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 7, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in the Las Cruces City Hall, 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. 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 2, 2017 _____________________________________________________________________
4. PUBLIC COMMENT _________________________________________________________________________ Chair
5. ACTION ITEMS _____________________________________________________________________________
   5.1. UPWP Amendment: FFY17 carryover ____________________________________________________ MPO Staff
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS _________________________________________________________________________
   6.1. Potential FY19-FY20 UPWP items
7. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS ___________________________________________________________
   7.1. City of Las Cruces, Doña Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, and SCRTD Project Updates ___________ Jurisdictional Staff
   7.2. NMDOT Projects Update ________________________________ NMDOT Staff
   7.3. MPO Staff Update _______________________________________ MPO Staff
8. PUBLIC COMMENT _________________________________________________________________________ Chair
9. ADJOURNMENT______________________________________________________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held November 2, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
- David Armijo (SCRTD)
- Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
- Bill Childress (BLM)
- Michael Garza (DAC Flood Commission)
- Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
- Harold Love (NMDOT)
- Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
- Lily Sensiba (EBID)
- Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
- Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)

MEMBERS ABSENT:
- Todd Gregory (LCPS)
- Dale Harrell (NMSU)
- Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)
- Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
- Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)

STAFF PRESENT:
- Tom Murphy (MPO Staff)
- Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
- Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)
- Dominic Loya (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT:
- Rosa Kozub, NMDOT
- Wade Patterson, NMDOT
- Shannon Glendenning, NMDOT
- George Pearson, MPO BPAC
- Sean Barham, LCPS
- Aaron Sussman, Bohannan Huston
- Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (4:05 PM)

Trevino: Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the Mesilla Valley MPO Technical Advisory Committee for November 2, 2017. We'll go ahead and call roll starting from the right.

Shannon: Larry Shannon, Town of Mesilla.
Lujan:  Debbie Lujan, Town of Mesilla.

Love:  Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

Herrera:  Jolene Herrera, New Mexico DOT.

Armijo:  David Armijo, South Central Regional Transit District.

Sensiba:  Lily Sensiba, EBID.

Trevino:  Tony Trevino, City of Las Cruces Public Works.

Garza:  Michael Garza, Dona Ana County Flood Commission.

Sambrano:  Daniel Sambrano, Dona Ana County Engineering.

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

Childress:  Bill Childress, Bureau of Land Management.

Wray:  Mr. Chair. We should note that Mr. Garza from Flood Commission is a new appointee as of today, so welcome to the TAC.

Trevino:  Congratulations.

2.  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Trevino:  All righty. Item number two would be the approval of the agenda. Is there any changes from staff?

Wray:  No, Mr. Chair.

Trevino:  Board, Committee? No changes. So do I hear a motion to approve it?

Sambrano:  Motion to approve.

Garza:  Second.

Trevino:  All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Trevino:  Motion passes.

3.  APPROVAL OF MINUTES
3.1 October 5, 2017

Trevino: Okay. Item number three, approval of the minutes. I didn't see any changes to it. Staff, Committee, any changes? I hear none. Hear a motion to approve.

Bartholomew: I move we approve the minutes of October 5th.

Herrera: I second.

Trevino: All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Trevino: Motion passes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Trevino: Okay. Number four, public comment. Are there any comments from the public out there? Going once, twice. I hear none.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Amendments to the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program

Trevino: So we'll move on to action item number five.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: I have no additional comments but I'll answer any questions. Mr. Chair. If there's no other discussion I'll make a motion to recommend the amendments to the 2018-2023 TIP.

Trevino: Is there a second?

Love: Second.

Trevino: All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5.2 Mesilla Valley MPO Safety Targets Recommendation

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
Trevino: I see no questions. With no questions, do I hear a motion to approve?

Bartholomew: I move we recommend the MPO safety targets.

Trevino: I hear a second?

Shannon: Second.

Trevino: All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Trevino: Motion passes.

5.3 RoadRUNNER Transit Asset Management Goals

Trevino: On to action item number 5.3, the RoadRUNNER Transit Asset Management Goals.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to introduce Mr. Michael McAdams who'll speak on this item.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: Again I was talking with Mr. McAdams and I know this is something that the NMDOT Transit and Rail Division had just asked what we had said and I just want to point out that the two goals that we've provided them so far are the ones we've set for vehicles. We're still working on our facility goals at this point in time. As a Tier 2 agency we're still working on our TAMs plan that's going to be due in October of 2018 and the facilities part of it will take some coordination with our City Facilities Department to make sure it's all in place. But we had an option of reporting our goals in this year's National Transit Database, or NTD reporting but it was only optional this year and will be mandatory next year. And I'll be open to any questions.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I have some questions. Mike, can you tell us why you chose 14 years? Is there a reason for that? This question came up at the BPAC and we didn't have a good answer for that. So is that just pretty standard or …

Bartholomew: Well what we need to establish as part of our Transit Asset Management Plan is what they call the ULB, is the Useful Life Benchmark and it's based pretty much on our past experience with our buses. Now FTA has allowed funding for buses that have met thresholds of 12 years or half million miles on the buses and in reality that's basically the time we start finding the
funding to replace the buses. Our buses do typically, we keep, try to, well
not that we necessarily wanted to but they ended up being in service for
anywhere from 14, and when they start hitting 16 years they're really, it's
really getting difficult and in fact we had some buses it was hard to find
parts for when they start getting that old. So I think after 14 years the
biggest issues are going to be finding the parts and the maintenance costs
are just getting so high on the buses after that point.

Herrera: Thanks. That makes sense. I guess the other part of that question that I
didn't ask, that came up at BPAC was why there wasn't some kind of
mileage tied to it. So I think we were more curious as far as, "Why was it
number of years instead of years or miles?"

Bartholomew: I guess in our case looking at years, we've never exceeded the mileage
on the buses, that half-million miles. Generally even at 14 years when
we're retiring them they, well I think we had some buses that just hit 16
years were the ones that we're having difficulty finding parts for, and I
think those buses may have just hit half a million miles. So I think that to
look at the eligible replacement based on mileage only, we just don't do
enough rural driving, not like David does there in the Regional Transit
District, so we're just not racking up the miles like the systems that have
more rural miles to travel.

Herrera: Thank you.

Trevino: Is there any other questions from the Committee? Staff? On that note, do
I have a motion to approve both goals for the RoadRUNNER Transit Asset
Management?

Love: So moved.

Bartholomew: I'll second.

Trevino: All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 New Mexico Statewide Bike Plan Presentation

Trevino: Okay. Move on to action item number six, which is New Mexico Statewide
Bike Plan presentation.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We're very pleased to have with us this afternoon
Mr. Wade Patterson from NMDOT is going to kick off the presentation.
WADE PATTERSON AND AARON SUSSMAN GAVE THEIR PRESENTATION.

Trevino: Is there questions from the Committee?

Childress: Did you have some good interaction with the local group at lunchtime today and did they provide you some good insight?

Sussman: Well I will admit that my opinion is probably rather biased but I felt like it was a very constructive meeting, yes.

Childress: Okay. That's good to hear. Thanks.

Bartholomew: When you get to the point of doing public outreach, are you going to maybe even be specifically targeting outreach to economically disadvantaged areas where a bike might be the only wheeled transportation other than our buses that they would have access to?

Sussman: Sure. That's a good question. So obviously we're trying to reach as broad an audience as possible through the outreach efforts, but we're also building those considerations into our analysis of locations where bicycle infrastructure might be most appropriate on two real levels in particular. The first is through this equity analysis, to examine locations that have poverty levels above the state average, and also where there are locations where vehicle ownership is well below the state average. So locations where you essentially have the greatest propensity or likelihood for individuals to rely on bicycle for basic travel needs. So that's a real component of it. And then the integration and access to public transit across the state is a major consideration that's built into our demand analysis as well.

Bartholomew: And if you do specifically reach out to those areas, are you going to provide interpretive services if English is limited for some of the individuals?

Sussman: Sure. So we've translated a number of our documents into Spanish on the website. There is a Spanish language tab for individuals to access information about the plan in Spanish as well, and then we have Spanish language speakers on staff who can guide anybody who may pose questions to us, either by e-mail or by phone.

Bartholomew: And I guess my final question was can you define what, when you say "infrastructure" what kinds of facilities are you talking about?

Sussman: Sure. That's a good question. So we didn't get into a lot of detail today in terms of what the design guidelines will mean. That's something that we'll
flesh out over the next several months. But logically in more urban areas
you're talking about on-street bicycle lanes. In the most developed
settings you're talking about bicycle buffers, more rural areas you're
talking about rumble strips and wide shoulders. We'll provide guidance on
the type of signage and pavement markings that are appropriate. So it will
vary a little bit depending on location but those are some of the types of
facilities that we'll look at.

Bartholomew: Would it include like even bike sharing facilities or things like that?

Sussman: So that's something of a programmatic question rather than an
infrastructure, what goes on the ground. But as that's a growing
consideration as an expanding program in the City of Albuquerque, that
they're helping expand to Santa Fe, we talked to BPAC this afternoon
about the potential for bike share and dockless bike share companies that
are expanding all across the country and looking at Las Cruces as well.
So all of that means that there's going to likely be an increase in the
presence of bicyclists across the state. So that really does put an extra
onus on us to think about what's the appropriate infrastructure, because a
lot of bike share users are not the most advanced or most experienced
cyclists and that obviously is something that needs to be considered as
part of the design guidelines.

Bartholomew: And talking about getting back to the most advanced or inexperienced
riders and everything too, you know I was kind of tying that together with
the economically disadvantaged. For example, we have a bus route that
goes out as far as Porter Road on US-70. We do know we get customers
that regularly ride in from the Moongate area because that's the closest
point that they can access. So we're looking at what kind of bike facilities,
lockers, whatever we can put at that point too to help out. That's all I had.

Shannon: Would it help to have the different entities put this on their website to
gather further information through the websites and then have it forwarded
to you?

Sussman: MICROPHONE CUT OUT, NOT ON MICROPHONE.

Trevino: Is there any other questions from the Committee? With no other
questions, I appreciate the presentation.

Sussman: Thank you.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

7.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces
Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates
Trevino: Okay. On to item number seven, Committee and staff comment. I'll go ahead and get started with the City of Las Cruces, which is myself, Tony Trevino.

We got the Harrelson reconstruction project that I mentioned last month, which we're still waiting on some permits from NMDOT for some utility and storm drain. Once those are obtained we'll be able to go out for advertisement.

The Roadrunner Parkway extension from the westbound frontage road of Highway 70 to Settler's Pass, that should be going out to bid hopefully the end of November/beginning of December, so that will be on the plate here very shortly. And that's all I had so I will pass it on to Dona Ana County.

Sambrano: We have the Soledad Canyon plans at 60% and also we have the Dona Ana County Road realignment. The only thing we're waiting for that to go on is the right-of-way certification from DOT and they're normally pretty good about that so we should be going out to bid soon on that. And that's all we have.

Trevino: Okay. Town of Mesilla, you have anything?

Shannon: Mesilla has nothing to report.

Trevino: Okay. Is Las Cruces Public Schools, and they are not here today. How about RoadRUNNER Transit?

Bartholomew: I don't really have anything new to report that's different from last month's meeting other than we're continuing to work on the implementation of parts of our Short-Range Plan to add an additional route to our service in town and we really hope if we get the funding put together, the local side of the funding put together, we could be looking at January for adding that route.

Trevino: Thank you. How about SCRTD?

Armijo: Yes. Thank you. We've been working also increasing efficiencies and trying to add more trips, and we've been able to do that over the last several months. In the last two weeks we've shifted some of our resources to the City of Anthony and we're actually operating three of our routes from that location, so actually shifted where the buses are domiciled both here in Cruces and in Anthony, and what that's doing is it's saving us a lot of deadhead and fuel cost and miles. As we were mentioned earlier, Michael, you're correct. We put a lot of miles, when we have trips of 70 miles or more round-trip, anything you can do to save the deadhead is really big. So as a result we're actually increasing trips.
Ridership grew by 147% last year, and in the first quarter we're up about 35%, 45% over that. So our baseline has continued to grow and essentially it's just coming down to the fact that when we first started we were doing trips about every three hours apart, almost four hours and now we're within two hours and on the Red-Purple we're now getting to within an hour-plus in the peak hours. So there's a lot of ridership out there and a lot of folks are riding. And so growth of the system's doing very well with the limited fleet and limited resources. So we'll see what the year comes. I expect the ridership will probably be about a 40%, 50% growth in this year with the current rate.

Trevino: That's great news.
Armijo: Thanks.

7.2 NMDOT Projects Update

Trevino: Next up, NMDOT.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have a few projects in the area right now. I'll start with two of the smaller ones.

The project on Tortugas Drive to do some drainage and sidewalks is almost done. We have about another two to three weeks on that project and then we'll be done.

The same type of project on Thorpe Road is complete, substantially complete. We have had final inspection so the contractor's just doing minor little cleanup things but we're pretty much done with that project.

Our big project at Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses is on track. We're doing a lot of concrete work right now, and so just be aware that there's going to be construction there for a while to come.

The project on US-70 over the pass, they're doing minor cleanup work now. The project is pretty much done. They're installing some flashers, putting in some signing, and just doing minor cleanup on the shoulders before they're completely out of there.

And then the two projects that we have in design, well Valley Drive is not in design. We let the project. Bids came in extremely high so we made the decision to go ahead and re LET that project and see hopefully if we can get more contractors to put bids in and hopefully they come down. So we'll just have to wait that out and see what happens. I believe it's on the schedule to re-bid this month, in November. So we'll know here in a few weeks.

And then we're also in design on the University/I-25 interchange project. We got the interstate access control request approved by FHWA and so we're moving forward. We're at about 30% design and working with the City and NMSU closely on that project. There are a lot of bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are going along with that project as well.
as just general traffic flow in the area because there is so much traffic there. And that's all I have unless there are any questions.

Trevino: Jolene. I got a question. Was the Thorpe Road and Tortugas, was that designed in-house or did you have a consultant for those two?

Herrera: No. We designed that in-house.

Trevino: In-house, okay.

Herrera: And those projects weren't taken through this MPO because they were 100% State-funded. So they were capital outlay funds that came through the State Reps for those areas.

Trevino: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? If not.

7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update

Trevino: We'll go on to MPO staff updates.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. MPO staff has no updates to provide this month.

Trevino: Great. Okay.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Trevino: Number eight, we'll go back to public comments, if there's any. I see none.

9. ADJOURNMENT (4:49 PM)

Trevino: So I'm going to request a motion to adjourn.

Bartholomew: I'll move we adjourn.

Trevino: All right. Thank you.

Childress: I second it.

Trevino: Okay. All right. Thank you everybody for coming. Bye.

______________________________
Chairperson
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## Appendix A – Budget Summary - Financial Resources Available

### Fiscal Year 2017 (Oct. 1 2016–September 30, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support and Administration</th>
<th>Transportation Improvement Program</th>
<th>General Development and Data Collection/Analysis</th>
<th>Transportation Planning</th>
<th>Special Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Program Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>41.11.00</td>
<td>41.12.00</td>
<td>41.13.00</td>
<td>41.14.00</td>
<td>41.15.00</td>
<td>$250,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA 112 (85%)</td>
<td>$77,882.10</td>
<td>$25,960.70</td>
<td>$103,842.80</td>
<td>$38,941.05</td>
<td>$12,980.35</td>
<td>$250,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (112) MATCH (15%)</td>
<td>$13,272.04</td>
<td>$4,424.01</td>
<td>$17,696.06</td>
<td>$6,636.02</td>
<td>$2,212.01</td>
<td>$44,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>$8,268</td>
<td>$2,756</td>
<td>$11,025</td>
<td>$4,134</td>
<td>$1,378</td>
<td>$27,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>$4,818</td>
<td>$1,606</td>
<td>$6,424</td>
<td>$2,409</td>
<td>$803</td>
<td>$16,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESILLA</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$248</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA GRANT 5303 (80%)</td>
<td>$10,924.35</td>
<td>$3,641.45</td>
<td>$52,890.15</td>
<td>$29,900.15</td>
<td>$138,742</td>
<td>$138,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC (5303) MATCH (20%)</td>
<td>$5,202.83</td>
<td>$1,734.28</td>
<td>$12,139.93</td>
<td>$3,466.55</td>
<td>$34,686</td>
<td>$173,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$107,281</td>
<td>$35,760</td>
<td>$186,569</td>
<td>$83,207</td>
<td>$65,454</td>
<td>$477,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 112)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 5303)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TOTAL</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fiscal Year 2018 (Oct. 1 2017–September 30, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support and Administration</th>
<th>Transportation Improvement Program</th>
<th>General Development and Data Collection/Analysis</th>
<th>Transportation Planning</th>
<th>Special Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Program Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>41.11.00</td>
<td>41.12.00</td>
<td>41.13.00</td>
<td>41.14.00</td>
<td>41.15.00</td>
<td>$248,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA 112 (85%)</td>
<td>$74,590.20</td>
<td>$24,863.40</td>
<td>$99,453.60</td>
<td>$37,295.10</td>
<td>$12,431.70</td>
<td>$248,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (112) MATCH (15%)</td>
<td>$12,711.06</td>
<td>$4,237.02</td>
<td>$16,948.09</td>
<td>$6,355.53</td>
<td>$2,118.51</td>
<td>$42,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>$7,919</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$10,559</td>
<td>$3,959</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$26,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>$4,614</td>
<td>$1,538</td>
<td>$6,152</td>
<td>$2,307</td>
<td>$769</td>
<td>$15,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESILLA</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$237</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA GRANT 5303 (80%)</td>
<td>$8,547.60</td>
<td>$2,849.20</td>
<td>$19,944.40</td>
<td>$19,944.40</td>
<td>$5,698.40</td>
<td>$56,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC (5303) MATCH (20%)</td>
<td>$2,136.90</td>
<td>$712.30</td>
<td>$4,986.10</td>
<td>$4,986.10</td>
<td>$1,424.60</td>
<td>$71,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$97,986</td>
<td>$32,662</td>
<td>$141,332</td>
<td>$68,581</td>
<td>$21,673</td>
<td>$362,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 112)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 5303)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TOTAL</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fiscal Year 2017 (Oct. 1 2016 - September 30, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>Program Support and Administration</th>
<th>Transportation Improvement Program</th>
<th>General Development and Data Collection/Analysis</th>
<th>Transportation Planning</th>
<th>Special Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA 112 (85%)</td>
<td>41.11.00</td>
<td>41.12.00</td>
<td>41.13.00</td>
<td>41.14.00</td>
<td>41.15.00</td>
<td>$202,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (112) MATCH(15%)</td>
<td>$10,330.85</td>
<td>$3,443.62</td>
<td>$13,774.47</td>
<td>$5,165.43</td>
<td>$1,721.81</td>
<td>$34,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>$6,436</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$8,581</td>
<td>$3,218</td>
<td>$1,073</td>
<td>$21,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESILLA</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA GRANT 5303(80%)</td>
<td>$10,924.35</td>
<td>$3,641.45</td>
<td>$52,890.15</td>
<td>$25,490.15</td>
<td>$46,792.90</td>
<td>$138,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC (5303) MATCH(20%)</td>
<td>$5,202.83</td>
<td>$1,734.28</td>
<td>$12,139.93</td>
<td>$3,468.55</td>
<td>$34,686</td>
<td>$173,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$87,081</td>
<td>$29,027</td>
<td>$159,635</td>
<td>$73,107</td>
<td>$62,087</td>
<td>$410,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 112)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 5303)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TOTAL</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fiscal Year 2018 (Oct. 1 2017 - September 30, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>Program Support and Administration</th>
<th>Transportation Improvement Program</th>
<th>General Development and Data Collection/Analysis</th>
<th>Transportation Planning</th>
<th>Special Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA 112 (85%)</td>
<td>41.11.00</td>
<td>41.12.00</td>
<td>41.13.00</td>
<td>41.14.00</td>
<td>41.15.00</td>
<td>$306,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (112) MATCH(15%)</td>
<td>$15,652.97</td>
<td>$5,217.66</td>
<td>$20,870.63</td>
<td>$7,826.49</td>
<td>$2,608.83</td>
<td>$52,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>$9,752</td>
<td>$3,251</td>
<td>$13,002</td>
<td>$4,876</td>
<td>$1,625</td>
<td>$32,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$1,894</td>
<td>$7,576</td>
<td>$2,841</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$18,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESILLA</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA GRANT 5303(80%)</td>
<td>$8,547.60</td>
<td>$2,849.20</td>
<td>$19,944.40</td>
<td>$19,944.40</td>
<td>$5,698.40</td>
<td>$56,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC (5303) MATCH(20%)</td>
<td>$2,136.90</td>
<td>$712.30</td>
<td>$4,986.10</td>
<td>$4,986.10</td>
<td>$1,424.60</td>
<td>$71,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$118,191</td>
<td>$39,397</td>
<td>$168,273</td>
<td>$78,684</td>
<td>$25,041</td>
<td>$429,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 112)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERCENT OF 5303)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TOTAL</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F – UPWP Amendment Summaries

Amendment 1 August 10, 2016

This amendment shifts the proposed A-Mountain Study Area and the Participatory Mapping project from FY17 to FY18 as we’ve been notified by NMDOT that SPR funding is not available for FY17.

Amendment 2 February 8, 2017

On December 30, 2016, it was confirmed by the New Mexico Department of Transportation, Division of Rail and Public Transit that the Mesilla Valley MPO could use carry-over monies from FY2016 and use it for projects in FY2017. The amount of the carry is $66,910. Staff proposes that this money be used to contribute additional money to assist in the City of Las Cruces Active Transportation Plan; and to purchase software to facilitate the tabulation of the data from the Automatic Passenger Counters installed on the buses of RoadRUNNER Transit.

In the FY2017-2018 UPWP, this would consist of:

1. Adding an additional item “Purchase transit passenger counting” in the Main Products and Schedule by Month section in Task 3.1 Traffic Counting and Reporting.;
2. Deleting the item “Sub-plan: Coordinated human Services” in the Main Products and Schedule by Month section in Task 4.1 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
3. Add an additional item in Task 5.5

Amendment 3 May 9, 2017

This amendment adjusts the budget tables for FY2018 based on a change in the federal obligation limit for the State of New Mexico. The MVMPO budget was reduced by $17,516 (federal and local match)

Amendment 4 December 13, 2017

Unexpended funding of $67,334.50 moved from FFY17 to FFY18.
AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Potential FY 19-20 UPWP Items

DISCUSSION:

Purpose of UPWP

The purpose of the Unified Planning Work Program is to outline intermodal transportation planning activities to be conducted within the Mesilla Valley MPO Planning Area within a financially constrained budget. The UPWP contains MPO work projects, budgets, and staff assignments for the upcoming fiscal year. The UPWP must comply with the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan. The Unified Planning Work Program is updated bi-annually.

Calendar for Adoption for FY 19-20 UPWP

The MPO staff will develop the work program and budget for the FY19-20 UPWP in accordance with the following schedule. (Exact dates may vary by a few days.):
- May 1, 2018: Draft of UPWP to NMDOT Transportation Planning and Safety Division (NMDOT TPSD), RoadRUNNER Transit, and South Central RTD
- May 1, 2018: UPWP is posted online for Public Review and Comment. Begin 30-day public comment period.
- May 31, 2018: MPO and NMDOT TPSD meeting on Draft UPWP
- June 1, 2018: MPO staff revises proposed UPWP if necessary
- Mid-June 2018: Policy Committee votes on approving UPWP (Opportunity for Public Comment at meeting)
- July 1, 2018: MPO submits approved UPWP to NMDOT TPSD
- October 1, 2018: Effective date of UPWP at beginning of Federal Fiscal Year

The public may participate in the development of the UPWP in a few ways. The first is to attend MVMPO’s Policy Committee meetings which are held on a monthly basis and are open to the public. The public can also review the draft document during the 30-day public comment period. During this time, an electronic copy of the UPWP will be posted on the MVMPO website at http://mesillavalleympo.org/. Additionally, information in the MVMPO Public Participation Procedures can also be found at http://mesillavalleympo.org/.

The MPO staff would like to initiate a discussion on possible items for inclusion in the FY18-20 UPWP. We request the TAC members review the attached potential items for the FY19-20 UPWP and also consider their agency’s needs for the upcoming UPWP to expand or comment on this preliminary list.
Attachment Discussion Item 6.1:
Potential Items for FY18-20 UPWP

1. **Short Range Regional Transit Plan**
   a. Inclusion of SCRTD and NMDOT commuter service in next update in addition to RoadRUNNER Transit
   b. use of APC data for stop and route analysis for RoadRUNNER Transit
   c. ridership surveys (demographic, origin and destination, manual boarding and alighting counts when necessary etc.)
   d. possibility of in-house/consultant cooperation
   e. incorporation of ridership forecasting software (i.e., STOPS, Streelytics Flow, TBEST, remix, etc.)
   f. collaboration with Uber/Lyft or similar service (time banks)
   g. route integration with potential commuter rail
   h. inclusion of marketing plan for all entities
   i. coordination with El Paso MPO, RTPO, South Central COG, NMDOT
   j. centralized maintenance facilities
   k. revised funding and revenue coordination
   l. coordination of fixed-route and para-transit service
   m. feeder and circulator service

2. **Data Collection**
   a. automated passenger counts
   b. bicycle and pedestrian counts
   c. vehicle count data improvements
      -geo-referencing
      -relational database linkages (i.e., year, peak periods, speeds etc.)
      -investigation of purchase of internet linked traffic counter equipment (tubeless systems)
      (microwave, radar) and more efficient data retrieval
   d. crashes (motorized and non-motorized)
   e. improved data coordination with related governmental and non-governmental agencies
   f. development of reports
      -collision Analysis for all mode and in coordination with State Performance Goals
      -transit performance
      -traffic count maps and reports
      -bicycle and pedestrian Count reports
      -expansion of National Transit Database reporting (potential)

2. **Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update Preparation**
   a. inclusion of automated or connected vehicles
   b. forecasts and possible improvements
   c. greater emphasis on safety for all modes
   d. inclusion of Transit Asset Management Plan
   e. inclusion of long range transit plan (optional)
   f. inclusion of findings from Active Transportation Plan
   g. greater emphasis on built environment and mixed used developments (i.e., Transit Oriented
Development, transit corridor development, pedestrian/bicycle/transit only development)
h. development of process for stakeholder and public participation process

3. **Long Range Transit Plan (separate or part of MTP Update?)**
   a. focus on Bus Rapid Transit and possible light rail
   b. additional transfer centers
   c. Transit Oriented Development
   d. circulator buses
   d. growth areas
   e. automated vehicles
   f. long range forecasting using transit forecasting software
   g. introduction of transit district for the region (merger of RoadRUNNER and SCRTD)
h. integration of local transit providers with possible Las Cruces-El Paso commuter rail
j. potential of interregional passenger high speed rail (El Paso-Las Cruces-Albuquerque-Santa Fe-Denver) or non-rail linkages to New Mexico Rail Runner Express

4. **Las Cruces-El Paso Commuter Rail Study Continuation**
   a. pre-engineering and detailed costs for improvements
   b. further analysis of rolling stock options
c. exploration of funding opportunities
d. discussions with NMDOT, Burlington-Northern Santa Fe, El Paso MPO etc.

5. **Participatory Mapping**
   a. possibility of use of cloud based mapping
   (this is being used in Statewide Bicycle Plan)
b. Use of paper maps and then transferal to GIS
c. incorporation with MTP update etc.