



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://MesillaValleyMPO.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

POLICY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO) to be held **September 5, 2018 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **City of Las Cruces Council Chambers**, 700 North Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://MesillaValleyMPO.org).

The MVMPO 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 MVMPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the MVMPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** _____ **Chair**
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____ **Chair**
Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
5.1. August 8, 2018 _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
6.1. Resolution 18-06: A Resolution Amending the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
7.1. Truck Route Map (proposed Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) amendment) **MPO Staff**
7.2. Committee training: NMDOT Policy and Procedures Manual _____ **MPO Staff**
7.3. NMDOT update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held August 8, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. in
6 the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:07)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
12 Commissioner Kim Hakes (DAC) (arrived 1:06)
13 Trustee Stephanie Johnson-Burick (Town of Mesilla)
14 Commissioner Benjamin Rawson (DAC) (arrived 1:09)
15 Commissioner Isabella Solis (DAC)
16 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
17

18 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Councilor Gabriel Vasquez (CLC)
19

20 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
21 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
22 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
23 Debra Fuller (MPO Staff)
24

25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
26

27 **1. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (1:00 PM)**
28

29 Eakman: I'd like to call the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
30 Organization Policy Committee to order. Welcome everyone.
31

32 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**
33

34 Eakman: I wonder if you would please review the agenda in front of you today and
35 declare whether or not you have a conflict of interest on any of the items
36 listed.
37

38 Sorg: I don't have any.
39

40 J-Burick: I don't have any either.
41

42 Solis: I don't have any conflict.
43

44 Eakman: Thank you so much. And once again I'm told I omitted something very
45 important. Let's all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.
46

1 ALL STAND FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

2
3 Eakman: And I always like to blame others. I wonder if in the future we could put
4 Pledge of Allegiance on a separate line.

5
6 Wray: We will do that.

7
8 Eakman: That would be helpful to this Chair. You can change it next year.

9
10 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

11
12 Eakman: Is there any public comment to come before the Metropolitan Planning
13 Organization today? Hearing none.

14
15 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

16
17 Eakman: We have a consent agenda in front of us with only the approval of the past
18 minutes on that. Would there be a motion to approve the consent
19 agenda?

20
21 Sorg: I move to approve.

22
23 J-Burick: Second.

24
25 Eakman: It has been moved and seconded that we approve the consent agenda.
26 Mr. Wray, would you be kind enough to poll the board?

27
28 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Commissioner Solis.

29
30 Solis: Yes.

31
32 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

33
34 Doolittle: Yes.

35
36 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.

37
38 J-Burick: Yes.

39
40 Wray: Councilor Sorg.

41
42 Sorg: Yes.

43
44 Wray: Mr. Chair.

45
46 Eakman: Yes.

1
2 MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

3
4 **5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

5
6 **6.1 * June 13, 2018**

7
8 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
9

10 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

11
12 **6.1 Resolution 18-05: A Resolution amending the 2018 Meeting Calendar**

13
14 Eakman: We do have an action item. Will you be handling that Mr. Wray?

15
16 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. For the information of the Members of this Committee,
17 after the last Policy Committee meeting the Chair reached out to MPO
18 staff, notified us that the September meeting of the policy committee as
19 originally scheduled on September the 12th is in conflict with the Domenici
20 Conference. The Chair expressed his concern that we might have
21 difficulty reaching a quorum on that date and wanted to give Members of
22 the Policy Committee who wanted to attend the conference freedom to be
23 able to attend the conference without having to worry about quorum
24 issues for this body. So the date of September 5th was suggested and
25 that is the action that is before this Committee at this time and the meeting
26 would be still here in the City Council chambers at 1:00, just one week
27 earlier.
28

29 Eakman: So Mr. Wray the question for the Board is whether or not to approve this
30 calendar with the inclusion of September 5th instead of September 12th.
31

32 Wray: That is correct Mr. Chair.

33
34 Sorg: Mr. Chairman.

35
36 Eakman: Yes.

37
38 Sorg: I'll make it a motion to approve this agenda item, this resolution.
39

40 J-Burick: Second.

41
42 Eakman: We have a motion and second on this action item. Any discussion?
43 Hearing none, poll the Board Mr. Wray.
44

45 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
46

1 Solis: Yes.

2
3 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

4
5 Doolittle: Yes.

6
7 Wray: Trustee Johnson Burick.

8
9 J-Burick: Yes.

10
11 Wray: Councilor Sorg.

12
13 Sorg: Yes.

14
15 Wray: Mr. Chair.

16
17 Eakman: Yes.

18
19 MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

20
21 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

22
23 **7.1 Committee Training: Pedestrian Safety and Transit**

24
25 Eakman: At this point could we move right ahead with the discussion items Mr.
26 Wray?

27
28 Wray: Certainly Mr. Chair. I'd like to introduce Dr. Michael McAdams who will be
29 presenting this item.

30
31 Eakman: And if we could for the minutes, could we please recognize that
32 Commissioner Hakes has joined the MPO at 1:06 p.m.

33
34 McAdams: Thank you Andrew. And let's continue with the discussion. And this is a
35 topic that's sort of near and dear to my heart as well because I work a lot
36 with transit. But public transit is very important for pedestrian safety
37 because transit, if you get, to go to transit stops you have to cross streets.
38 And so innately pedestrian safety is related to public transit.

39 Some key topics I'd like to discuss is transit is important to be
40 convenient and accessible. You have to cross the street to get to transit
41 stops and they should be accessible. And also we want to talk a little bit in
42 this discussion about the importance of transit operators and the needs of
43 other users as well.

44 Bus is the most common form of public transportation we have. We
45 have light rail and other forms but this is the most common across the
46 nation.

1 Many people as you see in the photograph have no choice. They
2 have to use public transportation for work, for shopping, for medical
3 reasons, and we're fortunate our bus system we have lifts as well so the
4 people in these, in the lifts, wheelchairs, that are almost like tanks, have to
5 get up to use them too as well.

6 If you look at sidewalks, really to accommodate transit they should
7 be much more than ADA standards for that, in this case for the bus to be
8 aligned so that the ADA person can assist putting wheelchairs at all
9 points. So it's a little bit more recommended at bus stops. Here we have,
10 this is obvious, narrow curbs or no curbs sometimes and we have a lot of
11 people that have something like a wall or something like that. I don't, if we
12 have in this situation you can see that people are right up against the bus.
13 It's not a very safe situation. If you look at this also the sidewalks are full
14 of people, all right. And they block access to the bus and, but it happens
15 very quickly but still it's very important if you're waiting for the bus stop
16 with a lot of people they are waiting too as well, it will block entrance too.
17 And we have a lot of bus shelters in the area and bus shelters are really
18 important not so much for, here for rain but it's to keep you out of the
19 elements, the sun and in shadow. And we'd like to install more too. But
20 shelters should be accessible. When you have grass strips in front of
21 them, that's not accessible is it? So you can eliminate that by creating,
22 we'll see in the next slide as part of the furniture zone you can see there's
23 no grass to impede people particularly you're having a wheelchair. You
24 can't maneuver the grass in a motorized wheelchair very well can you?

25 So next I'd like to talk about pedestrian crossings as far as bus stop
26 location and bus pullouts. Pedestrian treatments and we see, if you
27 remember some of our past conversations our (*inaudible*) was just transit
28 passengers. We have, notice it's, with this photograph we have a
29 separate distinct crossing with it looks like a brick. We have a stop line for
30 motorists before the crosswalk. We have a protected median and also
31 notice that the side, there's no barrier from the sidewalk to the bus stop,
32 right, and a clearly defined bus stop.

33 We should put bus stops not in front but in back so that the
34 passengers won't have to cross in front of the buses. We'll talk about far
35 and near side. Far side is at intersection beyond the intersection, near
36 side is before the intersection just this like, so in case if you have transit
37 terms, if any time I'm discussing and see I'm getting too technical, please
38 stop me and I'll be glad to explain the terms. Sometimes you get inside of
39 the silo and you don't realize that everybody else understands you as well,
40 right. So place crosswalk behind the bus stop all right, so people when
41 they get off the bus, they will instead of going in front of the bus they will
42 go in the back of the bus. Pedestrians see the traffic, the bus drivers can
43 move forward, and the bus doesn't run over pedestrians, which is really
44 important too. It does happen but this is a good thing, we could, a near-
45 side bus stop is much better in that aspect. So far side, excuse me, far
46 side generally for an intersection because the bus driver's considered far

1 side or near-sided stops the driver can cross from an intersection before
2 the light turns red. Near side can mean waiting an extra cycle. So far-
3 side ensures pedestrians cross behind the bus, okay. So, see these
4 illustrations right here, so it's better to have them cross behind the bus.
5 Here's an illustration at a corner. You can see where there are conflict
6 points right at the crosswalk. You can see pedestrians crossing in front of
7 the vehicles but still probably it'd be better to have them cross behind the
8 vehicle too, all right. Near-side allows pedestrians but bus queuing too.
9 So you can have several buses, we have several situations where there's
10 one bus has several bus routes going through it and we often have two
11 buses coming along to it as well. Here's another. If the bus makes a right
12 turn you don't want to have, you have to be careful of pedestrians too, as
13 well, all right. But it's easier because you know pedestrians for the bus
14 would not be crossing in front of you.

15 So how do you improve safety? You look at where the bus stops in
16 relations to where the bus crossings, at intersections or midblock. If you
17 have good bus stops they may be a little bit more inconvenient for the
18 transit rider but much safer and also it may also decrease transit time as
19 well. You can see that. Bus pullouts: We have several in our area and
20 bus pullouts may create tension traffic operations, it makes it hard for a
21 bus driver to reenter the traffic stream. So even though there's many
22 outside of the transit arena that said all bus pullouts are good, actually in
23 most situations transit operators don't want them. The drivers and the
24 agencies don't like bus pullouts for various reasons. But you can make
25 them better and we're going to discuss about that as well. So this is, we
26 don't have to worry about this, I'm not sure why it's, we can, I'll just go
27 through this real quickly.

28 Here's an example of a far-side pullout, your turn and this is not
29 good. We'll for reason. When the bus is not there it actually acts as an
30 acceleration lane for this, zip. So this is not a good way to do it. There is
31 a solution which is pulling a bulb-out which will then, will prevent the
32 vehicles from cutting so sharp and using this as an acceleration lane. See
33 right there? Look at this. Now what will we do with the path? So the
34 bulb-out is a real simple solution. At the intersection means that the driver
35 does not use this as an acceleration but moves around the bus and of
36 course pedestrians and cyclists as well.

37 Near example, slower driving, making right-hand pedestrians,
38 protect pedestrians and also it slows down traffic. On streets with on-
39 street parking with a bus bulb-out also retains traffic spot, parking spots
40 and if you didn't you wouldn't be able to have that parking spot there too.

41 So the good bus bulb-outs do decrease dwell times because the
42 bus does not need to reenter the traffic. That means a full, the sidewalk
43 will be against the bus. So it's like a, so they enter this, park there, they
44 get off and on and you can go on quickly.

45 What is a pedestrian safety concern at every transit stop, all right?
46 The need to cross safely. We have a number of different places in this

1 area where it's, I think it's very dangerous for pedestrian crossing. And
2 often, we discussed before pedestrians don't often cross at crosswalks, at
3 unofficial, or at official crosswalks, at intersections or midblock. They do it
4 for convenience purposes, right. One of the main considerations with
5 transit stop locations, all right, are they convenient to different land uses?
6 What some things like, are the pads connected to the sidewalks?
7 Somewhere we have pad there, it's a pad, it's not sidewalk, no paths or
8 anything.

9 And what are some transit operations concerns? We already
10 mentioned the bus pullouts without the bulb-outs are probably not good for
11 transit operators. It's really, it traps them and they have to wait for the
12 cars to pass. So there's, it's really not suitable without other
13 considerations too.

14 What are the needs for road use? I think we forget that pedestrians
15 are also road users as well, and bicyclists. We need to navigate safely
16 around transit stops so they don't have to worry about conflict with buses
17 as well. Any questions? I'd be glad to stand for questions or comments.

18
19 Eakman: Are there questions for this presentation? I would like to recognize that
20 Mayor Barraza and Commissioner Rawson have joined us. Appreciate
21 that very much. Yes Vice-Chair Rawson.

22
23 Rawson: Mr. Chairman. I know that we've had the focus the last few meetings
24 talking about pedestrian safety. I'm trying to understand the, what has set
25 that as an importance rather than working on different items.

26
27 Eakman: Would staff like to address that?

28
29 McAdams: Mr. Chair. I'd be glad to address that. We feel that pedestrian safety is
30 very important for the Commission to be looking at and often ignored at
31 both Policy Committee and Technical Committee. So we have trained you
32 for this, for the both committees and not so much for the BPAC but for the
33 TAC and the Policy Committee. We feel it's, this training was really, really
34 enjoyable and also very pertinent. And with the safety standards being
35 adopted now by the FHWA which we already, we already complied we
36 need to focus on safety and particularly pedestrians and bicycles as our
37 most vulnerable users.

38
39 Rawson: Thank you for that. Mr. Chairman. I would like to point out from some of
40 the other information that we had that we do have a very safe, from a
41 pedestrian standpoint certainly one is too many, but just from a numbers
42 standpoint the MPO that we're in is a very safe pedestrian area which is
43 great.

44
45 Eakman: I would agree with you Vice-Chair. We do have a couple of real pressure
46 points in the City. I'm not sure in the County. There are some that, I hope

1 Valley Drive reconstruction assists us around Hadley and places like that.
2 And I will have to say to staff, I sometimes get confused about the way we
3 are working on some of our construction projects such as on bulb-outs
4 and things like that. I see them being integrated into some of the planning
5 that's going on and I scratch my head sometimes about why they are
6 installed sometimes where they are. I note that parking spaces are often
7 taken away and well I just wonder, are we integrating the information here
8 with our own Public Works Department with the County and the City?
9

10 McAdams: Mr. Chair. I think that's something we need to work on.
11

12 Eakman: So in essence we're not.
13

14 McAdams: I think it, we're looking, one thing I can say, that the ATP, the Active
15 Transportation Plan is a good tool to get coordination. It's, I think with any
16 planning process it's about process not the plan, and through this we've
17 been talking with Public Works and other people about how we do good
18 planning and where should we do things. So I think, I'm not diverting the
19 issue but I'm saying we have, the ATP has been process and the MPO
20 tried to encourage it as well. So yes I think there have probably been
21 mistakes made but I think we're trying to correct those.
22

23 Eakman: Thank you. Those mistakes sometimes take 40 years to correct. Mayor
24 Pro-Tem Sorg. You had a question?
25

26 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you Mike for that presentation. I think
27 this is very important for us as we plan for the future. So I'm glad you're
28 doing this. Thank you.
29

30 Eakman: I have an additional question. Since we have a Transportation Policy
31 Review Committee here at the City, has this presentation been made to
32 them?
33

34 McAdams: We would like, we would be glad to make that presentation.
35

36 Eakman: Mayor Pro-Tem. Do you serve on the Transportation Committee?
37

38 Sorg: I do indeed.
39

40 Eakman: Do you think this would be beneficial there?
41

42 Sorg: It certainly will be. I will ask our Chairman, Councilor Smith to do just that.
43

44 Eakman: Excellent. Any other questions of our presenter? Hearing none, we're
45 working toward a land speed record for an MPO meeting. I see nod,
46 heads shaking in disgust that we might do that but I'll move ahead.

7.2 NMDOT update

Eakman: Is there an update Mr. Doolittle from the New Mexico Department of Transportation?

Doolittle: Yes Mr. Chair. I just have some very brief updates for you all. A little bit outside of the MPO area, we just started a guard rail replacement project on US-70 over Organ. As you know we've done a lot of safety improvements along that corridor. When we did the pavement preservation some of the guard rail didn't meet specifications so we're replacing all of the guard rail over the pass and that should be the last section that we have for any roadway improvements over the hill, but certainly is making it safer for the bicyclists that commute to White Sands that intermingle with the vehicles. But again we just started that on Monday. That's a 60-day working day project so we should be finished in a few months, relatively simple and low impacts.

The other one that I wanted to touch on very briefly is the Valley Drive project. We did start that one last month. We've been in it about three weeks. For the most part traffic is where it's going to be for several months while we build one side of the road and then basically you'll just see a mirror. We are working, as I'm sure you all are aware, working with businesses as we move traffic around, close and open driveways. Hadley was closed for a while, it was open for a while, and we're working to do some utility work with the City so it'll be closed. But very specifically in that area we're providing some direct access into the shopping center, the grocery store, those kinds of things. But I will tell you short of those few hiccups the contractor is moving along very well. Mostly what you're seeing now is subsurface work, utility work, so right now the City is very involved because that's mostly their work. We're overseeing it but they're the ones participating in the pavement of those. So it's going to look like a lot of stuff is torn up and not a lot of work is getting done all because it's under the dirt. But once we get that finished you'll see a lot of productive work as we start working on the roadway itself. But that's really all we've done on Valley Drive right now, just real preliminary things.

The other one I just wanted to touch on as a reminder very briefly is University and I-25 is still under design. The plan is still to bid that project in December so construction early spring. And with that Mr. Chair I'll take any questions the Board may have.

Eakman: I'll have a couple questions but I'll let the Board Members ask theirs first. Any questions of Mr. Doolittle? Vice-Chair Rawson.

Rawson: Mr. Chairman. I'll take you up on that. Mr. Doolittle there's been a lot made on social media about access specifically to some of the small businesses that are there in that area off of Valley. I know the City of Las

1 Cruces is now looking at an advertising campaign to make sure people
2 know that those businesses are still open and there's still access. Is there
3 anything that NMDOT is doing to meet with people that are in that area,
4 either business owners or residents of some of the mobile home parks
5 over there to talk on a monthly basis about access and what access
6 they're going to have?
7

8 Doolittle: Yes Mr. Chair, Commissioner Rawson. So we continue to have our
9 monthly public meetings and I'm glad you brought that up because I meant
10 to mention that. Our next public meeting is scheduled for August 21st
11 there on the Solano office. We'll continue to have those. So we are
12 meeting, generally updating the public on our contractor's progress. My
13 project manager is on-site every day so he has been talking to those very
14 specific businesses that have those concerns, so for instance the bakery's
15 one that has come up on social media quite frequently and we've had a
16 couple of articles. He was meeting with them one-on-one. So as we're
17 hearing of these concerns we are approaching those businesses as we
18 can. But in general that one was a little bit different because they were
19 routing them up Picacho, back around so it was quite a detour. And so we
20 acknowledge that and we're trying to address those so that the detour's
21 not so far. But we are providing access, our goal is to provide access at
22 all times except for the short closures for pavement, crossings, those
23 kinds of things. But my project manager is meeting with people as they
24 request. A lot of times we're not hearing of it unless it's through social
25 media or someone shows up at the public meeting and they bring those to
26 our attention. So one thing I would request is you all as representatives of
27 the citizens, if you hear of anything feel free to give me a call, shoot me a
28 quick e-mail, and I'll make sure that my project manager is meeting with
29 them individually. But I will tell you that Ryan Tafoya who's the project
30 manager, he has spent most of his career in Las Cruces and he makes it
31 a priority, meet with him as he hears. It's just us finding out. So very
32 specifically the one that came up, granted looking back, hindsight the
33 detour was kind of long but we really hadn't heard much about it until it hit
34 social media. So as they come up just let me know and we'll certainly try
35 to take care of it as best we can. But really the only way that we're taking
36 care of it as a general perspective is these monthly meetings and then
37 through press releases through our PIO.
38

39 Rawson: Thank you very much Mr. Doolittle. Thank you Mr. Chairman.
40

41 Eakman: Thank you very much. I've taken the opportunity to attend the first two of
42 those meetings with Mr. Tafoya and the construction workers and the
43 public shows up. The first one they were standing room only and this last
44 one was, people saw that they weren't being affected yet so they
45 understood the schedule. If I understand correctly the only way they can
46 access some of these businesses off the road is through a \$17,000 item

1 that has to go on the wall, something about an attenuator, and six were in
2 the contract for this project. The construction company brought in two of
3 their own to add for more access and the NMDOT has just brought on
4 another so there are now nine. Does your crew believe that nine will
5 handle the needs to access businesses throughout the rest of this project?
6 That's the spot I'm putting you on right now.
7

8 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. It's difficult for me to answer that question. Any time that you
9 have an opening we have to put these attenuators. And you're correct.
10 They are very costly and any time they're hit basically you're replacing
11 them at that same cost. That's why initially there were only a few. What
12 they try to do is consolidate those business accesses. So several will
13 access through one opening but understanding that due to utility work, we
14 have found some utilities that either weren't located or aren't in the same
15 location that we thought they were in the plans, we're having to shift things
16 around and that's why we've needed some of those additional attenuators.
17 We'll just continue to monitor those. Again our goal is to provide access to
18 all businesses but it's just not realistic for us to put up that wall barrier to
19 separate traffic from those deep trenches with the utilities and provide
20 individual accesses to every single business, but we'll continue to monitor
21 it. But Mr. Chair it's difficult for me to say at this point whether six or nine
22 is feasible. And then we still have a whole other side of the road that we
23 have to build. So we'll continue to monitor it. Like I shared with
24 Commissioner Rawson, if you hear of those things very specifically that
25 people are having to detour too far out of their way or very, even more
26 important than that that they just don't have access at all, please let me
27 know. But six, nine, 12, I just don't know. The good thing is we have an
28 item on the contract and so we're able to increase those as we need.
29

30 Eakman: For everyone's information I think we're all affected by that Valley Drive
31 reconstruction. Phase 1 is happening right now. There are three phases.
32 They'll each be approximately six-month, and we are on time with this one.
33 During this first phase they're going to move over to Hickory and Avenida
34 de Mesilla because there is a large amount of underground work that has
35 to be completed in Phase 2 which is on Avenida de Mesilla up to Valley
36 Drive. There are all kinds of utilities that have to go into a bunker under
37 that roadway. So that is going to be a problem for folks soon and they
38 hope to get that all complete before they move to Phase 2 of another six
39 months, and then the last six months will be the remainder of Valley Drive
40 from Amador to Avenida de Mesilla. It's a very complex project. I'm very
41 complimentary of the contractor. He just absolutely takes no prisoners.
42 He's getting things done. I thank the City on Monday at our City Council
43 meeting because at every meeting I have representatives from Public
44 Works, our Utilities Department, our Economic Development Department,
45 and our Police Department at those meetings so they can ask their
46 questions right now so we can keep traffic moving, so that we can keep

1 things safe, and so that we can work in coordination for all the utilities that
2 need to be and answer questions on the spot because sometimes design
3 and construction are two separate crafts. And so I really thank the City for
4 that involvement. I have Mr. Tafoya on speed dial and I've asked him and
5 the PIO to please let me know when they're going to be closing streets. I
6 don't want to go on the internet and look at your regular street closing site.
7 I'd like to be forewarned for the sake of the businesses and Ami Evans
8 over in Deming I guess is your PIO Officer and so she has promised me
9 that she'll be getting in touch. But this is a very complex project and I
10 don't feel in the least that I'm on top of it, and I need to be because that is
11 my district. Any questions? Mayor.
12

13 Barraza: Good afternoon. Thank you Mr. Chair. I just have a question for the MPO
14 staff or maybe for Mr. Doolittle with the Department of Transportation. I
15 know we've done a study on University Avenue with Bohannon Huston to
16 completely I guess replace University Avenue and widen the street and
17 put sidewalks. And I know we're at a standstill and I'm just wondering:
18 What can we do within the Town of Mesilla to start to move this project
19 forward? I know funding is going to be a big obstacle for us but what do
20 we need to do in order to start trying to see where we can start applying
21 for monies for that project?
22

23 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. The DOT recently amended the TIP to put in I
24 believe it's a Phase B study for that area. Is that correct, Jolene? B
25 through D so that is the next step in the process on putting improvements
26 in on University. So it is moving forward albeit slowly.
27

28 Barraza: Can you explain to me, what did you say, B3B?
29

30 Wray: B through D. It's ...
31

32 Barraza: Oh, B through D.
33

34 Wray: It's different phases in the process. The study that was completed back in
35 2015, that was a Phase A study. Phase B through D, that's getting kind of
36 really more into the nitty-gritty of actual studying what would have to be
37 the costs, etc. etc.
38

39 Barraza: Okay. Very good. Okay. And so who starts this process? DOT?
40

41 Wray: This is a DOT-generated project, yes.
42

43 Barraza: Okay. Okay. Very good. Thank you.
44

45 Eakman: Are there any more questions or comments from the Board? Mayor Pro-
46 Tem Sorg.

1
2 Sorg: Mr. Chairman. Thank you. A quick comment. I haven't been on Valley
3 Drive lately. I did go there when it was first started and, but I noticed in
4 other projects around town where businesses are affected there seems to
5 be inadequate signage to tell people where to go. So I just wanted to
6 bring that out, that is to keep in mind to have the best signage we can
7 possibly have for these businesses telling where you go for X, Y, Z
8 business. Thank you Chairman.
9

10 Eakman: Mr. Doolittle. Did you want to respond? One thing, may I add something?
11 Our Economic Development Department wishes to work with the NMDOT
12 on that. The NMDOT feels that by putting anything other than a "Business
13 Access" sign, they are going against the law of New Mexico in helping a
14 business with their business enterprise and the City seems to feel that's
15 an over-reading of the law and would like to put in "Business Access"
16 signs that actually tell you what businesses you can get to at certain
17 corners. So I'm not going to ask you for a decision on that today. I'll just
18 tell you that discussion is going to be forthcoming because we'd like to get
19 the customers to the businesses. Thank you.
20

21 Doolittle: So Mr. Chair. If you'll allow. So purely by coincidence I did have some
22 very brief initial discussions with the executive staff just this past week.
23 Part of that interpretation is coming from Federal Highway. To get back to
24 Councilor Sorg's comment, I'm not aware of any other projects other than
25 the Valley Drive that is ours. This morning for instance I came to work and
26 I traveled on Solano and you're doing, the City is doing some pavement
27 rehab along Solano so I'm wondering if some of those concerns might not
28 be either City or County projects. But certainly if they're ours let me know.
29 But you're right Mr. Chair. Any of our signing at least at this point is going
30 to be just a general "Business Access" sign. Which was part of the
31 problem that I certainly acknowledge as the district engineer for the
32 shopping center, the grocery store, and the bakery. You can't put a
33 "Business Access" sign with an arrow on it, take them up three or four
34 blocks, back around, you just can't do that. So I certainly acknowledge
35 that point and I'll continue to have those kinds of discussions both with
36 project management and executive staff.
37

38 Eakman: I appreciate that. That might lower my phone calls to find out "Where the
39 heck is Archuleta?" Is there any more comments or questions?
40

41 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

42

43 Eakman: I'll turn it over to staff. Does staff have any comments for us today?
44

45 Wray: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. Staff's comment is we would like to introduce
46 to you Ms. Debra Fuller. She is our new Senior Planning Technician.

1 She's already proving to be a valuable member of the team and we're very
2 much looking forward to working with her in the future.

3
4 Eakman: Welcome very much to the MPO.

5
6 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**

7
8 Eakman: And we have no member of the public at this time, do we?
9

10 **10. ADJOURNMENT (1:36 PM)**

11
12 Eakman: I'm open to a motion to adjourn.

13
14 J-Burick: Move to adjourn.

15
16 Eakman: I heard a motion. Is there a second?

17
18 Sorg: Second.

19
20 Eakman: All in favor say "aye." We are adjourned.
21
22
23
24

25
26 _____
Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 5, 2018

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Resolution 18-06: A Resolution Amending the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 18-06
Self-Certification Statement for Resolution 18-06
Emails from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT

DISCUSSION:

On June 14, 2017, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change	Performance Measure Justification
LC00110	2017	NMDOT	El Camino Real at Doña Ana School Rd.	Intersection Realignment	Move Project to FY2019	The project has been identified as a safety issue by DAC and this project is to address the safety concerns.
LC00271	2023	NMDOT	US 70 MP 149.1 – 150.0	Bridge Replacement, Roadway Reconstruction, Pavement	New Project \$11 Million	This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by

				Preservation, & ADA Intersection Improvements		widening the bridge over the Outfall Channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections.
LC00360	2019	NMDOT	I-25/Lohman Interchange	Landscaping Project	New Project \$1.95 Million (\$750K NM funds, \$1.2M CLC funds)	No impact on adopted safety targets
LC00270	2019	NMDOT	US 70 MP 149.1 – 150.0	Design Phase	Adding \$800K for Phase II design)	This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by widening the bridge over the Outfall Channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections.

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 18-06

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2018-2023 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 2018-2023 TIP on June 14, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested an amendment to the FY 2018-2023 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its August 21, 2018 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its August 30, 2018 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2018-2023 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 2018-2023 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 5th day of September, 2018.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Eakman	
Vice Chair Rawson	
Trustee Arzabal	
Mayor Barraza	
Mr. Doolittle	
Commissioner Hakes	
Trustee Johnson-Burick	
Commissioner Solis	
Councilor Sorg	

Councilor Vasquez	
-------------------	--

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

EXHIBIT "A" to MVMPO RES 18-06 FFY 2018-2023 TIP Amendments								
CN	FFY	Location	Termini	Scope	Current Funds	New Total	Change	PM Justification
LC00110	2017	El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Rd.	El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Rd.	Intersection Realignment	\$525,000.00	\$525,000.00	Move Project to FY2019	This Project has been identified as a safety issue by DAC and this project is to address the safety concerns.
LC00271	2023	US 70	MP 149.1 - 150.0	Bridge Replacement, Roadway Reconstruction, Pavement Preservation, & ADA Intersection Improvements	New Project	\$11,000,000.00	New Project	This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by widening the bridge over the Outfall Channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections.
LC00360	2019	I-25	Lohman Interchange	Landscaping Project	New Project	\$1,950,000 (\$750,000 NM Funds; \$1,200,000 CLC Funds)	New Project	No impact on adopted safety targets.
LC00270	2019	US 70	MP 149.1 - 150.0	Design Phase	\$0.00	\$800,000.00	Adding \$800,000 for Phase II design	This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by widening the bridge over the Outfall Channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

Resolution 18-06 Exhibit "B"

MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

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

- (1) The fiscal constraint required in 23 C.F.R. 450;
- (2) 49 U.S.C. 5323(l), 23 U.S.C. 135, and 23 U.S.C. 450.220;
- (3) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;
- (4) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);
- (5) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and U. S. DOT implementing regulation;
- (6) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and
- (7) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d)).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR

Date

NMDOT

Date

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2018 11:04 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Thomas Murphy; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT
Subject: RE: TIP Amendments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Andrew,

Please see updates below regarding performance measures.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner
C. (575) 202-4698

From: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 8, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Cc: Murphy, Tom <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: TIP Amendments

Good Afternoon Jolene,

Thank you very much for providing this information.

We do have two follow up requests we would like to make to NMDOT Staff for the purposes of gathering information to present to the BPAC later this month.

Is there any information NMDOT can give at this point about how LC00271 and LC00360 will support adopted performance targets or if they are applicable?

Also, LC00360 does not have a program year listed below.

Thank you.

Andrew Wray
Transportation Planner/Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization/Community Development
Direct: 575-528-3070 Main: 575-528-3043, awray@las-cruces.org



**METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
LAS CRUCES DOÑA ANA MESILLA

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT [<mailto:JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 11:02 AM
To: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>
Cc: Tom Murphy <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us>
Subject: TIP Amendments

Good morning Andrew,

Please see the below list of TIP Amendments for the upcoming August and September meetings. Please let me know if you have any questions.

- LC00110, El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Road, Intersection Realignment. Move project to FY2019 with \$478k in construction and \$47k in construction management for a total project cost of \$525,000 of HSIP funds. [This project has been identified as a safety issue by Dona Ana County and this project will realign the intersection to directly address safety concerns. This project has been awarded safety funds.](#)
- LC00271, New project: US 70 MP 149.1 – 150.0, Bridge Replacement, Roadway Reconstruction, Pavement Preservation, ADA & Intersection Improvements, \$11M construction FY2023. [This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by widening the bridge over the outfall channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections. The project will also address pavement condition with a preservation project and bridge condition with the replacement project.](#)
- LC00360, New project: I-25/Lohman Interchange (I-25 MP 3 – 3.7), Landscaping. \$1.95M total (\$750K NM state funds, \$1.2M City of Las Cruces funds) FY2019. [This project will not directly be impacting the safety targets, as it is for landscaping at the interchange only, outside the roadway prism.](#)

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner
NM Department of Transportation
750 N. Solano Dr.
Las Cruces, NM 88001

C. (575) 202-4698

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Thomas Murphy; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT
Subject: RE: TIP Amendments

Hi Andrew,

We need to make an addition to the list below. Please add the following amendment:

LC00270, US 70 design phase, add \$800K in FY2019 for Phase II design (construction added under LC00271 project below). This project will not impact safety targets but the construction phase will, as mentioned below.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner
C. (575) 202-4698

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2018 11:04 AM
To: 'Andrew Wray' <awray@las-cruces.org>
Cc: Murphy, Tom <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: TIP Amendments

Hi Andrew,

Please see updates below regarding performance measures.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner
C. (575) 202-4698

From: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 8, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Cc: Murphy, Tom <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: TIP Amendments

Good Afternoon Jolene,

Thank you very much for providing this information.

We do have two follow up requests we would like to make to NMDOT Staff for the purposes of gathering information to present to the BPAC later this month.

Is there any information NMDOT can give at this point about how LC00271 and LC00360 will support adopted performance targets or if they are applicable?

Also, LC00360 does not have a program year listed below.

Thank you.

Andrew Wray

Transportation Planner/Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization/Community Development

Direct: 575-528-3070 Main: 575-528-3043, awray@las-cruces.org



**METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
LAS CRUCES DOÑA ANA MESILLA

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT [<mailto:JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>]

Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 11:02 AM

To: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>

Cc: Tom Murphy <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us>

Subject: TIP Amendments

Good morning Andrew,

Please see the below list of TIP Amendments for the upcoming August and September meetings. Please let me know if you have any questions.

- LC00110, El Camino Real at Dona Ana School Road, Intersection Realignment. Move project to FY2019 with \$478k in construction and \$47k in construction management for a total project cost of \$525,000 of HSIP funds. This project has been identified as a safety issue by Dona Ana County and this project will realign the intersection to directly address safety concerns. This project has been awarded safety funds.
- LC00271, New project: US 70 MP 149.1 – 150.0, Bridge Replacement, Roadway Reconstruction, Pavement Preservation, ADA & Intersection Improvements, \$11M construction FY2023. This project will address multimodal safety in the corridor by widening the bridge over the outfall channel and upgrading ADA ramps at intersections. The project will also address pavement condition with a preservation project and bridge condition with the replacement project.

- LC00360, New project: I-25/Lohman Interchange (I-25 MP 3 – 3.7), Landscaping. \$1.95M total (\$750K NM state funds, \$1.2M City of Las Cruces funds) FY2019. This project will not directly be impacting the safety targets, as it is for landscaping at the interchange only, outside the roadway prism.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner
NM Department of Transportation
750 N. Solano Dr.
Las Cruces, NM 88001
C. (575) 202-4698

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 5, 2018

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Amendment – Removal of Segments from the Truck Route Map

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Emails from Hector Terrazas, City of Las Cruces.

DISCUSSION:

The City of Las Cruces has requested that the following segments be deleted from the Mesilla Valley MPO Truck Route Map:

Church St. – Picacho to Amador

Water St. – Picacho to Amador

Main St. – Picacho to Amador

Melendres – Main to Picacho

The City wishes for these segments to be removed to eliminate larger trucks from these facilities. Delivery trucks would still be accommodated. The City proposes that alternative routes would be Valley Drive or Solano.

This request requires an amendment to the currently adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). This requires at least one public meeting and a 30-day public comment period before the amendment can be taken up for action by the MPO Policy Committee. The public comment period commenced at the August 2, 2018 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee (BPAC) recommended approval of the amendment at their August 21, 2018 meeting.

This issue will be on the agenda for TAC action at the September 6, 2018 meeting and go before the Policy Committee at their October 10, 2018 meeting.

From: Hector Terrazas
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 9:47 AM
To: Tom Murphy
Cc: Andrew Wray
Subject: Truck Route Modifications

Tom,

With the downtown redevelopment to be more urban Traffic is requesting that Church, Water and Main (between Picacho and Amador) be removed from the truck route. Let me know if you have any questions, thanks.

Hector Terrazas, P.E.

Interim Traffic Operations Engineer/Public Works/Street and Traffic Operations
Direct:575-541-2508 Main:575-541-2595 hterrazas@las-cruces.org

From: Hector Terrazas
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Tom Murphy
Cc: Andrew Wray; SooGyu Lee
Subject: RE: Truck Route Modifications
Attachments: TRuck Route.png

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Tom,

I will be available for any questions.

The streets (see attached) are owned and maintained by the City of Las Cruces.

At this point Traffic Engineering wants to remove the streets from the official truck route to eliminate the bigger size trucks.

Traffic will be looking at the appropriate max size truck that would be allowed in the downtown area to accommodate deliveries.

Traffic on NM478 would still have alternatives such as Valley drive and Solano.

Let me know if you have any more questions, thank you.

Hector Terrazas, P.E.

Interim Traffic Operations Engineer/Public Works/Street and Traffic Operations
Direct:575-541-2508 Main:575-541-2595 hterrazas@las-cruces.org



From: Tom Murphy
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 7:53 AM
To: Hector Terrazas <hterrazas@las-cruces.org>
Cc: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>
Subject: RE: Truck Route Modifications

Hector,

We will place this on the August TAC if you like. Will you be available to answer any questions the committee may have?

Also, staff would like some information to provide in the packet. Can you address the following?

Are all road sections city owned/maintained? What about NM 478 designation?

Are trucks to be prohibited? If so, how are commercial activities to be handled in area?

If not, what does the changed designation accomplish?

Thanks.

From: Hector Terrazas
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 9:47 AM
To: Tom Murphy <tmurphy@las-cruces.org>
Cc: Andrew Wray <awray@las-cruces.org>
Subject: Truck Route Modifications

Tom,

With the downtown redevelopment to be more urban Traffic is requesting that Church, Water and Main (between Picacho and Amador) be removed from the truck route. Let me know if you have any questions, thanks.

Hector Terrazas, P.E.

Interim Traffic Operations Engineer/Public Works/Street and Traffic Operations
Direct:575-541-2508 Main:575-541-2595 hterrazas@las-cruces.org



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING September 5, 2018**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.2 Committee Training: Policy and Procedures Manual

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals, extracted from the PPM

DISCUSSION:

MPO staff will give a presentation on the recently updated New Mexico Department of Transportation Planning Procedures Manual (PPM).

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
Metropolitan Transportation Plan							
	4 years for nonattainment or maintenance MPOs; 5 years for MPOs in attainment	GTG Liaison and MPO agree upon a schedule for drafting and reviewing versions of the MTP. Final MTP due on or before September 30 (proposed but may be revised).	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_WorkProduct_version.ext Examples: 2018_0530_SFMPPO_MTP_Draft1.docx 2018_0930_SFMPPO_MTP_Final.docx	1. MPO Planner works with GTG Liaison to review drafts and incorporate comments according to the outlined schedule. 2. MPO Policy Board formally approves final MTP and any subsequent amendments. 3. MPO Planner submits approved MTP and amendments to GTG Liaison. 4. The GTG Liaison follows internal protocol to submit the approved MTP and amendments to NMDOT Secretary, FHWA-NM, and FTA Region 6 for informational purposes, and for review of conformity with air quality and planning process. 5. MPO staff post approved MTP and amendments on MPO website.	1.FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide determination of conformity (if applicable) in writing to Division Director. 2.FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide determination of conformity (if applicable) for revised MTP in writing to Division Director, if necessary.
Travel Demand Model (if applicable)							
	4-5 years in conjunction with MTP; also following decennial censuses.	Coordinate with NMDOT before MTP update, and after Federal distribution of decennial census-related data.	MPO Planner	Bureau TDM Manager	Coordinate and collaborate with NMDOT to ensure consistency between the MPO TDM and the NMDOT STDM	1. MPO Staff inform Bureau TDM Manager of initiation of MPO TDM update 2. Bureau TDM Manager reviews proposed procedures and data, confirming all are sound 3. MPO Staff update MPO TDM 4. MPO Staff present update procedures to stakeholders 5. Bureau TDM Manager reviews updated MPO TDM	None
Public Participation Plan							
	4-5 years in conjunction with MTP; update as necessary based on federal regulations or public input.	GTG Liaison and MPO agree upon a schedule for drafting and reviewing versions of the PPP. Final PPP due on or before September 30 (proposed but may be revised).	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_WorkProduct_version.ext Examples: 2014_0530_MRMPO_PPP_Draft1.docx 2014_0930_MRMPO_PPP_Final.docx	1.MPO Planner works with GTG Liaison to review the current PPP to ensure compliance with applicable Federal regulations and determine needed revisions, including revisions based on public input received. 2.MPO issues draft PPP or revisions for a 45-day public comment period and posts on MPO website. 3.MPO Policy Board formally approves the revised or new PPP. 4. The MPO Planner submits the approved PPP to the GTG Liaison. 5.The GTG Liaison follows internal protocol to submit the approved PPP to FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 for informational purposes. 6.MPO staff post the approved PPP on the MPO website.	None – PPP provided for informational purposes only.

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
Title VI Plan							
	3 years	GTG Liaison and MPO agree upon a schedule for drafting and reviewing versions of the Title VI Plan. Final Title VI Plan due on or before September 30 (proposed but may be revised).	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_WorkProduct_version.ext Examples: 2014_0530_MVMPO_TitleVI_Draft1.docx 2014_0930_MVMPO_TitleVI_Final.docx	1.MPO Planner works with GTG Liaison and NMDOT Title VI Coordinator to review the current Title VI Plan to ensure compliance with applicable Federal regulations and determine needed revisions, including revisions based on public input received. 2. MPO issues draft Title VI Plan or revisions for a 45-day public comment period and posts on MPO website. 3. The MPO Policy Board formally approves the revised or new Title VI Plan. 4. MPO Planner submits the approved Title VI Plan to the GTG Liaison. 5. GTG Liaison sends approved Title VI Plan to NMDOT Title VI Coordinator for review and concurrence. 6.MPO staff post the approved Title VI Plan on the MPO website.	None – Title VI Plan provided for informational purposes only. The NMDOT Title VI Coordinator follows internal protocol to notify the FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 by email that the NMDOT reviewed and approved the Title VI Plan in terms of compliance with federal regulations.
Transportation System Performance Measures and Targets							
Guidance forthcoming							
Unified Planning Work Program and Budget							
Draft Program	2 years	Coordination schedule to develop program is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program Timeline. Draft due on or before April 30 in even-numbered FFYs.	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example: 2014_0430_MVMPO_FFY15UPWP_Draft2.docx	Submittal and review process is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program and PPM Timeline.	None
Final Program	2 years	Coordination schedule to develop program is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program and PPM Timeline. Final due on or before July 1 in even-numbered FFYs.	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example: 2014_0930_FMPO_FFY15UPWP_Final.docx	Submittal and review process is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program and PPM Timeline.	FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide review comments and / or approval in writing to Division Director.

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
Amendments - Formal	Quarterly or as needed	March 15 June 15 September 15 (in odd-numbered FFYs) December 15	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example: 2014_0430_FMPO_FFY15UPWP_Q1Amendment1.docx	Submittal and review process is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program and PPM Timeline. Formal UPWP Amendments require Policy Board/Committee approval prior to submitting them to GTG Liaison. MPO Planner must use the MPO/RTPO Work Program Amendment Request Form when submitting an amendment to the GTG Liaison. The Form should be submitted as a Word document.	FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide review comments and / or approval in writing for UPWP quarterly amendment to Division Director.
Amendments - Administrative	As needed	As needed	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example: 2014_0430_FMPO_FFY15UPWP_Q1Amendment1.docx	1. Using the MPO/RTPO Work Program Amendment Request Form, the MPO Planner submits proposed administrative amendment and summary to GTG Liaison for consideration. The MPO Planner must include the amended UPWP and Budget with the Form. The Form should be submitted as a Word document. 2. GTG Liaison submits amendment information to GTG Supervisor and Bureau Chief for review and concurrence, as well as updates NMDOT files with amended UPWP and Budget. 3. GTG Liaison notifies the MPO of concurrence within 10 calendar days. 4. MPO Planner should share the Administrative Amendment with the Policy Board/Committee as an informational item only.	None
Indirect Cost Plan							
	Annual (Optional)	Plan is submitted annually Final due on or before July 1	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext 2014_0701_FMPO_FFY15CAPICA_Final.docx	Submittal and review process is detailed in Month-by-Month Work Program and PPM Timeline via the process for UPWP submission, though it happens annually.	1. FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide review comments and/or determination of acceptance in writing to Division Director. 2.FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 provide determination of acceptance for Plan in writing to Division Director, if necessary.

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
Transportation Improvement Program							
Final Program	2 years	Final Program is developed in conjunction with Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Final Plan due according to deadline in current <i>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Manual</i> posted on the NMDOT website.	MPO Planner	STIP Coordinator	Refer to the current <i>STIP Manual</i> posted on the NMDOT website.	1. MPO Policy Board approves TIP after public comments are incorporated. 2. STIP Unit concurs that listed projects all meet federal eligibility requirements. 3. Public comment is solicited and revisions made by MPO as necessary. 4. MPO Planner submits TIP to STIP Coordinator.	1. STIP Coordinator submits TIP to NMDOT Secretary for approval. 2. STIP Coordinator submits NMDOT Secretary-approved TIP to FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 for approval.
Amendments	Quarterly	Refer to the current <i>STIP Manual</i> posted on the NMDOT website.	MPO Planner	Districts & STIP Coordinator	Refer to the current <i>STIP Manual</i> posted on the NMDOT website.	1. MPO Policy Board approves TIP Amendment after public comments are incorporated. 2. STIP Unit concurs that listed projects all meet federal eligibility requirements. 3. Public comment is solicited and revisions made by MPO as necessary. 4. MPO Planner submits TIP Amendment to STIP Coordinator.	1. STIP Coordinator submits TIP Amendment to NMDOT Secretary for approval. 2. STIP Coordinator submits NMDOT Secretary-approved TIP Amendment to FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 for approval.
Traffic Counts							
Count data (if applicable)	As determined with Traffic Count Section		MPO Planner	Traffic Count Section Manager		As coordinated with the Traffic Count Section	None
Traffic flow maps	Annual		MPO Planner			MPO posts traffic flow maps on MPO website.	
Annual Listing of Obligated Projects							
Final List	Annual	December 28	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention, or send a link to website URL where file can be downloaded; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example: 2014_1201_FMPO_FFY14ObligatedProjects_Draft1.xlsx	1. MPO Planner extracts list of obligated projects from the TIP and reviews list for consistency with TIP on or before November 30. MPO Planner works with GTG Liaison to resolve any issues regarding obligated projects list. 2. MPO staff post the final list on the MPO website by 12/28 and notify GTG Liaison. 3. Bureau notifies FHWA and FTA that MPOs have posted lists on websites.	None
Annual Performance and Expenditure Report							
Draft/Final Report	Annual	Draft due November 15 Final due November 30	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext Example:	1. The MPO Planner submits the report to the NMDOT GTG Liaison for review by November 15. 2. The GTG Liaison requests any changes to the report by November 20. 3. The MPO Planner submits the revised report to the GTG Liaison by November 30 and posts the report on the MPO website. 4. The NMDOT Bureau compiles the Division APER, the MPO and RTPA APERs in one submittal to FHWA-NM/FTA	None – report provided for informational purposes only.

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
					2014_1201_SFMPO_FFY14APER_Final.docx	Region 6 within 90 days following the close of the federal fiscal year (December 30) for informational purposes.	
Freight Program Assessment							
Federal Report	Odd Calendar Years	Second Friday in December	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of report using form provided by FHWA following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_CYWorkProduct_version.ext Note: Example: 2018_1201_SFMPO_CY18FPA_Draft1.docx	1. The Bureau Freight Program Manager will send the federal Freight Program Assessment form to the MPOs by November 5th. 2. The MPO Planner submits the completed report to the NMDOT GTG Liaison for review and approval by November 30th. The NMDOT Bureau compiles the reports and submits them to FHWA-NM by December 20th. Note: these timelines may change, based on when FHWA-NM sends NMDOT the survey.	
Reimbursement Packets							
	Quarterly	January 25 April 25 July 12 October 25	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison FTA materials must be submitted to the Transit Bureau's designated Program Manager	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext	1. MPO Planner submits packet to GTG Liaison for review. 2. If approved, GTG Liaison submits approved packet to Bureau Financial Manager. If not approved, GTG Liaison emails MPO Planner within 5 working days to request additional information or provide grounds for rejecting the packet. 3. Bureau Financial Manager reviews. If approved, the packet is then submitted to the GTG Supervisor for final approval. 4. GTG Supervisor reviews. If approved, the Bureau Financial Manager then processes for payment. If not approved, the GTG Liaison emails MPO Planner to request additional information. If the packet is rejected, the GTG Liaison emails a rejection letter to the MPO Planner, MPO Officer and the COG Executive Director, if applicable. 5. MPO Planner resubmits packet with required materials and/or required revisions. <u>FTA Materials</u> 1. FTA materials are submitted directly to the Transit Bureau's Program Manager. 2. The PM corresponds with the MPO regarding approval or non-approval according to the Transit Bureau's procedures.	None

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
U.S. Census-Related							
Smoothed UZA boundary map	10 years		MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files	1. Bureau Chief issues reminder to MPO Planners that MPOs have the opportunity to smooth the new UZAs. 2. MPO Policy Board reviews/approves boundary-smoothing proposals. 3. MPO Planner submits approved/adopted boundaries in a GIS shapefile to GTG Liaison. 4. GTG Liaison reviews proposed boundaries with Bureau Technical Planner 5. Technical Planner assembles one packet for New Mexico. Division Director prepares and signs a transmittal cover letter. 6. Technical Planner follows internal protocol to submit approved boundary revisions to FHWA-NM for review. 7. Results of FHWA-NM and FTA Region 6 review are provided via email. 8. MPO makes revisions as necessary and Technical Planner follows internal protocol to resubmit to FHWA-NM. 9. Upon receipt of approval from FHWA-NM, Technical Planner submits shapefiles to NMDOT GIS Unit, Data Management Bureau Chief, and Roadway Inventory ProgramSection Head.	1. FHWA-NM provides review comments and/or determination of acceptance in writing to Division Director. 2.FHWA-NM provides determination of acceptance for revised boundaries in writing to Division Director, if necessary.
Roadway functional classification map	10 years, and as needed		MPO Planner	Various	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention: Refer to <i>PPM</i> for information.	Refer to <i>PPM</i> for information.	None
Review MPA boundaries	10 years, and as needed		MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention: Refer to <i>PPM</i> for information.	Refer to <i>PPM</i> for information.	Submitted to FHWA and FTA for informational purposes (see PPM)
Non-Attainment or Maintenance Area Requirements							
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) – Mandatory; Reporting	Annual	February 15	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison/CMAQ Coordinator	CMAQ reporting information must be directly entered into the federal CMAQ Public Access System reporting module by February 15; this module is accessed via the federal User Profile and Access Control System (UPACS). Note: UPACS access can take up to 6 months to be granted. NMDOT advises recipients of Mandatory CMAQ funding to establish access early.	1. Recipients of Mandatory CMAQ funds (via direct allocation) are required to enter the required reporting data into the federal CMAQ Public Access System, accessed via UPACS. 2. Once data is entered, the recipient agency alerts the NMDOT CMAQ Coordinator and GTG Liaison. 3. NMDOT CMAQ Coordinator reviews data in the system and either approves or follows up. 4. Final data submission is due to FHWA-NM no later than March 1.	FHWA-NM reviews the requests and either requests additional information or approves the federal CMAQ Public Access System reporting module requests.

TABLE 3
Summary of MPO Work Product Reviews and Submittals

MPO Work Product	Submittal Frequency to NMDOT	Submittal Date to NMDOT	Designee Responsible to Submit to NMDOT	NMDOT Recipient	Submittal Format	Submittal Review and Approval Process (MPO/NMDOT)	Submittal Review and Approval Process (NMDOT/Governor, FHWA-NM, FTA Region 6)
Quality Assurance Reviews							
Financial Audit of Fiscal Agents	Annual	Within 30 days of approval by fiscal agent	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	Electronic submittal of files following designated file naming convention; GTG Liaison to send email confirming receipt of files File Naming Convention Year_MonthDay_XXMPO_FFYWorkProduct_version.ext	1. MPO Planner submits copy of annual financial audit of their respective fiscal agent to GTG Liaison. 2. GTG Liaison reviews audit and reports any deficiencies identified and / or the need for corrective action to the GTG Unit Supervisor. 3. GTG Unit Supervisor notifies the Bureau Chief and Division Director about the audit review results.	None
Site Review	Annual	Date scheduled by GTG Liaison, no later than April 30	MPO Planner	GTG Liaison	MPO staff required to participate in the site review and provide access to electronic files pertaining to the expenditure of state and federal funds.	Refer to <i>PPM</i> for information.	None