MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held December 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Las Cruces City 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 listed above.

1. CALL TO ORDER______________________________________________________________Chair
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3. PUBLIC COMMENT________________________________________Chair
4. CONSENT AGENDA*________________________________________________________Chair
5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES__________________________________________________Chair
5.1. November 16, 2016____________________________________________________Chair
6. ACTION ITEMS____________________________________________________________
6.1. *Resolution 16-16: A Resolution Adopting the 2017 MPO Calendar of Meetings __MPO Staff
6.2. Resolution 16-17: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program _____________________________________________________________MPO Staff
6.3. Resolution 16-18: A Resolution Rescinding the Camino Real Consortium of MPO Project Priorities (Resolution 16-15) and Advising the Camino Real Consortium of New MPO Project Priorities ________________________________________________________MPO Staff
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS_________________________________________________________
7.1. NMDOT update __________________________________________________________NMDOT Staff
8. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS _________________________________________Chair
9. PUBLIC COMMENT________________________________________________________Chair
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The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held November 16, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:08)
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (arrived 1:01)
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)

STAFF PRESENT:  Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Dominik Loya (MPO Staff)

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

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:00 PM)
Sorg:  Okay I’ll call the meeting to order, it’s one o’clock.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY
Sorg:  The first item on the agenda is a conflict of interest inquiry. Does any member of the Committee have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda?
Pedroza:  No.
Eakman:  None.
Sorg:  All right.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT
Sorg:  We’ll move on then to public comment. Is there anybody from the public here that would like to make comment? Seeing none.
4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: We'll move on to the next item, the consent agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

Flores: So moved.

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Trustee Flores and second by Councilor Eakman. Would staff poll the members?

Wray: Trustee Flores:

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 * October 12, 2016

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 * Resolution 16-12: A Resolution Adopting the 2016 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects
6.2 Resolution 16-13: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Sorg: All right then we move onto action items. The first action item is approved by the consent agenda. The second one is 6.2, resolution 16-13, a resolution amending the 2016-2021 transportation improvement program. And I make a comment that Commissioner Garrett has just arrived.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the committee to page 33 in the packet. There are a number of amendments that have been requested by NMDOT and RoadRUNNER Transit. I will deal with the NMDOT amendments first as those are fairly straightforward. LC00250 is an additional $1.6 million in federal fiscal year 2017 for preliminary engineering, construction is still intended to be in fiscal years '18 and '19. And the last item on the table, LC00300 is a new project for federal fiscal year 2018 which is a bridge and pavement preservation and ADA improvements on US-70, Elks to Del Rey. The other three items that are on the list; TL00011 all RoadRUNNER Transit has requested that all of the money in that project be moved out of that project which would've effectively eliminate that project out of the TIP. The money would go to, both segments of the money will go to TL00016, $1.1 million will go into federal fiscal year 2017 and the remaining $4 million will go into federal fiscal year 2020. And I'll stand now for any questions.

Sorg: Do we have a motion to approve this resolution?

Wray: We do not.

Sorg: Would someone like ...

Flores: So moved.

Sorg: Trustee Flores made a motion to approve it. And ...

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Second by Councilor Eakman. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Trent.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to real briefly expand a little bit on LC00300 only because there's been a lot of discussion tied to that section of US-70. We are still currently working on a study for that same section of road. If you'll notice this is just a pavement preservation. We've had severe difficulties with that pavement specifically at the Elks intersection
where trucks are coming to stop and it's shoving that asphalt around. Our maintenance guys have gone in there and kind of shaved off some of the ruts and we're just afraid that the pavement has become very thin in that section, so ultimately this is just to buy us a little bit of time while we complete the study before we determine long-term what we're going to do. And then the bridge preservation is mostly work on the I-25, I mean the US-70 bridges over I-25 just as some pavement preservation. So I just wanted to clarify that this is a completely separate project and scope than the study that we're currently doing from Three Crosses to the Del Rey intersection.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. And other comments or questions? Seeing none. Could you call the roll?

Wray: Trustee Flores.
Flores: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.
Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
Benavidez: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
Pedroza: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Eakman.
Eakman: Yes.
Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
Garrett: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Chair.
Sorg: Yes.

6.3 Resolution 16-14: A Resolution Accepting the Missouri Study Corridor Phase A recommendations
Sorg: Nest item on the agenda is 6.3, a resolution, 16-14, a resolution accepting the Missouri study corridor phase A recommendations. Is there a motion to approve?

Eakman: So moved.

Pedroza: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman. Second by Councilor Pedroza. We've had already a thorough presentation on this Missouri Study Corridor. We aren't going to have a presentation today, but if there's any last minute questions or comments the committee has, this is the time to do it.

Murphy: And Mr. Chair if I may add, since the last presentation we did not receive any new public comment on there, so just essentially the two items to move forward as recommended by the consultant it stands under what the committee will be voting on.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Seeing none, we'll have a roll call vote then.

Murphy: Member Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Member Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Member Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Member Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Member Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Chair.
Sorg: Yes.

6.4 Resolution 16-15: A Resolution Advising the Camino Real Consortium of MPO Project Priorities

Sorg: Next item on the agenda is the 6.4, resolution 16-15, a resolution advising the Camino Real Consortium of MPO project priorities. Motion to approve.

Pedroza: Move to approve.

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Moved to approve by Councilor Pedroza and second Councilor Eakman. Could you explain this one a little bit?

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. The regional leadership consortium of which the MPO is a member of is requesting priority projects from each of their members at their next meeting December 2nd. What I have up on the screen and I will zoom in as needed, is a copy of the map that illustrates the MPO's transportation priorities as adopted in the MTP last summer. Also handed out before you is a list of the projects that did not quite make that map because we needed to be fiscally constrained so what I believe we can do to satisfy the request of the RLC is for this Board to signify and I believe the number is three, the top three projects from these two, the map and the list, which the Board indicates is our top priorities and I'll defer to Member Garrett or Member Flores if they want to add any more on what the RLC is, oh and Member Pedroza you were there too.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes, thank you. The point behind this is that the Camino Real Consortium would like to be able to encourage legislative support as well as any other kind of support that we need for projects that have regional implications and are consistent with both the planning documents that have been developed through the Viva Dona Ana initiative, and also the livability principles that were developed by the residents of the County. And so what we're looking for are, the notion is that everybody's going to bring three or up to three and then the RLC, the Regional Leadership Committee will narrow that down to probably three that we will then recommend to legislatures from the area. So I think in terms of looking at this, it's important to keep those livability principles in mind and also to, this can reinforce what's going on from a different entity or it can be something that is not specifically on anybody's list but it's partly because it
really has implications that are regional in nature. I hope that that's somewhat clearer.

Flores: Do you have a …

Sorg: Trustee Flores.

Flores: I know that a copy of a livability principles was sent to the MPO and I was hoping that that would be included in the packet so people could look at it ahead of time that weren't in Viva Dona Ana, so they could look at the list and then see if they wanted to move something.

Murphy: I apologize. I did not get that list out. Is that on your screen, is that readable?

Pedroza: Mr. Chairman.

Garrett: Mr. Chair if I could. What you've got on the screen are the livability principles that were developed in Dona Ana County. The model was something that's been developed at a sustainable level, sustainable communities level nationally but we tweaked these and have adopted these at a local level and so the illustrations, for example the 20 miles from home to the supermarket is simply a reminder that currently that's how far it is for families in Colonia's to be able to get to fresh food and that kind of thing which has an implication in terms of existing supporting communities but also looking at economic competitiveness and a variety of other things.

Sorg: This is in Viva Dona Ana.

Flores: Mr. Chair.

Garrett: This is in Viva Dona Ana. This is part of the Viva Dona Ana.

Flores: Might I add that the principles aren't necessarily in order of importance. They're all …

Garrett: Right.

Sorg: I couldn't hear.

Flores: Of equal importance.

Garrett: Say it again.
Flores: The principles are not in order of importance. They're all important. They're just so many principles so.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to see if I've got this correct. As I understand somebody, possibly Tom, will be presenting this to the Regional Leadership or whatever we are called at this point in order to add to the projects that will be considered by the entire group for approval, support, and any other kind of implementation that's possible. So do I have that part right?

Garrett: Yes you do.

Pedroza: Okay. And do we know who will be presenting, will it be Tom or?

Garrett: I'm going to assume that the representative from the different entities will make a presentation, so the County will have three, the City will have three …

Pedroza: Okay.

Garrett: Mesilla Valley MPO will have three, Town of Mesilla will have three or up to three. So for all of us.

Pedroza: All right. Thank you very much.

Sorg: Okay.

Eakman: Mr. Chairman.

Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes, just a question for staff. Is the most comprehensive project here the first one, Roadrunner Parkway? And are we only talking about redesign, we're not talking about anything besides redesign? What is involved in that very first one?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. I'm not sure we have these in any specific order. I do know that the idea behind the Roadrunner Parkway would be to make it multimodal which would involve probably narrowing the median to have enough width to add bike lanes, some buffers for the sidewalks, and therefore it would be a very expensive project relative to most of these others, although the US-70/North Main bridge would also be quite an expensive undertaking as well, but I don't believe we put these in any kind of order that should infer any values. Just a list.
Eakman: Oh, and correct, I did not mean that that was priority one, it was just listed on the page as number one. So in those words "redesign" it is the full scope of redesign; contracting, execution, opening, it's the entire.

Murphy: Yes sir.

Eakman: Thank you.

Sorg: If I may add a comment to that particular project in itself, the former representative from District 6 often times spoke at the MPO and other places about the danger that Roadrunner Parkway has in this area, this part of it for pedestrians and for bicyclists and she's always asked for remedies, should we call it, or fixes to that street or road and so I think it's quite important that we have it on the list. Complete street, and then going into this in general, it looks to me like without going in to, most of these projects seem to be converting for more complete streets in general for multimodal use of modes of transportation. Am I correct in saying that?

Murphy: Mr. Chair. I would say that's essentially correct because I think one of the underlying principles of the last MTP was that we were going to concentrate on the existing communities in line with that one liability principle.

Sorg: Right.

Murphy: So we did not have developed a lot of new projects for the MTP.

Sorg: Okay. Well I'm glad to see this, this is something I've been wondering about for a long time. I'm glad we're changing existing roads so there are more along complete street standards. Any other questions or comments about the resolution?

Pedroza: I have a question.

Sorg: Commissioner, Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Then are we, do we have here the task of from the entire list, picking out the top three that we want or what is it that we're supposed to be doing?

Sorg: I do not know. Would you like to explain that Mr. Murphy?

Murphy: From what I understood was the ROC had asked for no more than three.

Pedroza: We look at them all again so that we can.
Murphy: I'll move back over to the map.

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: So if you want me to zoom in any particular area. And I imagine if you just want to pick one that would suffice with our instructions as well, but probably should do three.

Pedroza: Okay.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Go ahead.

Garrett: If I could I think we all are aware that the state is dealing with some pretty significant financial issues and it's not at all clear how much money is going to be available for capital projects. The discussion is that we had at the RLC was that, this is really an opportunity for us to showcase to other members of the consortium and to legislatures and to the general public how the livability principles work for different entities that are part of the consortium. And so I'm being very practical about this. I look at this in sense as an educational effort as much as it is anything else and it's also that we're sort of priming the pump for the future. So in order to kind of move this off of neutral, I just want to suggest that something like the Roadrunner Parkway which is moving toward a complete street concept, it's something that's very much in alignment with a number of the livability principles. I think that the idea of the connection to Bosque Park by redoing the Calle Del Norte bridge crossing is another one that has to do with access to different areas in the County. That this is something that's, fourth from the bottom, and it's going to reinforce cycling, hiking, there's all that kind of thing and I think the last one that I would just call to your attention is the multiuse path on the south side of Tortugas. Again that's something that has to do, these are all things that in sense have regional implications or they certainly are bigger than one neighborhood. And I think that they would stand in good stead in terms of presenting the interests of the MPO and Viva Dona Ana. I'm just putting those out as a reference point.

Flores: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Go ahead.

Flores: Might I suggest that we number the ones on the page and then perhaps give numbers to the ones up on the map and then maybe everybody pick out three and then see if there's a consensus and then if there's a tie or
whatever maybe we can have some more discussion, just as a way to move forward.

Sorg: I had a little difficult hearing you. May I try to understand, we, each of us would number three of them.

Flores: Number the ones on the page so that way everybody's dealing with the same projects, and the difficulty is going to be that the ones on the map are not on the page, right?

Murphy: That's correct.

Flores: So we need to have those as possible options as well, however I will point out that some of these on the page have already gotten, on the map have already been funded and so for me I'm looking to, as a practical matter to have this be a way to get funding and so I'm going to cut those out that have already been funded, and basically look to what hasn't been funded and that's how I'm going to rate things. But we need to have the ones on the map numbered so perhaps we can go through the projects and add those. There are 15 projects on the page, so maybe we can all just, if you could just state the ones on the map and then give them a number starting with 16 and then that way people on the committee can just kind of look through them, decide what they want to, and put in three and then maybe we can kind of count up and then discuss those that have been on there and limit it that way.

Sorg: Very good. I think that's a good idea. Is the rest of the committee would like to go that route? Okay.

Pedroza: I have one question. Can you tell, identify which of the ones on the list have already been funded?

Sorg: Please that would, we're going to do that next. Yes.

Pedroza: Okay.

Sorg: Mr. Murphy you're in charge.

Murphy: Okay I'm trying to think through how to, if I can transfer this over to at least the document.

Sorg: Can you highlight the ones that aren't funded? The ones we need to look at.
Murphy: I'm going to try different color highlighting in order to ... That too dark?
You said to highlight the funded ones, is that correct or highlight the unfunded ones?

Sorg: It doesn't matter.

Murphy: Okay.

Sorg: So long as we know which is which.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: While he's doing that Trustee Flores brought up those on the map that were already funded; so US-70/Picacho/17th Street intersection, we're currently planning on putting a signal there.

Sorg: Yeah.

Doolittle: The Spitz/Three Crosses was also on the map, that one bids on Friday so that one's currently being approved. The Triviz/University multiuse path underneath to NMSU, we're currently under a study and design as part of that interchange improvement. So I think those the three that Trustee Flores was mentioning are on the map that we're currently pursuing design, actually two of 'em it's a little late for, to include those in our list. University I think we're always happy to have some money, but it is fully funded at this point.

The other thing I just wanted to share my thoughts on this, a lot of these honestly I'm not fully aware of. There's not a whole lot of information on these. One of them that does show up on here that I'm a little bit concerned about is a DOT route, it's the connection to the Bosque Park on Calle Del Norte. Right now Calle Del Norte doesn't have any shoulders so widening the bridge at this point, you still have access issues on both sides of the bridge. Trustee Flores did mention to me that is part of their plan to incorporate a multiuse path to the path that runs along the river to La Llorona Park. But I think at least from my perspective I'm having some difficulty rating these only because other than a location and a slight improvement or issue, I don't really know what the scope is, what the intent is, you know how does it connect. So I just wanted to voice that. I think I could go through here. I was jokingly sharing with the Trustee I'm gonna pick all DOT routes but I think I know where that gets the DOT with the Board, but I think I could come up with a list of three, I just, the limited information makes it a little difficult for me personally.

Sorg: I have to agree. Trustee Flores.
Flores: Yes, I just want to say that we kind of decided to do this after having a speaker come and it was just an idea that was out there and because of the way we have our meetings, you know we're not having a meeting this month, we're having a meeting next month, and the way funding gets done, we just kind of wanted to quickly come up with some type of way to bring some projects out there. And we're going to refine it and people will have more time the next time around, but this is just kind of like the first round of "Hey let's try and promote some projects in the region." So this is the first time around and hopefully next year we'll be ahead of the ball and that way our member organizations will be ahead of the ball and be given some more warning so we apologize.

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: And then additionally, and I don't remember what I was going to say for the second part we were commenting on. Never mind, I'll raise my hand if I remember what I was going to say after that.

Sorg: Okay. Mr. Trent.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just one other example that I've got for you is Stern Drive is on this list, talks about road deterioration but Stern Drive runs all the way from Union, really it runs all the way down to Vado and even further and we recently just repaved Stern from Union to Cholla. So not knowing termini tied to that section, again makes it a little bit difficult, but just another comment.

Sorg: Sure. Thank you. So Mr. Murphy are we done with your …

Murphy: I have the list numbered and split screen on there and I believe it should be large enough for view.

Sorg: Oh yeah. Large enough in two ways. We can see it well and there's 40 different projects here, is there not?

Murphy: Yes, including the 15 on the other sheet.

Sorg: Oh includes these.

Murphy: Yes.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: Those are …
Flores: Supposed to start with number 16.

Garrett: This goes to 15, that starts at 16.

Flores: So they'll all be on the same page.

Sorg: Okay, yeah. Okay, gotcha. So do you want us each to pick out three projects from the whole list and then turn them in and you guys tally them up and, how do you want to work this?

Murphy: I think that was Trustee Flores' suggestion of …

Sorg: What is the …

Murphy: It would be …

Sorg: Yeah what does the committee think?

Murphy: That's fine with me.

Sorg: Is there any objection to doing that?

Benavidez: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yeah, Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes I have a question regarding the last, number 15, the south side of Tortugas Hill. It's on BLM land, would that make a difference or is that project going to be funded?

Sorg: Mr. Murphy could you answer her question please?

Murphy: I'm sorry. Please restate the question.

Benavidez: The south side of Tortugas Hill, A Mountain, it's on BLM land. How is that going to, is it going to be funded?

Murphy: We wouldn't know the funding of any of this. I think that could be something that could be a future TAP funding cycle, for instance BLM has shown an interest in working with trails on their land. You know things used for public purpose, so I think the project is viable. I think BLM probably would support something like that, but again as Commissioner Garrett had pointed out nobody knows where the funding's coming from at this juncture.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. That's all.
Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Garrett: Thank you. Mr. Murphy I'm wondering if you or the staff have looked at
the list, both the 15 and then the other ones that we just pulled off the map
and if you have any sort of immediate sense of some of the projects that
from your perspective really do support and reinforce the livability
principles.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. In addition to the three that you had
pointed out on the illustrative list, I would say maybe the Spruce and the
Walton road diets which would be numbers nine and ten, you know
particularly the Walton one due to the reconfiguration of the Roadrunner
Transit routes and the ability for people to cross to shopping across from
that transfer area. I would also probably point out the El Paseo complete
streets has been a significant project for the City which would be number
22. I think the number 34, the Hadley bicycle boulevard you know
providing connection into the City's Amador Proximo planning area would
be good. I think some of the pedestrian, number 33, pedestrian crossings
along University, I think a lot of those are moving towards funding right
now and I know at least one of them going through the City's CIP cycle so
maybe that one might be highlighted by this time next month. But those
would be the ones that I would, and then 37 the Rio Grande Trail, those
would be the ones that I would maybe take a close look at.

Sorg: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Mr. Chair. I guess in just listening to the discussion and the comments
that the Board has made or the Members have made here and this is the
first time that I've seen this list and not really even knowing what each of
the projects consist of and dollar amounts that are attached to it, I think
Commissioner Garrett had a good point in saying, we don't know what to
expect for next year in terms of funding throughout the whole state and
whether we'll even have any capital outlay money designated to our
different legislatures for capital outlay projects. I'm just, I guess it's difficult
for me to try to prioritize these without having more information on each of
the project with a dollar amount attached to it to be realistic on what we
can present to the Camino Real Consortium, so that's my thought on that.

Sorg: Thank you. I understand. Commissioner or Trustee Flores you have
some more to say?

Flores: No, I just kind of agree that that would've been nice to be added, but we
have what we have and the meeting at the RLC is going to be on
December 2nd, so unless you can quickly access the costs or Mr. Murphy
can quickly access the costs so that we can add those on, I just think we
need to do what we can and make our votes and next year be mindful that
that that type of information needs to be included, maybe a packet on
each, a packet with a little more explanation on each project so that we'll
have better information while we're making decisions.

Sorg: Okay. Mr. Murphy wouldn't, let me throw something out and see if this
would work. Instead of just picking three, maybe picking five or six and if
one or two on the list because of costs aren't just able to be done,
because we don't know what the costs are at the moment, they could be
moved down and the ones that are affordable shall we call them, doable,
then take over, be higher on the list?

Murphy: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Will that work? I don't know.

Murphy: I'm not sure. This list was developed as part of our public outreach project
and development of the MTP. We don't have any very distinct cost
estimates for it, that's something that's always meant to be figured out
later on in the process. Had some general ballpark, an interchange
versus a road restriping kind of magnitude to kind of guess at that so we
don't have any real good costs. I think it, this is list in its entirety
represents what our identified through our public process as priorities for
the region. My preference would be to give this whole list to the RLC and
say this came through our process, these are all priorities. The MPO's not
a implementing agency. We're not going to be building any of these so I
think it would be just encouragement from us to either the County or the
City, the Town, the state, these are projects we suggest you do. It sounds
like we're being asked to provide a greater degree of encouragement and
saying okay this one rises above all the others, taking into consideration
the livability principles. So …

Sorg: Right.

Murphy: At this point I would advise to kind of stay away from the cost …

Sorg: Right.

Murphy: Because we've not done it, and which ones are most, from speaking with
your constituents and reviewing the livability principles, which one of these
projects do you feel achieve everyone's goals best.

Sorg: Yeah I understand. And I appreciate that, that's kind of the way I thought
in the first place. Let's turn them all in and let it, let somebody else decide
which we can do by affording them. All of them are necessary. All of
them have livability principles and eventually at some point in time all of
them should be done as soon as we get the funding available for them. So what does the Committee feel about that? Yes Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. Mr. Murphy are any of these on the ICIP, on anybody’s ICIP?

Murphy: I don't know off hand. I know that the Spruce and the Walton road diets in working with the BPAC we had submitted those to be considered onto the City's CIP. We've also been talking with Angela and Samuel over at the County as far as when their CIP cycle comes in and which of the cycling projects should be put onto that one. But beyond that I can't recall if any of these are currently on a CIP.

Garrett: And are any of these projects on any other funding list? Perhaps as a phase.

Murphy: The highlighted DOT projects are on the TIP. I think many of the, yeah those are …

Garrett: Could I make a suggestion? In order to sort of move this along. I understand the interest in having numbers if we've got numbers. And also I think an argument can be made for putting forward the entire list. What that does is that there's the danger of the RLC just saying it's too much and so we're not going to deal with anything on that list. So what I think we could potentially do is to put all 40 on a list and put at the top any project that we can find out that is in somebody's ICIP and then anything that's on the TIP could also be highlighted up at the top and then all the rest of them are projects that are worthy but haven't yet been developed to the point that they're on the TIP or they're on anybody's ICIP. And that way then if the RLC is going to concentrate on ICIP projects, that at least we'll say "Well here's that set," or if it's a matter of supporting the TIP then people can get behind that. But that at least will tell us that those are projects that are advanced enough to be looking for money and also it would mean that in those cases you'd be able to put down what the money is. I'm just going to suggest that we let it go at that and say that that's enough of input into the process.

Sorg: Any further comments? To my understanding I could be not completely accurate here but except for the ones that are highlighted, I don't think any of them are on current ICIP but some of them definitely would be considered in the next year's ICIP. And if that helps people decide that we pick out top priority ones here, fine. That's good. I think that'll be a good idea, don't you think? What's the Committee think? So Mr. Murphy would you like to instruct us how to proceed?

Murphy: I think if maybe on the back of the sheet handed out, each member can write the number down of their top three, staff will then accumulate those
and see which gets multiple votes and we'll count that or assemble that
top ones, one through three.

Murphy: I think there's no way …

Sorg: Four, five, six.

Murphy: That this Board can pick more than 24 at this point, so we'll get 16
dropping off right away.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: Hopefully we'll filter some that way.

Sorg: Don't lose those 16 though.

Murphy: No.

Sorg: Yeah we'll save them for later. Okay. Thank you. So let's proceed and
go ahead and do that. I'll give you a minute to select three and write the
three numbers on the back of the page we got and then we'll proceed from
there.

Pedroza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Pedroza: Could Tom give us the first 15 or are those first 15 the ones on the sheet?

Murphy: Yes.

Pedroza: I see. So we do have all of them here. Okay, thank you.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I do have one quick comment that kind of goes along with mine
a little bit earlier. I don't know if it's my engineering mind or the lack of
information, I just don't feel comfortable selecting projects out of this list of
40. I think you yourself made the comment that all of these have value
and at some point meet some of those bullets outlined. Not to cop out in
this exercise, but I think I'm going to have to abstain. I just don't feel
comfortable selecting three. Maybe once we reduce them down a little bit.
I just don't have enough information, even on my own internal DOT routes,
like the one I mentioned was Stern. I don't know where that is. I don't
know what they're planning on doing. So at this point I think at least for
the initial round I can certainly provide some input, but I don't feel
comfortable selecting three projects.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.


Garrett: Well there is the alternative that I had suggested before and that is to
leave the list at 40, clean it up, and put at the top of the list any projects,
and I don't think it matters what order they're in cause there're not going to
be that many, any project that's on the list that's on an ICIP just goes to
the top and gets identified as this is on the Las Cruces ICIP or it's on the
Mesilla ICIP or whatever. Then identify in the next band any projects that
are on our list for TIP. And then just list everything else below that. And
that way we've giving them the whole list, we're identifying those that are
at a certain stage in the process in terms of specificity, budget, and
development. And it seems to me that that's, as we've said, you could
probably make an argument for any of our projects that to some degree
they're going to be supportive of the livability principle. This is the way
we've been working. So that's a suggestion in terms of narrowing it down
and not overstepping what we know.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair if …

Sorg: Go ahead.

Doolittle: I tend to agree with that approach. I don't if we can make that as the
motion in an effort to move forward or how that would take place, but I feel
more comfortable with that because then it is tied to some sort of step in
the process but I appreciate that comment and that recommendation.

Sorg: Seeing a nodding head there I would suggest we make a motion.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. I …

Sorg: Mr. Garrett.

Garrett: Move that we advance a list of 40 projects based on the ones that we
have seen today to the Camino Real, RLC and that at the very top of the
list we place any projects out of the 40 that are on an ICIP list and below
that we put a band of any projects of the 40 which are on the TIP funding
list and everything else is simply listed as it's been presented.

Doolittle: I second that motion.
Sorg: Okay it's moved, motion's been moved and seconded. Is there further discussion? Trustee Flores.

Flores: I would just recommend that we eliminate anything that's no on the ICIP or TIP just to make it easier because the request was for three projects so that's my …

Sorg: What projects do we have if we eliminate those two? If it's not on an ICIP which as far as I'm concerned I don't remember seeing any of these on the City's ICIP yet and I don't know what's on the County's and I don't know what's on the TIP.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yeah, go ahead.

Garrett: If I could. I think that what this motion does is actually accomplish two things that we talked about. One is that we want the RLC to be aware of the projects that are in the mix from the point of view of the Mesilla Valley MPO and I think that that's important for them to see the whole list of all 40. By also then highlighting the other two categories this will give staff time to find out, to do the research to find out what's actually on an ICP, if we've got it. If not, it'll just be TIP projects and so I think it will, from that we'll be able to say here's a list to look at. So I think we can do both objectives that we were talking about.

Sorg: Okay. Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes, thank you. I appreciate everyone's view on this. I will be voting against this motion because I do believe that we could advance some things based on just livability issues and it's not a firm decision, nothing is in concrete, but you know I would prefer to give my own three to staff to see what happens and so please understand I know what you're doing, I'll just be voting against it.

Sorg: Any other further comments? Questions?

Barraza: Mr. Chair just for …

Sorg: Mayor.

Barraza: Clarification on the motion that is on the floor made by Commissioner Garrett. Basically I like that idea that we'll list all 40 projects but then we're going to show the trail whether they're on someone's ICIP or on the TIP list, but it's going to show a history of each of the projects that we're going to be listing. Am I correct in saying that?
Garrett: I'm not sure what you mean by "history."

Barraza: Well just that they're on someone's list as a project to move forward.

Garrett: Right. The motion is basically that at the very top of the list we would have a band and it would be any projects that are on an ICIP. The second band would take out of the 40 and put second as a grouping anything that's on the TIP and that everything else would be below that. And I think that the idea is that the presentation to the RLC would consist of the things that are at the very top. There's not a great deal of additional analysis here. We're doing exactly I think what was intended by this exercise which is think about the bigger picture and how this stuff relates to the livability principles and if we're not actually doing that in a rigorous way we need to be doing that in a more rigorous way as we move forward so.

Barraza: Okay. And Mr. Chair I guess it's just difficult decision to make not knowing the history of each of the different projects that are being presented because I would want to push a project that's for the Town of Mesilla forward and make that you know as one on the top as I'm sure the other members here that are representing their municipality or county and we would like to see those moving forward. So to me it's a difficult decision to make I guess.

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle and then Councilor Pedroza.

Doolittle: So it was brought to my attention that any thing that's currently a TIP project is already fully funded, so do we need to include that on a list because we don't need additional funding for those projects?

Sorg: Good point Mr. Doolittle. We don't need to put that on the list.

Flores: Maybe we could put it on the bottom of the list and say this is already funded, just for education purposes.

Sorg: All right.

Flores: So for educational purposes we're letting you know what we've worked on and what's already being funded.

Sorg: Kind of a separate side list. Okay, Councilor.

Pedroza: Thank you. I think that we shouldn't think that the RLC is not going to ask questions. Absolutely there are going to be questions, but I think that we do not need to provide every single answer to every possible question today. I don't see how anybody could. I think that the compromise, the
motion to present them all and say which ones are on somebody's wish list or ICIP list, etc., will be very, very helpful to people. And if all the ones on the TIP are funded, well then will certainly be information that's helpful to the RLC to know. So I would not try to be all things to all people, and instead just kind of present the RLC with as much information, valid, as we can. Thank you.

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: I'm sorry Mr. Chair. I just have one more quick comment. Looking at the list numbers 21 and 27 are the same project. So we need to take one of those off. And then I also noticed on the bullets on the map that the US-70/17th Street intersection although fully funded was on the map, but I didn't find it on this list anywhere so I would just, I think we just need to make sure that the list is truly comprehensive and there's no duplications when MPO staff compiles that list.

Sorg: Good point. Thank you.

Garrett: Mr. Chair, I'll take that as a friendly amendment as well as the point about putting the funded projects at the bottom of the list.

Sorg: All right. Then I think we should have a vote on the, I think we're ready to have a vote on the motion. Mr. Murphy could you poll.

Murphy: Member Barraza.

Sorg: One more question. Hold it. Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes can you pull back the list of projects back. Can you explain number 37, the Rio Grande Trail from Sunland Park to Albuquerque? What is that please?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. That is the, in our region it'd be the extension of the La Llorona Trail that kind of fits into the Rio Grande Trail that goes statewide that I believe Jeff Steinborn had been promoting through the legislature and I think they recently dedicated La Llorona as part of that system. This project list's an extension of that within the MPO area.

Benavidez: And it would go through the Rio Grande, all the way from Albuquerque to Sunland Park?

Murphy: It would be part of that system, yes.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. No further questions.
Sorg: Okay. Seeing no more lights on. Now you can poll, on the motion.

Murphy: Member Barraza.

Barraza: No.

Murphy: Member Flores.

Flores: I'm sorry, what are we voting on again? I was talking. I apologize.

Sorg: The motion.

Murphy: The motion to submit the 40 list with the friendly amendments.

Flores: Okay. Yes.

Murphy: Member Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Member Benavidez.

Benavidez: No.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Member Eakman.

Eakman: No.

Murphy: Member Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair.

Sorg: Yes. So ...

Murphy: That passes.

Sorg: Now we need to vote on the resolution itself. Any last words? Seeing none. Poll the Committee Mr. Murphy for the resolution.
Murphy: Member Barraza.

Barraza: No.

Murphy: Member Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Member Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Member Benavidez.

Benavidez: No.

Murphy: Member Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Member Eakman.

Eakman: No.

Murphy: Member Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 NMDOT update

Sorg: Okay, now going on. There's discussion items is the next thing on the agenda. Is there any discussion items from NMDOT?

Doolittle: I gave just a relief brief update last week but officially I just wanted to remind the Board that on Friday we are opening bids for the Spitz/Three Crosses project. So next month I'll have an update on our potential low bidder and then I'll have a better update on construction season but between now and probably February our update's going to be pretty quiet.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Doolittle.
8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Sorg: Is there any other comments from the Committee or staff? Seeing none.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:00 PM)

Sorg: I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Eakman: So moved.

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman.

Barraza: Second.

Sorg: Second by Mayor Barraza. All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: The Committee meeting is adjourned.

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

AGENDA ITEM:
2017 MPO Meeting Schedule

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of 2017 MPO Meeting Schedule

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2017 MPO Schedule of Meetings

DISCUSSION:
This item is to adopt the 2017 MPO Meeting Schedule.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-16

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2017 MEETING SCHEDULE

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Policy Committee has the authority to adopt and amend the MPO’s schedule of meetings as it deems appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the MPO’s Bylaws and Open Meetings Resolution have identified the guidelines for regular, special and emergency meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the 2017 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO Committees to be APPROVED.

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

(I) THAT the proposed 2017 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO committees, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made part of this resolution, be APPROVED.

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

DONE and APPROVED this 14th day of December, 2016.
**APPROVED:**


__________________________  
Chair

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

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

**ATTEST:**


__________________________  
Recording Secretary

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**


__________________________  
City Attorney
Exhibit “A” 2017 Schedule of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Policy Committee</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>BPAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>17th (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>8th (TIP)</td>
<td>2nd (TIP)</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10th (TIP)</td>
<td>4th (TIP)</td>
<td>16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18th (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>9th (TIP)</td>
<td>3rd (TIP)</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>17th (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>8th (TIP)</td>
<td>2nd (TIP)</td>
<td>21st (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>16th (TIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Committee Meetings for January – June 2017 and January 2018
Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meetings for August – December 2017
Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for January – June 2017 and January 2018
Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for August – December 2017
Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meetings 2017
Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard
Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF December 14, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval by 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:

<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>LC00160</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Valley Drive – Picacho to CLC Limits</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction and ADA Improvements</td>
<td>Added $1.4 Million in FY2017 for Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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,

Jolene Herrera
NMDOT Urban & Regional Planner

CC: Tom Murphy, MVMPO Officer
    Andrew Wray, MVMPO Transportation Planner
    Trent Doolittle, NMDOT District 1 Engineer
RESOLUTION NO. 16-17

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 an Out-of-Cycle amendment to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

WHEREAS, NMDOT has provided the required Out-of-Cycle amendment justification letter; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its December 1, 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 14th day of December, 2016.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By:
Second By:

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

ATTEST:    APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________    ____________________________
A RESOLUTION RESCENDING THE CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM OF MPO PROJECT PRIORITIES (RESOLUTION 16-15) AND ADVISING THE CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM OF NEW MPO PROJECT PRIORITIES

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization developed a list of regionally significant projects as part of Transport 2040: Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, the Camino Real Consortium requested a list of project priorities from the Mesilla Valley MPO; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee developed a list of recommended list of projects and submitted it to the Camino Real Consortium (see Resolution 16-15);

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has reconsidered the list of recommended list of projects recommended to the Camino Real Consortium and developed a revised list of recommended projects (see Exhibit “A”);

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

(I)

THAT the revised project list as shown in Exhibit “A” attached replaces the previous list in Resolution 16-15.

(II)

THAT the revised project list Exhibit “A” be submitted to the Camino Real Consortium as the recommend list of projects;

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

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

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

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

VOTE:

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

ATTEST: 

__________________________
Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
City Attorney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue/Improvement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS Implementation</td>
<td>ITS Signal Coordination Plan for City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>$3.5M funded by City Hold Harmless GRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadrunner Parkway (US 70 to Lohman)</td>
<td>Redesign as a Complete Street</td>
<td>Applied to CLC ICIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce (Main to Triviz)</td>
<td>Road diet</td>
<td>Applied to CLC ICIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton (Lohman to Griggs)</td>
<td>Road diet</td>
<td>Applied to CLC ICIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Road diet</td>
<td>Applied to CLC ICIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut (Lohman to Griggs)</td>
<td>Road diet</td>
<td>Tier 1 Bicycle Priority/ Applied to CLC ICIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri/Roadrunner Extension to Sonoma Ranch</td>
<td>Connection of Missouri/Roadrunner to Sonoma Ranch</td>
<td>Phase A report adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Ranch</td>
<td>Sonoma Ranch Study Area</td>
<td>MPO UPWP FY18 ($200K State Planning and Research (SPR)funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Bosque Park</td>
<td>Improve Calle del Norte bridge crossing</td>
<td>Proposed Tier 1 Trail System Priorities Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side of Tortugas Hill (A Mountain)</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>On BLM Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melendres</td>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver Road</td>
<td>Shoulders</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 70/North Main bridge widening</td>
<td>Bridge not wide enough for bicycle lanes or pedestrians</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Alturas (University to Mesquite Interchange)</td>
<td>Road deterioration and bicycle lanes/shoulders</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>Road deterioration and bicycle lanes/shoulders</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griggs</td>
<td>Wide street needs bicycle lanes for traffic calming</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Arroyo</td>
<td>Designated Trail</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces Arroyo South Fork</td>
<td>Designated Trail</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Main (Downtown to University)</td>
<td>Shoulder work for bicycle facility</td>
<td>Tier 1 Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engler Interchange</td>
<td>Requires Interstate Access Request</td>
<td>Engler grade separation project allotted for future interchange geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Interchange at I-10</td>
<td>Requires Interstate Access Request – I-10/I-25 IAR considered possible future interchange at Arrowhead</td>
<td>A new IAR will be required for future interchange geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazitos Interchange at I-10</td>
<td>Requires Interstate Access Request</td>
<td>Potential location identified during I-10 widening (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paseo and Idaho</td>
<td>Safety Improvements</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Adapting intersection striping for bicycle use per NACTO guidelines</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paseo</td>
<td>El Paseo Complete Street Implementation</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Issue/Improvement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Mesilla</td>
<td>Sidewalk assessment</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/TOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Asset Management on Sidewalks</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/Juridictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Improvements leading to ZTrans bus stop on East Mesa</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/ZTrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Improvements leading to RoadRUNNER bus stops</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadley</td>
<td>Hadley bicycle boulevard</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutz</td>
<td>Installation of bike lanes</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bike Route 7</td>
<td>Reroute State Bike Route 7 off US 70</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/NMDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoadRUNNER Transit</td>
<td>Relocate Mesilla Valley Mall Transfer Point</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Already Funded/on TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue/Improvement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triviz Grade Separation at University</td>
<td>Interchange Redesign</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/NMDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mesa Corridor Study</td>
<td>Study of potential West Mesa Road</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/NMDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements on University</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Trail</td>
<td>Portion of statewide trail from Albuquerque to Sunland Park</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Range Transit Plan</td>
<td>Implement findings of short range transit plan</td>
<td>MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE TPB MEETING OF November 18, 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 November 18, 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

New Mexico Related Items
There were no New Mexico related items discussed at this meeting.