot of work put in by Bohannon Huston
38 and the various people in the Las Cruces area that are involved and I think
39 they've come out with a accurate and valuable report to go forward with.
40 Thank you.
41
42 Gwynne: Thank you for your comments. We don't often get public here, especially
43 none commenting so thank you very much.
44
45 Bartholomew: And Mr. Chair. And I would note that the comments that Mr. Pruet made
46 about the Paseo de Onate area too it was noted that that was at the public

1 meeting and recommended to be addressed at what, if I remember right
2 Andrew, in the next MTP update plan. Was that what it was
3 recommended in there?
4

5 Wray: It'll be examined.
6

7 Bartholomew: Examined, yeah.
8

9 Wray: Yeah.
10

11 Bartholomew: It's, that's the word I meant. I didn't, that, recommended.
12

13 Wray: The difficult, I cannot remember off the top of my head whether Paseo de
14 Onate is even functionally classified so ultimately it may, if it's a local road
15 that it is going to fall under the sole discretion of the City or the County
16 depending on where the city limits are if it's a local.
17

18 Bartholomew: Right. But I did notice that the, those comments were noted in the final
19 report too.
20

21 Gwynne: Very good. Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments from
22 the Committee? I stand for a motion.
23

24 Bartholomew: I move we recommend the Missouri/Roadrunner Corridor Study to the
25 Policy Committee.
26

27 Herrera: I second.
28

29 Gwynne: Okay. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?
30

31 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
32

33 Gwynne: Any opposed? Motion carries.
34

35 **5.3 Transportation Alternatives Program Application Recommendations**
36

37 Gwynne: Okay. The next item's item 5.3 and Andrew correct me if I'm wrong, I
38 believe we need to look at each of these individually and vote on them
39 individually.
40

41 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the Committee to page 19
42 of the packet. We have four applications for the Transportation
43 Alternatives Program that have come out of jurisdictions that are members
44 of the MPO. We do need to look at these in isolation from each other so
45 we will be taking four distinct votes. Just to give a little bit of background
46 the TAP program was originally created during MAP-21 and its most

1 recent transportation authorization the FAST Act. The funding categories
2 remained although the rubric of TAP, the, the language was not present in
3 the bill. However, NMDOT decided to go ahead and maintain that
4 nomenclature within the State of New Mexico for these programs so here
5 we are. The, I'll just go ahead and go in order as it is in the, in the, in the
6 packet. Unfortunately, due to size constraints as, as you can imagine
7 these applications were very large, we're not able to e-mail them so I trust
8 everyone was able to review them from, from the, the available links on
9 the MPO website.

10 I'm going to go ahead and start with the application from Las
11 Cruces Public Schools for traffic calming projects. Just in general, the
12 Public Schools would like to use the, the TAP funding to implement some
13 safety measures in the vicinities of some of, some of the schools in the
14 area where they believe that there are consistent traffic problems. And I'll
15 turn, turn the discussion over to Mr. Todd Gregory from Las Cruces Public
16 Schools.

17
18 Gregory: Thank you Andrew. Yes, the, this application, I'm looking at trying to
19 supplement some areas that have been identified by our Safe Routes to
20 School Coalition which has members from County, City, Traffic
21 Engineering and other representatives from the community to look at
22 some of the traffic congestion around schools.

23 And the traffic calming measures are going to be school zone
24 flashers, speed limit flashers signs so when you go over the speed limit it'll
25 flash your speed, as well as traffic dollies or mobile traffic dollies. And the
26 schools that have been identified are the ones that we've talked about at
27 the Safe Routes to School Coalition to try to address some of the traffic
28 congestion or speed concerns that they have around and in the schools
29 on these certain roadways. So we've implemented some of these
30 throughout the city and we put some up at Fairacres to address some
31 speeding concerns from the public or the school or parents from those
32 schools.

33 We're also trying to supplement our efforts for the lack of consistent
34 enforcement around schools and these traffic calming measures will help
35 us educate and remind the driving public that this is a school zone and we
36 are in session, and trying to educate them to reduce speed and slow
37 down. The school zone flashers have kind of been identified at a couple
38 of schools that we've identified the need for it. Highland is one of them
39 that we just haven't been able to find funding or get funding sources to get
40 to that point. And so these measures would be something that I can put
41 out or implement and work with the community to address some of these
42 safety concerns around schools and kind of take a proactive approach to
43 doing something or putting something there that will help traffic flow, help
44 educate the public about the safety concerns and the traffic volumes
45 around our schools. So I guess that's kind of the summary of that
46 application.

1
2 Wray: Thank you Mr. Gregory. I also want to make a note, and this applies to all
3 of the applications and I apologize I did not make this sooner. The
4 deadline for submission to NMDOT and NMDOT is the final evaluator and
5 recipient of these applications is November 30th. We're bringing these
6 through the committee process for the purposes of offering the relevant
7 stakeholders an opportunity to offer comments and suggestions to
8 improve the applications, improve their chances of being successful. So
9 while we are asking the TAC to recommend to the Policy Committee either
10 "yea" or "nay," regardless of that vote we certainly are open to
11 suggestions that Mr. Gregory is here but we can also pass on to the
12 applying jurisdiction in case anybody here has any comments or
13 suggestions. So I just wanted to make that note.
14
15 Gwynne: Thank you very much. Any questions from the Committee?
16
17 Love: In reviewing your packet Todd, is it the intent of Las Cruces Public
18 Schools to try to reduce the speed limit in front of Fairacres?
19
20 Gregory: Not the Las Cruces Public Schools, it's not our intent.
21
22 Love: Okay.
23
24 Gregory: My intent is just to encourage and educate drivers that that is the speed
25 limit.
26
27 Love: Okay.
28
29 Gregory: And to drive the speed limit and not go faster than the speed limit.
30
31 Herrera: Mr. Chair.
32
33 Gwynne: Yes.
34
35 Herrera: If I could maybe just ask a follow-up question. So I know that we do
36 already have the notification speed signs outside of Fairacres, but
37 Fairacres is one of the schools included in your packet, so what more are
38 you planning to do at Fairacres?
39
40 Gregory: The goal with Fairacres was a traffic dolly or a dolly that I could actually
41 move around, not necessarily be stationed there the whole time. They're
42 roll-able dollies. So my goal is to, you know when you get a complaint or
43 you have a citizen that's upset about something I can go put it out there
44 temporarily, which would be just more education encouraging and then it
45 would go away once we'd filled that, it's subsided. So it's more designed,
46 it's not going to be permanently there. It's more designed to move around.

1
2 Herrera: Okay. And I guess the only concern with that, and the reason I keep
3 talking about Fairacres is because that's the only one within DOT right-of-
4 way so that if you did want to place something like that you would have to
5 you know get permits and things so, just so you're aware of that.
6
7 Gregory: Yes, and I've worked with ...
8
9 Herrera: Yeah.
10
11 Gregory: With them on several flashers or other items that we would definitely
12 comply with that.
13
14 Herrera: Okay. Thank you.
15
16 Gwynne: Okay. Any other questions? I'll stand for a motion.
17
18 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I move to approve the Las Cruces Public Schools traffic
19 calming project.
20
21 Bartholomew: I'll second.
22
23 Gwynne: All those in favor?
24
25 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
26
27 Gwynne: Any opposed? Motion carries.
28
29 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Next is the application for the continuation of
30 utilizing TAP funding for the Public Schools' Safe Routes to School
31 program. This program has been in existence at the MPO since, or the
32 Coordinator position has been in existence since 2009. It was originally
33 housed within the MPO. A few years ago it transitioned over into the
34 hands of the Las Cruces Public Schools. Currently the incumbent is Ms.
35 Ashleigh Curry. This application is to continue the funding of that position
36 through Fiscal Years '18 and '19 and I believe there is also some
37 additional funding for some of the Champion positions but I'll turn it over
38 now to Mr. Gregory.
39
40 Gregory: Thank you. Yes like Andrew said this has been around for close to over
41 ten years and we continually, year to year see growth in the program not
42 to just within the Las Cruces Public Schools but you know even now
43 spreading out to more interest in the County. And our goal is really you
44 know we're educating, encouraging students and parents that there is
45 alternative ways to get to schools.

1 We deal constantly with traffic congestion, busing issues in and
2 around schools, and so we're really trying to educate our community on
3 these alternatives and we're very active in the update of the Safe Routes
4 to School Action Plan which is through the MPO as well as working with
5 our traffic engineering partners to update walking maps, to address
6 concerns that come up within the community so we've made a lot of
7 progress and we're wanting that progress to continue cause we still have a
8 lot of work to do and you have to have somebody coordinating that or else
9 it'll just stagnate. And I'm fortunate enough to have some a very good
10 coordinator and we want to keep that momentum going. We still have a
11 lot of work to do that we want to accomplish and I definitely would want
12 this to move forward cause it had a great positive impact on our
13 community right now and that Safe Routes to School Coalition is bringing
14 the right people together to make changes in our community. So I would
15 hope that we could push this forward too. I appreciate the vote for it.

16
17 Gwynne: Any other questions by the Committee?

18
19 Herrera: Mr. Chair.

20
21 Gwynne: Yes.

22
23 Herrera: I just have a comment. I just wanted to let the Members know that this is
24 the only successful Safe Routes to School program in the whole state so
25 they're doing a good job.

26
27 Gwynne: Good deal. No other comments? I'll stand for a motion.

28
29 Love: So moved.

30
31 Bartholomew: I'll second.

32
33 Gwynne: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

34
35 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

36
37 Gwynne: Opposed? Seeing none, motion carries forward.

38
39 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. The next one is the application from the Town of
40 Mesilla regarding a potential multi-use path along Calle del Norte from La
41 Llorona to the intersection with the Mesilla Lateral. Regrettably Town of
42 Mesilla staff is not here today to speak so I'll do my best to sort of speak
43 on their behalf.

44 This application grew out of the work that the MPO did earlier this
45 year, I'm sure everyone remembers regarding the establishment of the
46 southern leg of the multi-use trail. This application that Town of Mesilla is

1 submitting to the State is a part of that multi-use loop trail. We do have
2 some issues regarding exactly who has jurisdiction over where La Llorona
3 actually physically ends and connecting that to where it would intersect
4 with Calle del Norte so the proposal basically starts along Calle del Norte
5 and then proceeds on eastwards to the Mesilla lateral. And hopefully we'll
6 be able to work out the issues with International Waters at some point in
7 the near future regarding establishing that connection point. But that is
8 the genesis of this project or this application the Town of Mesilla's
9 submitting and we certainly hope that it will be successful and proceed
10 forward throughout the rest of the process. Other than that there really
11 isn't much else that I can say on behalf of the application. I will say that if
12 Members of this Committee have any comments that they would like to
13 have forwarded on to Town of Mesilla staff, ways that they could improve
14 their application, MPO staff will certainly take those down and pass those
15 on.

16
17 Gwynne: Are there any questions from the Committee?

18
19 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I have a comment. Andrew if you wouldn't mind passing it
20 along. It's the same comment that I made at the BPAC meeting. It's
21 about the funding. So the way that they have it listed on the TAP
22 application has it split 50/50 so it's the same amount each fiscal year and
23 that's not how the funding works. You know it's preliminary engineering
24 and design in the first fiscal year and construction in the second fiscal
25 year. So they need to make sure that that's really clear on the application
26 and that they're able to handle that.

27 And all of the other comments that I made at the BPAC they did
28 really good at updating the application and some of them, just for the
29 Committee Members here, were just about the maps. They didn't talk at
30 all about the MPO Trails Map or anything and now they've mentioned that.
31 So their application is a lot better. It's just that one piece of the funding.
32 Thank you.

33
34 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. We will pass that comment on to Town of Mesilla
35 staff.

36
37 Gwynne: Andrew I do have one question. I don't know if you can answer it or not.
38 I'm just curious if they've already have gotten all their right-of-way.

39
40 Wray: Mr. Chair. That's actually an NMDOT facility so I will defer to them on
41 that.

42
43 Herrera: They don't have the right-of-way but Harold from District 1 has written
44 them a letter of support and it is included in the application saying that
45 we're willing to work with them on whatever they need to do within our
46 right-of-way.

1
2 Gwynne: Very good. Thank you. Are there any other questions from the
3 Committee? We'll accept a motion.
4
5 Bartholomew: That a motion to recommend the application?
6
7 Gwynne: Yes.
8
9 Bartholomew: Okay. I'll move to recommend the application.
10
11 Gregory: Second.
12
13 Gwynne: Okay I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?
14
15 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
16
17 Gwynne: Opposed? Seeing none, the motion carries. And the last one Andrew.
18
19 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. The final application for consideration today is from
20 the City of Las Cruces. It relates to part of the ongoing CLC efforts at
21 downtown revitalization. Yes we've got Mr. Armando Morales from City of
22 Las Cruces Community Development to speak to you about this
23 application.
24
25 Morales: Good afternoon everyone. I'm Armando Morales and I'm with the City of
26 Las Cruces and my project or the City's project is we're applying for TAP
27 funding for green infrastructure in the downtown area. First let me start off
28 by defining what "green infrastructure" is. Green infrastructure uses
29 vegetation, soils, and other elements and practices to restore some of the
30 natural processes required to manage water and create healthier urban
31 environments. Some examples include rain gardens, permeable
32 pavement, green roofs, bioswales, and cisterns. In an effort to continue
33 downtown revitalization we want to use green infrastructure as a tool to
34 encourage economic development, walkability, and improve the overall
35 aesthetics of the downtown.
36 One of the reasons we targeted this is because it would follow the
37 two-way conversion of Church and Water which is set to start early 2017
38 and that project is projected to be done in 18 months. And what that
39 project will do is it will convert Church and Water streets downtown into
40 two-way streets and on the cross-streets, so Bowman, Las Cruces, and
41 Griggs. It will also include green infrastructure. So this project that we're
42 applying for will kind of fill in the outside streets and make a continuous
43 green area that will also aid in helping to reduce the urban heat island
44 effect as well as making it much more aesthetic and attractable to
45 consumers and pedestrians and cyclists as well. And that is the quick
46 summary of what we're applying for and I will stand for any questions.

1 And we have not submitted any changes from the previous iteration from
2 the BPAC but all those comments were noted and they are being
3 discussed and taken into consideration.
4

5 Gwynne: Are there any questions from the Committee?
6

7 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I may I just want to reiterate the comments that were made at
8 BPAC and I'm hoping that the City will do more than consider them and
9 actually implement them, just because if it's unclear to me and I live here,
10 it's going to be really unclear to someone in Santa Fe reviewing the
11 application. It's things like when you say "green infrastructure" and then
12 you explain it, it makes perfect sense, but in the application it's really
13 unclear what specific elements you're planning on doing. We talked about
14 if you have pictures or schematics of what things you want to do on the
15 streets that would be really helpful. Also the funding is still a little bit
16 unclear. You don't talk about design at all so if that's something that City
17 staff is planning on doing in-house you probably should mention that
18 somewhere. If it's something that you're planning on going out to RFP for,
19 definitely break that out so that we know this much is for preliminary
20 engineering, this much for construction, etc. And then also the letter that
21 explains the project sponsor, we talked a lot about that at the BPAC
22 meeting, it's really unclear. It makes the TIDD sound like kind of its own
23 thing but it's really not so that letter needs to be updated just to be very
24 specific on who the sponsor is and how it's going to be paid for.
25

26 Wray: Hello? Well, getting me.
27

28 Morales: Hello, okay, there. Sorry. My apologies on the earlier comment. What I
29 meant to say was we've talked about it and we're working on how we will
30 implement those recommendations.
31

32 Herrera: Thank you. I'm just trying to help you get the funding for the City.
33

34 Morales: I understand. We appreciate it.
35

36 Gwynne: Any other questions from the Committee?
37

38 Bartholomew: I just to refresh my memory on these TAP funds. How much does a,
39 maybe Ms. Herrera knows, how much funding is in the cycle for this, for
40 the entire state for this program?
41

42 Herrera: That's a good question. It's just over \$6 million a year so it's \$12 million
43 total that we're awarding for, \$6 million in the, the two fiscal years. It is
44 broken out by population so Las Cruces will be competing with other cities
45 of similar size, well actually the funding category is from 5,000 to 200,000

1 so we'll be competing with like Silver City and Roswell and Hatch for
2 funding. But not Albuquerque, that's kind of its own category so.

3
4 Bartholomew: And how large was this project? I thought was, this application, was it ...

5
6 Herrera: It was just over a million.

7
8 Morales: Just over a million, yes.

9
10 Bartholomew: Yeah, over a million. Okay. Thank you.

11
12 Gwynne: Any other questions? I'll stand for a motion to move forward to the TAP to
13 the Policy Committee.

14
15 Bartholomew: I'll go ahead and make a motion to recommend it.

16
17 Lee: Second.

18
19 Gwynne: Have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

20
21 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

22
23 Morales: Thank you.

24
25 Gwynne: See any against? No. Motion carries.

26 27 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

28 29 **7.1 NMDOT Projects Update**

30
31 Gwynne: Okay. Let's move on to committee and staff comments. Start with DOT
32 projects updates.

33
34 Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We don't have any projects in construction right
35 now, if you can believe it.

36
37 Gwynne: Right.

38
39 Herrera: We do have a few that are going to be in construction soon: The
40 intersection of Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses and US-70 is going to bid later
41 this month so we should have construction starting probably early next
42 spring.

43 Our study and design on Valley Drive, well I guess it's, the study
44 part is done so we're at about 60% design for plans on Valley Drive. So
45 that's moving along.

1 And then we are sort of in the middle of the study on US-70 looking
2 at capacity and safety from the Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses intersection to
3 the I-25 interchange, so we're in the study phase. And I do realize that we
4 did just add a project for pavement pres in that same area earlier this
5 evening but we don't think the pavement is going to hold up until the time
6 when we're able to implement whatever comes out of the study. So that's
7 why we're moving forward with kind of the quick project now.

8 And we also have the I-25/University interchange, huge project.
9 That's still in the very early stages. We're working through the process of
10 getting approval from FHWA for ramp modifications now. So we're still a
11 couple years out on that one.

12
13 Gwynne: Okay. I have one question, Jolene. There's another project on Thorpe
14 Road. Do you know anything about that one, where that one's at?

15
16 Love: We're completing final design on that small project.

17
18 Gwynne: Yeah.

19
20 Love: I think we're looking at trying to let it in January of 2017.

21
22 Gwynne: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other jurisdictions that have updates?

23
24 Gregory: Las Cruces Public Schools, on our Safe Routes to School Coordinator
25 program we're focusing currently with education at the elementary
26 schools. We still continue our monthly/weekly walking activities and we're
27 currently still in the process of updating the Action Plan. We've made
28 some progress but we still have a little bit more work to do and we are
29 working with Soo to try and still finish up the walking maps at all the
30 elementary schools and eventually all the schools. So we're, currently
31 that's what we're doing so thanks.

32
33 Gwynne: City of Las Cruces, do you have any updates? No. Okay. Anyone else?

34 35 **7.2 MPO Staff Projects Update**

36
37 Gwynne: Okay. MPO staff do you have some updates?

38
39 Wray: Yes. First thing that we'd like to mention is that we are currently in the
40 Open Call for Projects for the 2018 to 2023 TIP. The deadline is in mid-
41 December. We anticipate that we'll be bringing the resulting proposed TIP
42 through the committees in the early spring and then that TIP will take ...
43 October 1, 2017. We do seem to be having a problem with the
44 microphone cutting out for some reason. At this point I'd like to turn it over
45 to Mr. Michael McAdams for some updates on some of the things
46 regarding the BPAC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Gwynne: Okay.

McAdams: Good afternoon. We do a lot of things. I'll try to make this brief because everyone wants to get probably home before five, well after five soon. I'm making some highlights and please also think of us as the MPO as a resource for anything we like to do in transportation needs. You know that but I just want to emphasize that that we can provide a lot of things for you hopefully.

First thing we're going to do is, or first I'd kinda of like to discuss is about the South Central Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Committee. We are reestablishing the Committee after a hiatus about five years. It's to really look and it's to look at coordination of public transit and human services in mainly Dona Ana but maybe extending beyond other counties as well. There are multiple providers besides the regular public transit providers such as RoadRUNNER or SCRTER/Sun Metro. There have been two planning efforts for public transportation coordination. The, first was the Coordinated Mobility Plan for human services transportation done in 2009 and then the South Central RTPO, Mesilla Valley MPO, and El Paso MPO Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services transportation plan which was done in 2015. We are not going to duplicate these plans but we'd like to extend them and create a permanent committee to look at public transit coordination. The committee's purpose would be explore public transit providers and to cooperate together on things such as insurance, procurement, vehicle maintenance, coordination service, etc. It will also include agencies that rely upon public transportation entities to transport their clients and nonprofits who are involved in public transportation issues. We would like to hold the first stakeholders meeting in December as a broad group and maybe breaking down later to smaller groups, we think this is a much-needed area. It's been encouraged by the State and we also have the State involved too as well.

The other issue was the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Committee submitted proposals of projects to the City of Las Cruces infrastructure capital improvement program for FY2016. The BPAC held a special meeting on the 20th of September to examine what projects could be placed in the City, the ICPs of jurisdictions that are in the MPO area. And the BPAC members met and in the special meeting with not only Members but also members of the public. They looked at the maps and also comments, they picked what projects they would like to do and the staff came back, you know assembled it, came back to the BPAC at their regular meeting, and then presented that list to them. We are, as of November 1st we submitted a six sets of recommendations. I can go over them if necessary but if you'd like to look I'd be glad to discuss them now or later, and that was really the process and their preliminary review of these projects are really simple, road diets, intersection improve, well road diets and perhaps some intersection improvements, refuges. Well many

1 of you aware of them already. And after that process we'll go through the
2 normal ICIP projects but right now at November 1st they're for just looking
3 at what's the cost of them, the feasibility, etc. So I would be glad to
4 discuss them now or later. And I think that's it for right now. Any
5 questions? I'd be glad to stand for questions.
6

7 Gwynne: Are there any questions from any of the Committee Members? Thank you
8 very much.
9

10 McAdams: You're welcome.
11

12 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**
13

14 Gwynne: One more chance for public comment.
15

16 **8. ADJOURNMENT (5:00 PM)**
17

18 Gwynne: Anything else Andrew?
19

20 Wray: That's it, just adjournment.
21

22 Gwynne: Good enough. Let's adjourn. Do I have a motion?
23

24 Gregory: I motion.
25

26 Bartholomew: Second.
27

28 Gwynne: All those in favor?
29

30 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
31

32 Gwynne: We are adjourned.
33
34
35
36

37 _____
38 Chairperson



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 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF December 1, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment Request Letter from NMDOT

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
LC00160	2017	NMDOT	Valley Drive – Picacho to CLC Limits	Road Reconstruction and ADA Improvements	Added \$1.4 Million in FY2017 for Preliminary Engineering

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



November 28, 2016

Councilor Gill Sorg
Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee Chair
700 North Main Street
Las Cruces, NM 88001

RE: Request for Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment

Dear Council Sorg,

This letter is a request for an Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment for the Valley Drive project, control number LC00160. The reason for the Out-of-Cycle request is because this funding was mistakenly left off the TIP Amendment request for the November 9, 2016 Policy Committee meeting. In order to keep the scheduled let date of May 19, 2017, NMDOT will need this Amendment processed as soon as possible.

The requested amendment is to add \$1.4M for preliminary engineering to complete the final design phase of the project. This amount is in addition to the \$15.4M already programmed in the TIP for this project making the amended project total \$16.8M.

If you have any questions or concerns about this request please don't hesitate to contact me at (575) 525-7358 or Jolenem.Herrera@state.nm.us.

Thank you for your consideration of this time sensitive matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jolene Herrera".

Jolene Herrera
NMDOT Urban & Regional Planner

CC: Tom Murphy, MVMPO Officer
Andrew Wray, MVMPO Transportation Planner
Trent Doolittle, NMDOT District 1 Engineer

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6



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 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF December 1, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 CIP Project Update

DISCUSSION:

At the meeting of October 18, 2016, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley MPO recommended 6 projects to be placed in the City of Las Cruces' 2018 CIP. The MPO Staff submitted these projects to a list that is being scoped for consideration into the list of CIP projects for FY 2018. Staff will discuss the details of these projects and their relation to the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the associated goals of improving facilities for pedestrians and bicycles for the region.