

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING**

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held November 14, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Commissioner Kim Hakes (DAC)
Trustee Stephanie Johnson-Burick (Town of Mesilla)
Councillor Gabriel Vasquez (CLC)
Commissioner Benjamin Rawson (DAC)
Commissioner Isabella Solis (DAC)
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)

STAFF PRESENT: Andrew Wray (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Cathy Matthews (CLC)
David Armijo (SCRTD)
Mike Bartholomew (CLC)
David Maestas (CLC)
Steve Pacheco (DAC)
Larry Nichols (CLC)
Ashleigh Curry
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:03 PM)

Eakman: Ladies and gentlemen I'm going to call the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization to order at this time. It is just slightly after 1:00 and I do appreciate everyone's attendance today.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Eakman: At this time could we please stand and you join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ALL STAND FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Eakman: Thank you so much. November historically has more on the agenda than any other of our meetings and I so hope we are prepared to go beyond one hour today because the agenda will make that most necessary.

1 I would like to at this time, Andrew if you would be kind enough to poll the
2 Board and check our attendance for a quorum.
3
4 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mr. Doolittle.
5
6 Doolittle: Here.
7
8 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
9
10 Hakes: Here.
11
12 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
13
14 Solis: Here.
15
16 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
17
18 J-Burick: Here.
19
20 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
21
22 Sorg: Yes.
23
24 Wray: Commissioner Rawson.
25
26 Rawson: Yes.
27
28 Wray: Mr. Chair.
29
30 Eakman: Yes. Thank you so much. I wonder Mr. Doolittle would you introduce to
31 us the person right next to you.
32
33 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. As I shared with the Chairman, I do have a public
34 meeting later this evening in T or C so I need to be gone by about 2:00 if
35 at all possible. So I've asked Filiberto Castorena, who's my Assistant
36 District Engineer for Construction. He'll be acting on my behalf as Proxy if
37 we're not finished by the time I leave.
38
39 Eakman: Do I have the consent of the Board to allow for Trent to have a Proxy this
40 afternoon?
41
42 Sorg: Yes.
43
44 Eakman: Would you so move then, Mayor Pro-Tem Sorg.
45
46 Sorg: I so move.

1 Eakman: Commissioner Hakes would you second.
2
3 Hakes: Yes.
4
5 Eakman: Then moved and seconded. Would you poll the Board?
6
7 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mr. Doolittle.
8
9 Doolittle: Yes.
10
11 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
12
13 Hakes: Yes.
14
15 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
16
17 Solis: Yes.
18
19 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
20
21 J-Burick: Yes.
22
23 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
24
25 Sorg: Yes.
26
27 Wray: Commissioner Rawson.
28
29 Rawson: Yes.
30
31 Wray: Mr. Chair.
32
33 Eakman: Yes. Well thank you so much for that.
34
35 **3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**
36
37 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**
38
39 Eakman: At this time I'd like to ask if there is any public comment to come before
40 the Mesilla Valley MPO this afternoon. Is there any public comment?
41 Seeing none. Thank you so much.
42
43 **5. CONSENT AGENDA ***
44
45 Eakman: As a part of our consent agenda today we would like very much the
46 approval of the Board to move the agenda around somewhat. So that we

1 would start with Resolution 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 before we move to 7.1. I was
2 wondering if the Board would approve that change of the agenda and we'll
3 ask for it as a part of the Consent Agenda. Would anyone move the
4 Consent Agenda?
5
6 Wray: Mr. Chair.
7
8 Eakman: Yes.
9
10 Wray: If staff could before any motions are made, staff respectfully requests the
11 Policy Committee to remove item 7.2 from the agenda, to strike it
12 completely. The reason for this is that subsequent to this packet's
13 publication, the City of Las Cruces notified MPO staff of a conflict with the
14 proposed 2019 Meeting Schedule and so staff would like the opportunity
15 to retract that action item and put together a presentation hopefully with all
16 the complete information and present a draft 2019 calendar to this
17 Committee for approval at the December meeting.
18
19 Eakman: I'm sure we're all disappointed that we might want to remove one item
20 from the agenda, but if that could be included in the motion. The motion
21 would be to hear Resolution 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 prior to 7.1, pulling 7.2 and
22 then hearing 7.3 and 7.4.
23
24 Sorg: So moved.
25
26 Eakman: Is there a second?
27
28 Solis: Second.
29
30 Eakman: Thank you so much Commissioner Solis. Would you poll the Board?
31
32 Rawson: Mr. Chair.
33
34 Eakman: Yes, Vice-Chair Rawson.
35
36 Rawson: Could you repeat that one more time just as I try to follow along with the
37 new order.
38
39 Eakman: Indeed. We're going to hear Resolution 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 first and that is
40 due to Mr. Doolittle's schedule this afternoon where he needs to be
41 leaving by 2:00, and then we would hear 7.1, 7.3 and 7.4. We're pulling
42 7.2 from the agenda today.
43
44 Rawson: Mr. Chairman. It appears that 7.1 is a part of the Consent Agenda.
45

1 Eakman: You are correct. You're very correct on that, so we would be hearing 7.5,
2 7.6 and 7.7 and then hearing 7.3 and 7.4. I stand corrected.
3
4 Rawson: So Mr. Chairman. Then the motion on the table is to approve the Consent
5 Agenda item 6.1 and 7.1 and make the changes?
6
7 Eakman: That is correct.
8
9 Rawson: And remove 7.2.
10
11 Eakman: That is correct.
12
13 Rawson: Okay. Just so I understood the motion. Thank you.
14
15 Eakman: There's a motion and a second on the floor. If everyone understands, let's
16 call the roll please.
17
18 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
19
20 Doolittle: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
23
24 Hakes: Yes.
25
26 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
27
28 Solis: Yes.
29
30 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
31
32 J-Burick: Yes.
33
34 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
35
36 Sorg: Yes.
37
38 Wray: Commissioner Rawson.
39
40 Rawson: Yes.
41
42 Wray: Mr. Chair.
43
44 Eakman: Yes. Thank you.
45
46

1 **6. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **6.1 * October 10, 2018**

- 4
5 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6
7 **7. ACTION ITEMS**

8
9 **7.1 * Resolution 18-11: A Resolution Adopting the 2018 Annual Listing of**
10 **Obligated Projects**

- 11
12 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

13
14 **7.2 * Resolution 18-12: A Resolution Adopting the 2019 Mesilla Valley**
15 **MPO Meeting Calendar**

- 16
17 - REMOVED TO DECEMBER AGENDA, VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA.

18
19 **7.5 Resolution 18-15: A Resolution Adopting the Mesilla Valley MPO**
20 **Safety Performance Targets for 2019**

21
22 Eakman: And now if we would start with 7.5 Andrew and by-the-way would
23 everyone notice Andrew is wearing a suit and a neck tie today.

24
25 Wray: The world is coming to an end. Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the
26 Committee. Andrew Wray for the Mesilla Valley MPO. As we presented
27 to this Committee at the October meeting there are required Safety
28 Targets from FHWA that are coming due for calendar year 2019. I do
29 want to clarify something at the beginning of this presentation that goes for
30 all of these Performance Targets that staff will be presenting to you today.
31 These are adopted on a calendar year basis, not a fiscal year basis.
32 There was a little bit of confusion about that after the last meeting. Some
33 people asked for clarification so I wanted to provide that today to the
34 Committee on the record.

35 The Performance Targets are adopted on a calendar year basis.
36 So for the Safety Target last year it was adopted for calendar year 2018
37 so we are still under that particular Target that was adopted last year and
38 the Targets that staff is requesting the Policy Committee to adopt today
39 will be for calendar year 2019. Again the Safety Targets must be adopted
40 annually. Some of the other ones are on a slightly different schedule.

41 There are five Performance Targets that must be adopted:
42 Number of Fatalities, Number of Serious Injuries, Rate of Fatalities per
43 100 million vehicle miles traveled or VMT, Rate of Serious Injuries per 100
44 million VMT and Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries.

1 Last year this MPO endorsed supporting the State of New Mexico
2 Safety Targets and the State of New Mexico has released its Targets for
3 2019.

4 The Target that is here on this particular slide is the Target for the
5 Number of Total Fatalities. I will go ahead and read the NMDOT Target
6 Statement into the record. That statement reads: Limit the increase in
7 total fatality to 6.4% from 352.6 in 2016 to 375 by December 31, 2019.

8 Do have a little bit of additional information from the previous
9 presentation in October. The 2018 adopted Performance Target that was
10 good through December 31st of this year was 364.1. And a little bit more
11 of a somber note, but as was requested by the Committee providing some
12 more of the local information regarding this metric, there were fourteen
13 crash fatalities within the MPO area in Calendar Year 2016, which is the
14 most recent year for which we have data. I'll pause now if there is any
15 question about this metric.

16
17 Eakman: Yes, Vice-Chair Rawson.

18
19 Rawson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman the most recent data we have is
20 2016? When will 2017 finally be available?

21
22 Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Rawson. I would anticipate the middle of next
23 year. The way that the processing of the crash data works crash data is
24 always basically two years in arrears because of the reporting
25 requirements up to the State Clearing Office and then the time that it takes
26 for the office to process all of the data and then get it released. It's a two-
27 year cycle.

28
29 Rawson: Disappointing that it's such a long cycle. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

30
31 Eakman: Other questions please? I do have a question Andrew. What was the
32 actual number of fatalities in 2016 total throughout New Mexico?

33
34 Wray: I apologize Mr. Chair. I don't have that number available, but I can get
35 that for this Committee after the conclusion of this meeting. I don't have it
36 to hand right now for the entire state.

37
38 Eakman: I guess I'm curious about the thesis for increasing by 6.4% if we're thinking
39 that's due to increased usage of our highways that safety features haven't
40 been improved. I'm kind of wondering what the thesis for that increase
41 from NMDOT might be. Mr. Doolittle do you have any insight into that?

42
43 Doolittle: I'll try a little bit. If I recall correctly also at the last month's meeting when
44 Andrew was presenting we talked about additional volume of traffic is
45 going up. The other thing that we're noticing is also this distracted driving
46 is contributing to it, not necessarily DUI, but texting, talking on the phone

1 those types of things. But if I recall correctly it has to do substantially or
2 more so with increased volumes.
3
4 Eakman: Very good. Any other questions? Hearing none. We can move ahead
5 then Andrew.
6
7 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. The next metric that we are requesting the
8 Committee adopt is the Number of Serious Injuries. I'll go ahead and read
9 the Target Statement into the record. Decrease the number of serious
10 injuries by 17.5% from 1,333.8 in 2016 to 1,100 by December 31, 2019.
11 The adopted 2018 Performance Target was 1,219.4 and for the
12 Mesilla Valley area for 2016 that number of serious injuries was one
13 hundred and eleven. You will note that this slide contains good news in
14 that there is a decrease across the board as Mr. Doolittle indicated while
15 VMT is going up the safety features are improving so that the number of
16 serious injuries resulting from the crashes is going down as an absolute
17 number. I'll pause now for any questions.
18
19 Eakman: Questions of Mr. Wray? Is it a dichotomy that deaths are going up but
20 serious injuries are going down?
21
22 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. To some extent it is. My understanding is that it's largely a
23 result of if the crash is going to have a fatality associated with it, it's going
24 to be a really bad crash and when you get up to that level safety features
25 there's only so much that they can do. So that I believe is why you see
26 the dichotomy that the absolute number of serious injuries from the
27 crashes is going down, but that the fatalities are creeping up.
28
29 Eakman: Thank you.
30
31 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. This metric is Fatalities per 100 million VMT. I'll
32 read the NMDOT Target Statement into the record. Decrease the fatality
33 rate from 1.343 in 2016 to 1.318 by December 31, 2019.
34 The adopted 2018 Performance Target was 1.330 and the Mesilla
35 Valley MPO fatalities per 100 million VMT in 2016 was 1.07. You'll notice
36 across the trend line on the graph that as an average that number is
37 relatively stable even though there are peaks and valleys. All though it is
38 anticipated by the NMDOT projection that it is going to plateau a bit.
39 Again, that's a similar phenomenon to what we just discussed as far as the
40 improving safety features and combined with the increase in VMT is
41 causing that number to stabilize.
42
43 Eakman: Questions of Andrew? Hearing none.
44
45 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT, here again we
46 have good news. I'll go ahead and read the NMDOT Target Statement

1 into the record. Decrease the rate of serious injuries from 5.082 to 3.825
2 by December 31, 2019

3 The 2018 Performance Target was 4.456 and the Mesilla Valley
4 crash rate per 100 million VMT for 2016 was 8.1. Again, as in seeing the
5 absolute numbers we're also seeing the rate per 100 million VMT decline,
6 good news across the board. I'll pause now for any questions.
7

8 Eakman: Questions of Andrew?
9

10 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Lastly we have the non-motorized fatalities and
11 serious injuries metric. Again, I'll read the DOT Target Statement into the
12 record. Limit the increase in non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized
13 serious injuries to 220.6 by December 31, 2019.

14 The 2018 Performance Target was 228, I would like to highlight
15 that one if I may, even though DOT is anticipating an increase I would like
16 to point out that the Target adopted last year was higher than the Target
17 that is proposed to be adopted for Calendar Year '19. So, in a way that's
18 showing progress in this metric. And for 2016 the non-motorized fatalities
19 and serious injuries in Mesilla Valley MPO were 12. We have had a
20 number of questions about specific definition of the Non-motorized
21 Fatalities and Serious Injuries. That metric is specific to the vulnerable
22 user. Clearly most of the time there will be a vehicle involved in a fatal
23 incident involving a non-motorized user. I'm sure there could be some
24 scenarios where something tragic could happen without a vehicle on a
25 transportation facility, but this number and there's been a number of
26 questions that both the BPAC and the TAC, that number of 12 is specific
27 to the vulnerable user. And I'll pause now for any question.
28

29 Eakman: Anyone need more information? Hearing none.
30

31 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We are asking the Policy Committee to adopt
32 Targets at this meeting. MPO staff recommends to this Committee
33 endorsing the State Targets as we did last year. Again, the reporting
34 requirements for this particular metric would be very large. More than this
35 MPO as its own staff would be able to manage adequately. The Bicycle
36 and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended endorsement
37 of the State Targets at their October 16th meeting and the Technical
38 Advisory Committee recommended endorsement of the State Targets at
39 the November 1st meeting. And I will stand now for any questions.
40

41 Eakman: Other questions?
42

43 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
44

45 Eakman: Yes.
46

1 Barraza: The only question I would have is I know at our last meeting NMDOT,
2 there was some discussion between the MPO and DOT and have they
3 had an opportunity to get together, discuss I guess not the differences, but
4 some of the concerns they both have?
5

6 Eakman: Mr. Doolittle?
7

8 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. Thank you. Mayor Barraza the one that specifically that we
9 discussed is on the next agenda, item 7.6 and it had to do with the bridge
10 conditions. So once we moved in to that item I do have a little bit, if
11 Andrew doesn't cover it, I do have a little bit to explain how we got to that
12 Target on that one specifically.
13

14 Barraza: Mr. Chair. So DOT is okay with what's being proposed with this
15 resolution?
16

17 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. That is correct.
18

19 Barraza: Thank you.
20

21 Eakman: Are we ready for the question Andrew?
22

23 Wray If Mr. Chair, please do so yes.
24

25 Eakman: I would ask if anyone would like to move approval on Resolution number
26 18-15.
27

28 Hakes: Move approval.
29

30 Eakman: Did I hear a motion?
31

32 Hakes: Yes.
33

34 Eakman: Thank you Commissioner Hakes.
35

36 Eakman: Is there a second?
37

38 Barraza: Second.
39

40 Eakman: There is a motion and a second. Is there discussion? Andrew would you
41 poll the Board.
42

43 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mayor Barraza.
44

45 Barraza: Yes.
46

1 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
2
3 Doolittle: Yes.
4
5 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
6
7 Hakes: Yes.
8
9 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
10
11 Solis: Yes.
12
13 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
14
15 J-Burick: Yes.
16
17 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
18
19 Sorg: Yes.
20
21 Wray: Commissioner Rawson.
22
23 Rawson: Yes.
24
25 Wray: Mr. Chair.
26
27 Eakman: Yes.

28
29 **7.6 Resolution 18-16: A Resolution Adopting the Mesilla Valley MPO**
30 **State of Good Repair Performance Targets for 2019**
31

32 Eakman: Let's move on then to 7.6.
33
34 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, Andrew Wray speaking on behalf of MPO
35 staff for this metric. As Madam Mayor alluded to, this metric has been a
36 bit difficult for NMDOT and for MPO staff to come to grips with. MPOs are
37 responsible for establishing the Targets within the MPO areas. This is a
38 brand new measure for this year and unlike the previous Safety Targets
39 that we discussed, this metric is to be adopted by MPOs every four years.
40 DOTs have to adopt metrics for every two years. My personal expectation
41 is that at some point MPOs probably will move to that schedule, but for
42 this year the expectation is that this MPO will adopt a Performance Target
43 for the 2021 calendar year. There are six Performance Measures for
44 which the Targets must be set; it's Percentage of Interstate Pavements on
45 the NHS in Good Condition, Percentage of Interstate Pavements in Poor
46 Condition, Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements on the NHS in Good

1 Condition and Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements on the NHS in
2 Poor Condition and Percentage of Bridges on the NHS in good and in
3 poor condition.

4 The map that you see before you is the NHS Network within the
5 Mesilla Valley MPO Area. You will note that the map is centered in on the
6 urban core of the Las Cruces City Limits. That is because there are no
7 NHS Facilities further north in Doña Ana County or further to the south
8 within this MPO. On this screen we have the particular measures that are
9 used to determine whether a road facility is in good, fair or poor condition.
10 In order for a segment to be classified as poor two of the Performance
11 metrics have to be rated as poor and then the entire segment is classified
12 as poor. And the segments are taken every tenth-of-a-mile or measured
13 to every-tenth-of-a-mile.

14 I am, as I said at the October meeting, I'm not an engineer. I don't
15 know what all of the acronyms that are on the table, if you want further
16 clarification I would have to defer to Mr. Doolittle on that. NMDOT used a
17 couple of funding forecasts to determine the level of funding expected for
18 maintenance purposes within the time horizon. I should state that the
19 dollar amounts that you see on the slide are for the entire State of New
20 Mexico not just specific to this MPO area. However, the good news is
21 there is some additional funding that is utilized by DOT for maintenance
22 beyond what was taken into consideration for the adoption of the
23 Performance Metrics. So to some extent, the actual picture on the ground
24 is a little bit better than what might be indicated by just looking at the
25 projections alone.

26 Here on this are projected values for the next four years for the
27 Mesilla Valley MPO. You'll notice that for the Interstate NHS there is
28 anticipated to be a slight decline in the percentage of facilities in good
29 condition by the Target year of 2021, but thankfully the number of roads
30 that are going to be rated anticipated to be rated in poor condition is
31 anticipated to remain low.

32 Here we have the projected values for the Non-Interstate NHS,
33 unfortunately in this area the picture for the Mesilla Valley MPO is not as
34 good. I would like to specifically highlight the anticipated percentage of
35 17% rated poor for the Non-Interstate NHS Facilities. This is higher than
36 the State as a whole. We did have some conversation at the October
37 meeting as to why that is. The State is requesting that this MPO adopt an
38 independent Target for this particular metric of the percentage of the
39 roadways in good and poor condition for on the non-interstate NHS.

40 Lastly we have the Bridge Conditions. This one has been by far
41 and away the most difficult to reconcile. I don't know if Mr. Doolittle would
42 like for me to go ahead and defer to him as we literally were working on
43 this particular metric up until about two weeks ago. So to answer Mayor
44 Barraza's question, yes DOT and MPO we were working on this and
45 talking about it up until just a few weeks ago before we determined this
46 number, but I'll defer to Mr. Doolittle.

1
2 Eakman: Mr. Doolittle.

3
4 Doolittle: Yes Mr. Chair. So on this one if you'll recall last month the poor condition
5 was at about 12% and there were eight bridges on the listing that Andrew
6 presented to us. Six of those have been replaced as part of the Union
7 Ramp E there at Valley Drive/I-10 Intersection. Those were replaced
8 ultimately reducing that number down from eight bridges down to two.
9 The only two bridges that are currently in the MPO area that are under
10 poor condition are the two on University. The two on I-10 over University
11 the reason that the number of bridges went from 12 to two, but our percent
12 deficient only went from 12% down to 8% is because those bridges over
13 University are large. So if you look at this Performance Measure it's by
14 deck area not by the number of bridges. So ultimately the six that we
15 replaced were fairly small bridges. The thing I will tell you is the 8% is the
16 Target that we're going to ask to be considered by this Board. Our
17 expectation is internally at the District we have plans to do some work on
18 those University bridges. So our expectation is, unless something major
19 happens with the other bridges on the NHS System, your poor condition
20 rating will very likely drop to zero within the next two years because we'll
21 do some bridge rehab on those bridges specifically.

22 So that was the discussion last month as I had some concerns
23 about the data that was presented because it showed bridges that I
24 thought we had addressed. What happened was they were currently in
25 the inspection process by our District Engineer and his staff, so those
26 reports had not made it to Santa Fe to be incorporated into their data
27 base. That has since been fixed so the 8% that you see here is reflecting
28 our actual conditions as of today.

29
30 Eakman: Thank you. I have a follow-up question. Does the poor rating, is that
31 exclusive to structural integrity or is that for pavement quality?

32
33 Doolittle: So on a bridge there's different items that they inspect. And this one
34 specifically it has to do with substructure on the girders. We're seeing
35 some cracking at the abutments so it doesn't necessarily have to do up-
36 top. I will tell that just because it's rated poor doesn't mean that it's critical.
37 It just means that it's a rating that dropped below our normal acceptance
38 standards and we need to do some bridge preservation. So it has nothing
39 to do with the pavement. We do have an inspection criteria tied to the
40 deck. The deck of the University bridges is fine. It's the substructure
41 elements that are causing the rating to drop below the poor condition.

42
43 Eakman: Thank you. Are there other questions?

44
45 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. These are the Statewide Performance Targets
46 publish by NMDOT. As again, I would like to note that NMDOT is required

1 to adopt two two-year Targets, so that there is a Target year of 2019 and a
2 Target year of 2021.

3 Before you, you see the targets that MPO staff is going to
4 recommend to this Policy Committee for adoption. I will go ahead and
5 read those into the record.

6 Percentage of bridges on the NHS in good condition staff
7 recommends supporting the State Target and that target is 30%.
8 Percentage of bridges on the NHS in poor condition staff recommends
9 adopting an independent target for the poor condition number on bridges
10 and that target, as was on the previous slide, is 8%.

11 Percentage of Interstate Pavements in good condition, staff
12 recommends supporting the State Target. That target number is 59.1%.

13 Percentage of Interstate pavements in poor condition staff
14 recommends supporting the State Target and that target is 5%.

15 Lastly percentage of non-interstate NHS pavements in good
16 condition staff recommends adopting an independent target. That target
17 is 10% and finally percentage of non-NHS pavements in poor condition
18 staff recommends adopting an independent target and that target is 17%.

19 We do have until November 16th, this Friday, to adopt the State of
20 Good Repair Performance Target. MPO staff is asking for adoption at this
21 meeting. As I mentioned at the October meeting MPO staff was very
22 concerned in the lead up to this about the type of reporting requirements
23 that might be placed upon the MPO as part of adopting an independent
24 target. DOT assured us that there would be no additional reporting
25 requirements that basically the additional work for this particular metric is
26 what we are asking the Policy Committee to do today is voting to adopt an
27 independent target. DOT understands that we don't have the staffing or
28 the resources to be able to go out and conduct bridge inspections. But
29 they expect us to assist them in monitoring the data as it comes in and to
30 adopt independent targets if that is warranted.

31 The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee did make
32 some separate recommendations at their October 16th meeting, as I said
33 a few moments ago. MPO staff was still working with NMDOT up until two
34 weeks ago on the specifics of the metrics that DOT would request of this
35 MPO to adopt. Unfortunately, due to the timing of that, that meant that the
36 ultimate request from NMDOT was different than the one that was
37 presented to the BPAC. So the metric for bridge condition that the BPAC
38 recommended is not the same as the one that was presented to this
39 Committee today, I just want to be clear on that. But that being said, the
40 Technical Advisory Committee did recommend the requested Targets by
41 NMDOT that was presented to this Policy Committee this afternoon. I'll
42 stand now for any questions.

43
44 Eakman: Any questions of Andrew before we move to the question itself? Hearing
45 none. Would anybody like to move approval of this Resolution?
46

1 J-Burick: So moved.
2
3 Eakman: Thank you Trustee Johnson-Burick.
4
5 Barraza: Mr. Chair. Second.
6
7 Eakman: There is a motion and a second to accept Resolution number 18-16.
8 Andrew would you poll the Board.
9
10 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mayor Barraza.
11
12 Barraza: Yes.
13
14 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
15
16 Doolittle: Yes.
17
18 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
19
20 Hakes: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
23
24 Solis: Yes.
25
26 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick
27
28 J-Burick: Yes.
29
30 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
31
32 Sorg: Yes.
33
34 Wray: Mr. Chair.
35
36 Eakman: Yes.
37
38 **7.7 Resolution 18-17: A Resolution Adopting the Mesilla Valley MPO**
39 **System Performance Targets for 2019**
40
41 Eakman: Then you can move to 7.7.
42
43 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, Andrew Wray speaking on behalf of MPO
44 staff on this item. This is the last Performance Target that is required of
45 this MPO that we're requesting action on today. Again, this is a brand new
46 Performance Target for this year. Again similar to the State of Good

1 Repair, the request currently is that MPOs will adopt system performance
2 targets for a four-year time horizon. There are two measures that are
3 used to assess the system performance itself. Percentage of Reliable
4 Person Miles Traveled on the Interstate and Percentage of Reliable
5 Person Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS. Additionally, there is
6 the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for Freight Movement. There are
7 three additional measures for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
8 Program, but since this MPO is in attainment those will not apply to this
9 MPO.

10 There were three different forecast scenarios that NMDOT utilized
11 to make its projections. Those were an expected growth compared to
12 high growth and a build compared to no build. This is the Percentage of
13 Reliable Person Miles Traveled on the Interstate. You can see the base
14 line is established in Calendar Year 2017 and 2018. Then the first
15 NMDOT Required Performance Target of 2019, 2020 and then the four
16 year Performance Target for 2021 which is the one that this Committee is
17 considering today. As you can see, very little change expected across the
18 board no matter the scenario.

19 This is Percentage of Reliable Person Miles Traveled on the Non-
20 Interstate NHS system. Again same spread as last time and again as with
21 the previous metric very little change is expected regardless of the
22 scenario.

23 Then lastly Truck Travel Time Reliability Index the outcome is
24 projected to be the same regardless of scenario. I will go ahead and read
25 the NMDOT Target Statement into the record. Percentage of Reliable
26 Person Miles Travel on the Interstate System will decrease slightly in the
27 next four years. NMDOT has determined the Projected Reliability
28 Percentage of 95.1 percent to be an achievable target.

29 Next Percentage of Reliable Person Miles Traveled on the Non-
30 Interstate NHS System. Percentage of Reliable Person Miles Traveled on
31 the Interstate System will decrease slightly in the next four years. NMDOT
32 has determined the projected Reliability Percentage of 94.4% to be an
33 achievable target.

34 And then lastly for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. The
35 Index for Truck Travel Times on the Interstate System may be reduced
36 slightly in the next four years, but NMDOT has determined the 2021 Index
37 of 1.15 to be an achievable target.

38 Again, MPO staff is recommending to this Committee that it
39 endorse the State standards. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
40 Advisory Committee recommended endorsing the State Standards at their
41 October 16th meeting and the Technical Advisory Committee
42 recommended endorsing the State Standard at the November 1st
43 meeting. And I will stand now for any questions.

44
45 Eakman: Other questions? What are the wishes of the Board? Does anyone want
46 to make a motion to accept this resolution?

1
2 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
3
4 Eakman: Yes.
5
6 Barraza: I will make that motion to approve Resolution number 18-17.
7
8 Eakman: Thank you Mayor Barraza. Is there a second?
9
10 J- Burick: Second.
11
12 Eakman: Thank you Trustee Johnson-Burick. Motion and a second. Is there a
13 discussion? Hearing none. Andrew would you poll the Board.
14
15 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mayor Barraza.
16
17 Barraza: Yes.
18
19 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
20
21 Doolittle: Yes.
22
23 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
24
25 Hakes: Yes.
26
27 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
28
29 Solis: Yes.
30
31 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
32
33 J- Burick: Yes.
34
35 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
36
37 Sorg: Yes.
38
39 Wray: Mr. Chair.
40
41 Eakman: Yes.
42
43 **7.3 Resolution 18-13: A Resolution Endorsing Applications to NMDOT**
44 **for the Transportation Alternatives Program and Recreational Trails**
45 **Program**
46

1 Eakman: Then we can move to 7.3 Andrew.
2
3 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. As this Committee is aware, earlier this year we
4 have had an ongoing open call for projects for the Transportation
5 Alternative Program and the Recreational Trails Program. We have had
6 four applications submitted by our member jurisdictions as a response to
7 that open call for projects. What is being requested of this Policy
8 Committee here today is for this Policy Committee to give their seal of
9 approval to the applications that they wish to see move forward to the
10 State wide competitive process. I will just go ahead and proceed through
11 the applications in order as they are listed in the packet. We have Ms.
12 Ashleigh Curry here from the Las Cruces Public Schools to speak on
13 behalf of their application.
14
15 Curry: Thank you Mr. Wray. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. We are
16 proposing to continue the Safe Routes to School Program. We have
17 received funding since 2010 and we are just hoping to continue that on.
18 There aren't many changes to previous additions of this. I believe this is
19 maybe the fifth round of this funding that we're asking for. I believe its
20 \$107,000. It's slightly more than before because we are at all 25
21 elementary schools and just had an increase in the number of kids who
22 are walking and biking. So the slight increase would reflect the number of
23 incentive items that we purchase for kids. So that is a 25-hour salary
24 position for myself, that's nine months out of the year. And we have
25 stipend positions that we can pay \$500 a year to staff members at schools
26 to be able to assist us with the Weekly Walking School Bus Programs. So
27 if there are any questions I would be more than happy to answer.
28
29 Eakman: Are there questions? Thank you for the presentation.
30
31 Curry: Thank you very much.
32
33 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
34
35 Eakman: Yes.
36
37 Barraza: I don't have a question. I just want to commend Ms. Curry for the great
38 job that she has done for the Safe Routes to Schools. She is a Mesilla
39 resident and is very active at Mesilla Elementary with the Safe Route to
40 Schools as she is with the other schools that are participating in the
41 program. But Ashleigh is definitely a driving force for Safe Route to
42 Schools and I would hope that the Committee would support her and her
43 recommendation for approval of this application.
44
45 Eakman: Thank you Mayor Barraza. Mayor Pro-Tem Sorg.
46

1 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to also say the same that Ashleigh has
2 done an excellent job with the Safe Routes to School and my only regret is
3 that we can't give them more. I wish we could. Thank you Mr. Chair.

4
5 Eakman: Thank you. Thank you so much.

6
7 Curry: Thank you very much for your comments and thank you very much for
8 your consideration of the application.

9
10 Eakman: Andrew?

11
12 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I apologize to the Committee, I meant to point out
13 the page number that the SRTS Application began is on page 65 of the
14 packet.

15 Next we have presentation from the City of Las Cruces for the
16 Walnut Street Improvement Program Project that is on page 95 of the
17 packet. Mr. Steve Pacheco is going to speak for this application.

18
19 Eakman: Thank you. Welcome. Please introduce yourself and make your
20 presentation.

21
22 Pacheco: Thank you and good afternoon. This is Steve Pacheco with the Public
23 Works Department. We have been working on the funding for the
24 Transportation Alternatives Program, a grant for the Bicycle and
25 Pedestrian Infrastructure and Activities. We have the funding breakdown
26 on here as well. I apologize if you've already seen this before, but I went
27 ahead and wanted to present it to the full Committee. The NMDOT is to
28 fund 85.44% with a City match of 14.56%. We also have a map of the
29 area of interest that shows the portions that will be have a mill overlay and
30 striping and then the yellow portion will be only striping and then the blue
31 will be mill overlay and striping. So this will be from Hadley and end up on
32 Solano if we get the full amount of funding.

33 There are four different types, again the buffered bike lanes that we
34 will have, the bike lanes in Bike Boulevard and a shared lane marking. So
35 depending on which type of street we have it will be a mix of all of these
36 for the bicycle facilities. The NMDOT share ends up being \$999,648 and
37 the City share will be \$170,352 for an approximate total cost of
38 \$1,170,000. This is our estimate that we put together for the entire route.
39 And this is a cross section of Walnut of the different types depending on
40 which area we will be in that shows the actual bike lanes with the driving
41 lanes on them as well.

42 The Walnut Street Improvements Project, Walnut Street is a
43 principle collector with over 6,700 AADT. It has a major service
44 connection to the State Highway and Interstate and as you can see the
45 Highway 70 via Spruce, I-25 and I-10 via Amador Avenue, and US-70, so
46 this is a collector that really could use some additional help with the

1 pedestrians and bike lanes to make it a better route. So if you have any
2 questions I'll stand for any.
3
4 Eakman: Mayor Pro-Tem.
5
6 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Could you go back to the map?
7
8 Pacheco: Sure. There you go Councilor.
9
10 Sorg: So this begins at Hadley. Wasn't there a Walnut Project a map project
11 that dealt with Walnut even out to Lohman?
12
13 Pacheco: Yes. That's on the south side of this map, so it continues from this point
14 back to Lohman.
15
16 Sorg: So that's a separate project?
17
18 Pacheco: Yes sir.
19
20 Sorg: And that has MAP funding?
21
22 Pacheco: Yes sir.
23
24 Sorg: So this is a different MAP funding. Is this MAP funding at all?
25
26 Pacheco: Yes.
27
28 Trevino: Chairman, Councilor Sorg. This is Tony Trevino with the Public Works.
29 You are correct. We did submit for a MAP project from Lohman Avenue
30 all the way to Spruce. However, we only got funding for half of the project
31 so this is going to continue the project to Spruce and also I'm going to
32 incorporate some of the Active Transportation Plan.
33
34 Sorg: Sure.
35
36 Trevino: That includes some of the bike boulevards that make one connection of
37 one of the routes shown in the ATP Plan.
38
39 Sorg: Okay thank you for the explanation. That makes sense to me now. I
40 would like to make a comment that this is something that's all part of our
41 ATP and I'm all for it. Thank you Chairman.
42
43 Eakman: Thank you. Comments or questions?
44
45 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
46

1 Eakman: Yes Mayor.
2
3 Barraza: I feel like I'm really outspoken today. Is there anything there currently or is
4 it just sidewalk on this Steve?
5
6 Pacheco: Committee Members. This is a mix all the way through, but there is
7 sidewalk along the entire way and it will be improved for ADA Compliance.
8
9 Barraza: ADA Compliance and also putting in the bike facility, I guess it's the
10 striping for the bike lanes is that what we're proposing here?
11
12 Pacheco: Correct.
13
14 Barraza: Okay. That makes sense. Thank you.
15
16 Eakman: Thank you Mayor. Mayor Pro-Tem.
17
18 Sorg: I forgot something. Thank you Mr. Chair. I was just recently in Los
19 Angeles, downtown Los Angeles, and I saw the bike lanes they had there
20 not on every street, but on major streets, and I noticed that the beginning
21 of those bike lanes at an intersection they would paint in that case was a
22 green, I think the color was green, paint a section of it to kind of alert
23 people that this is for bikes only or for bikes and I would suggest that we
24 just paint with the bicycle symbol too, the stencil for that as to just to
25 emphasize this is what it is. I see people going down the street and
26 they're riding in the bike lane with their car. And so anything we can make
27 people understand that this is for bikes and you know it's better. Thank
28 you Mr. Chair.
29
30 Eakman: Thank you. Very good. Thank you so much.
31
32 Pacheco: Thank you.
33
34 Eakman: Next presentation?
35
36 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. The next presentation is again from the City of Las Cruces
37 for the Las Cruces Lateral Multiuse Trail Project. That application begins
38 on page 118 of the packet. We have Ms. Mathews here to speak on
39 behalf of this application.
40
41 Eakman: Welcome.
42
43 Mathews: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Cathy Mathews. I'm the
44 Landscape Architect with the City of Las Cruces. And we have submitted
45 an application for the Recreational Trails Program Grant. Basically the
46 proposal is to develop a trail, a multiuse trail along the Las Cruces Lateral,

1 an EBID facility, Elephant Butte Irrigation District facility from University
2 Avenue along the lateral adjacent to El Paseo and then continuing on that
3 Lateral behind Las Cruces High School and continuing on to the
4 intersection of Avenida de Mesilla/Idaho/Main Street where the City is
5 proposing to modify the road cross-section to include more bike lanes and
6 pedestrian facilities in that location also. So we'll be connecting that
7 facility in road facility to basically University Avenue with this multiuse trail.
8 I did develop a cost estimate or a proposed budget. Again with the similar
9 percentages as the previous project that you had a look at. The 14.56
10 match from the City, it would be coming from Park Impact Fees which
11 allow the City to increase level-of-service for recreation. With that I'd be
12 happy to answer questions as best I can.

13
14 Eakman: Mayor Pro-Tem did you have something?

15
16 Sorg: I wanted to see that cost page.

17
18 Mathews: Oh the cost, okay.

19
20 Sorg: Just leave it there for a while.

21
22 Mathews: Okay. Very good.

23
24 Eakman: Are there other questions or comments? Hearing none. Thank you Ms.
25 Mathews.

26
27 Mathews: Thank you.

28
29 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Lastly we have a presentation on the Doña Ana
30 County/Elks Drive Connectivity Project. Mr. Samuel Paz will be speaking
31 on behalf of this application.

32
33 Paz: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Andrew. So I don't have a presentation,
34 but I can tell you some few talking points. So we submitted a project
35 called Elks Connectivity Project and it's a project located in Doña Ana
36 County. The main intent is to connect schools and parks in the County.
37 We're talking about Elks Drive connecting Columbia Elementary to Doña
38 Ana Park. It's a multiuse trail proposal very similar to the Triviz Trail and
39 the capacity we're using is street right-of-way and the County right-of-way
40 so taking advantage of that corridor. Very short project, we're talking
41 about 1.15 miles. This is a new initiative for the County to really develop
42 community and pedestrian facilities we have something very similar to this
43 project happening in Chaparral, which is in El Paso MPO. That's really the
44 short and sweet tail of it so far. Stand for any questions related to it.

45
46 Eakman: Are there any questions?

1
2 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
3
4 Eakman: Yes Mayor.
5
6 Barraza: I just want to comment. I'm so happy to see the applications coming forth
7 for the trails, especially as we are moving forward on our trail here in the
8 Town of Mesilla. It's nice to see that the community is involved in trying to
9 better the walking facilities that we have for recreational purpose plus for
10 exercise purposes. So I'm very happy to see these applications come
11 forth.
12
13 Eakman: Thank you so much. Mayor Pro-Tem.
14
15 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chair. I want to get a picture of what this trail's going to
16 look like. You said it's like Triviz?
17
18 Paz: I guess a key comparison would be I think the Triviz Trail you know that
19 eight-foot wide multiuse path that's adjacent to the State Highway system.
20 Think of that kind of system.
21
22 Sorg: You mean the Interstate 25?
23
24 Paz: Yes. Interstate 25.
25
26 Sorg: Yes. I know it. I've used it.
27
28 Paz: We're proposing something similar to that.
29
30 Sorg: Okay.
31
32 Paz: One of the reasons why we actually went after this corridor is because the
33 County actually owns the right-of-way.
34
35 Sorg: Sure. I understand that I just still want to look at it and get a picture of it.
36 That particular trail has a good separation between the road or the street
37 and the trail and also with landscaping in between. Was that going to be
38 included in this?
39
40 Paz: So one of the pricing estimates we have is for retaining walls and green
41 infrastructure. So some of the issues we have in Doña Ana in that
42 particular area is we have a lot of erosion that comes from the nearby
43 arroyos. So we're looking at retaining walls, landscaping and a multiuse
44 path along that area. I don't know if that answers your question.
45
46 Sorg: A wall the whole way?

1
2 Paz: Not the whole way.
3
4 Sorg: Oh Okay.
5
6 Paz: There are key sections where we're really concerned with the grade.
7
8 Sorg: Yes. I see.
9
10 Paz: The grade of the highway versus the ...
11
12 Sorg: I see. Okay.
13
14 Paz: So we have those incorporated into our cost estimates.
15
16 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. That sounds great.
17
18 Eakman: Any other questions or comments. Is that the conclusion of the
19 presentations Andrew?
20
21 Wray: If Mr. Paz is concluded with his presentation then yes that's the last one.
22
23 Paz: The one thing I would like to add is that it also supports the Safe Routes to
24 School activities. Columbia is a Safe Routes to School location, but it has
25 very limited infrastructure. So it's very hard for that school to participate in
26 the Walking School Bus Program. Those type of activities and having that
27 connection between the park and schools really adds more value to those
28 programs that are already supported by the MPO.
29
30 Eakman: That's very helpful. Thank you so much.
31
32 Paz: Thank you.
33
34 Eakman: Mr. Doolittle.
35
36 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have one quick question on one of the previous
37 presentations if I may. Ms. Mathews I have a question about your
38 multiuse trail. So you mentioned that some of these are on EBIDs
39 laterals. Mayor Barraza and I have been dealing with EBID on the
40 University Project and sometimes it gets a little complicated just because
41 of the parties. Are there going to be any issues with the EBID and the
42 delivery of your project?
43
44 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. We have started the process of
45 applying for a Right-Of-Use Application with EBID. And the City does
46 have a MOU regarding trails on EBID property in place already. And I've

1 spoken with their engineer in general terms about what this project entails
2 and he has not expressed concern or reservation and actually has
3 encouraged me to proceed with that application, the Permit Application.
4 So while I do anticipate discussions and maybe some compromises
5 regarding which side of the lateral the City can have and which side will
6 remain strictly EBID, I don't anticipate that we would have much
7 difficulties, although, I'll be prepared for them now if they do come up as
8 difficulties.
9
10 Doolittle: Thank you.
11
12 Mathews: Thank you.
13
14 Eakman: Thank you very much. Are there other questions?
15
16 Wray: Mr. Chair. If I may.
17
18 Eakman: Yes Mr. Wray.
19
20 Wray: Related to that very topic, the City of Las Cruces today submitted a
21 requested amendment to their application to include the documentation of
22 the MOU between the City of Las Cruces and EBID for the purposes of
23 allowing permitting on their facilities for trails. So that will be appended to
24 the application and submitted to NMDOT as supporting documentation
25 should this Committee recommend approval of that application to
26 NMDOT.
27
28 Eakman: Very good. Thank you. Then is there a motion to approve Resolution 18-
29 13?
30
31 Barraza: Mr. Chair. I would like to make that motion that we approve Resolution
32 18-13 endorsing applications to NMDOT for the Transportation
33 Alternatives Program and Recreational Trails Program.
34
35 Sorg: I'll second that.
36
37 Eakman: There is a motion and a second. Is there discussion? Hearing none.
38 Would you poll the Board Mr. Wray?
39
40 Wray: Yes. Mr. Chair. Mayor Barraza.
41
42 Barraza: Yes.
43
44 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
45
46 Doolittle: Yes.

1
2 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.

3
4 Hakes: Yes.

5
6 Wray: Commissioner Solis.

7
8 Solis: Yes.

9
10 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.

11
12 J-Burick: Yes.

13
14 Wray: Councilor Sorg.

15
16 Sorg: Yes.

17
18 Wray: Mr. Chair.

19
20 Eakman: Yes.

21
22 **7.4 Resolution 18-14: A Resolution Amending the 2018-2023**
23 **Transportation Improvement Program**
24

25 Eakman: Now we can move to resolution 18-14. Thanks everyone for being here.

26
27 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. This particular resolution is TIP amendments
28 requested by RoadRUNNER Transit. This is starting on page 185 of your
29 packet. This is kind of, I hate to use the word routine, but it is very usual
30 for the once the appropriations come in that RoadRUNNER Transit must
31 amend the TIP in light of the updated funding allotments.

32 The first project that RoadRUNNER has requested amendment for
33 is TL00100. This is the Transit Operation Operating Assistant money.
34 This amendment is to add-in the 2019 apportionment. That apportionment
35 is the Federal share is \$3,454,358 and since this is a 50/50 grant the local
36 match is the same \$3,454,358.

37 Next amendment requested by RoadRUNNER Transit is TL00110
38 this is the Revenue Rolling Stock. Again adding in the Federal Fiscal Year
39 2019 apportionment, the FTA portion is \$460,364. The local match will be
40 \$82,241.

41 The next amendment requested is TL00120 this is the Capital
42 Equipment. This is again adding in the Federal Fiscal Year 2019
43 apportionment. The FTA apportion is \$270,400. The local match is
44 \$67,600.

45 Then the next one is TL00130 this has been an item that has
46 actually been of long standing on the TIP as it has been continually moved

1 into out years. The City of Las Cruces has now secured funding. This is
2 for the Transit Maintenance and Operations Center. The FTA portion of
3 this is \$16,131,221. Required local match will be \$4,032,806.

4 And then lastly we have the amendment requested for TL00140.
5 Again this was adding in the Federal Fiscal Year of 2019 apportionment.
6 The FTA amount is \$2,281,221 and the local match is \$487,864. I will
7 stand now for any questions.
8

9 Eakman: Are there questions? Hearing none. Yes Mayor Pro-Tem.

10
11 Sorg: Yes, I would caution that we don't go too fast on these things so we all
12 understand what it is, but that's okay.
13

14 Wray: I apologize.

15
16 Sorg: I have a question about 140
17

18 Wray: Rolling Stock.
19

20 Sorg: I see FY16 that's in the past, right? This is on the page 193.
21

22 Wray: Okay, Mr. Bartholomew is here from RoadRUNNER Transit.
23

24 Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew City of Las Cruces RoadRUNNER Transit. It's a
25 project TL00140 correct? The Fiscal Year is the year of the Federal
26 Apportionment for these funds, but we are going to apply for them in the
27 Fiscal Year '19 for the bus. So we had some funding from Fiscal Year '16,
28 Fiscal Year '17, Fiscal Year '18, Fiscal Year '19.
29

30 Sorg: That's one of things where you combined a whole bunch together to get
31 one.
32

33 Bartholomew: Correct.
34

35 Sorg: You explained that this morning right?
36

37 Bartholomew: In this particular it's 5339, Section 5339 funding and it's somewhat
38 formula based. It's the State's Appropriation for small urban systems for
39 the 5339 funds and it was the allocation the State gave to us in each of
40 those Fiscal Years.
41

42 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chair.
43

44 Eakman: Thank you. Other items for clarification? Hearing none. Is there a motion
45 to approve this resolution?
46

1 Hakes: I'll move approval of Item 7.4 Resolution 18-14, Transportation
2 Improvement Program.
3
4 Eakman: Thank you Commissioner Hakes. There's a motion on the floor. Is there a
5 second?
6
7 Sorg: I'll second it.
8
9 Eakman: Second by the Mayor Pro-Tem. Discussion? Let's take the roll. Mr.
10 Wray.
11
12 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mayor Barraza.
13
14 Barraza: Yes.
15
16 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
17
18 Doolittle: Yes.
19
20 Wray: Commissioner Hakes.
21
22 Hakes: Yes.
23
24 Wray: Commissioner Solis.
25
26 Solis: Yes.
27
28 Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
29
30 J-Burick: Yes.
31
32 Wray: Councilor Sorg.
33
34 Sorg: Yes.
35
36 Wray: Mr. Chair.
37
38 Eakman: Yes. Thank you.
39

40 **8. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

42 **8.1 NMDOT update**

44 Eakman: And now the agenda states it's time for any comments from the Chair or
45 Committee Members at this time if you have something?
46

1 Barraza: Mr. Chair.

2
3 Eakman: Yes Mayor.

4
5 Barraza: Are we going to do discussion items from DOT update first?

6
7 Eakman: You are correct. Mr. Doolittle, thank you for staying with us.

8
9 Doolittle: Yes, absolutely. So since this is the part of the agenda where you berate
10 me with questions and complaints, I'm going to excuse myself now and let
11 Fili stand in front of the bus. No, I'm just kidding. I wouldn't do that to Fili
12 and you all do not berate me. I appreciate the honest conversations we all
13 have.

14 We only have two projects in the area right now. Valley Drive as
15 anybody that's driven through that corridor have noticed, we're
16 transitioning now from one phase to the other. We're working on placing
17 some detours for the southern portion. Beginning to do some work on the
18 Avenida de Mesilla part and Hickory. So as we move towards that
19 transition you'll start to see some changing in some traffic control and
20 those kinds of things. We do continue to still have our public meetings
21 every month. Honestly we've had several complaints and concerns
22 brought to our attention about the new work that's going to take place, the
23 new phasing but that's typically standard for these urbanized projects.

24 I will tell you that Ryan Tafoya, my Project Manager has been
25 working very diligently with those property owners and businesses.
26 They're not always happy with our answers, but we're doing everything we
27 can to accommodate them as best we can. I ask that everybody just be
28 patient with us as we make our way through this transition. But if you
29 have any concerns or questions, work through Ryan or myself. If you
30 can't get a hold of Ryan just shoot me an e-mail and I'll do what I can.

31 Again I appreciate specifically Councilor Eakman, your
32 involvement and your partnering with us to make sure that not only are we
33 held accountable, but we're relaying the appropriate information of the
34 people that are along that corridor.

35 The other one that we have that honestly is causing a little more
36 problem than I thought it would is, we're replacing the guardrail on the I-10
37 corridor basically from the West Mesa all the way to the Texas State Line.
38 It's a rather large project to bring up all the guardrail to current standards.
39 So right now we're right about the I-10/I-25 Interchange working our way
40 east or south, however you want to look at it, and then when they get to
41 the end, we'll turn around and come back. Most of that are one-lane
42 closures. We are having to close ramps periodically for a few days at a
43 time depending on if they have enough room to get their guardrail truck
44 and paver in there, kind of low profile if you're not on the Interstate. If you
45 are it can be problematic at times. A lot of traffic on I-10 this time of year
46 because as they get snow up north the heavy truck traffic move their way

1 to the south. I can almost tell you every day it snows up north because
2 there's a substantial increase in the trucks. So you're going to see some
3 backup, you're going to see some delays on the Interstate as they work
4 their way through that one-lane closure.

5 That's all we have currently under construction. The other one that
6 I just wanted to provide a quick update on is our design for the University
7 Interchange is complete. It has been submitted to the general office in
8 preparation for advertising. We still haven't determined exactly when we'll
9 bid that job, but we're hoping to bid it in either December or January. But
10 with that being said, you can probably expect to see construction in either
11 late spring or early summer. Once we get started with that I'll provide my
12 updates and give you all when we're having public meetings that kind of
13 stuff. With that Mr. Chair I don't have anything else unless anybody has
14 any questions for me.

15
16 Eakman: Questions for Mr. Doolittle. Mayor.

17
18 Barraza: Thank you Mr. Chair and Mr. Doolittle. First on a positive note, the Town
19 of Mesilla last night approved the agreement with Souder, Miller for the
20 trail. So we're hopefully going to start working on moving that project
21 forward. So we'll be getting all the necessary paperwork in order for that
22 and we're very excited about that project. The walking trail from the river
23 down Calle del Norte to the Mesilla Lateral. So it's a project we've been
24 working on for a couple of years and it's so nice to see it finally, it's starting
25 to pick up pace anyway so it was voted on unanimously last night by the
26 Board of Trustees.

27 The other question I have is, well it's not a question, I guess a
28 concern, the three entries into the Town of Mesilla all have orange barrels.
29 We have Avenida de Mesilla, they have all the barrels up there already
30 working on Hickory all the way to Avenida de Mesilla. We have under the
31 underpass on University Avenue there's orange barrels and I think also on
32 Union, but that's closer towards the University so we're going to be seeing
33 quite a few orange barrels going on and even in the town, coming to the
34 meeting today, oh my gosh, it was our downtown the Market was going
35 on, the construction here Avenida de Mesilla, all orange barrels so yes, it's
36 a challenge, but definitely well-worth the time. You all have invested in
37 that.

38 My other concern is the Interstate going to Arizona and that's I-10.
39 We travel that very often, four times maybe a month. That road is so
40 horrendous and I'm seeing patches of the asphalt, just chunks are just
41 coming off. What is the plan for that part of the interstate from Las Cruces
42 to the Arizona border?

43
44 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. So right now we're actually in the process of working on
45 an RFP to conduct a study for the entire I-10 Corridor. As I mentioned last
46 month, when we were talking about Performance Measures, I-10 has

1 reached its service life. For the past ten or fifteen years probably we've
2 done mill and inlays just to try to hold it together, make the ride smooth.
3 We'll continue to do that. We're working with our design regent to design
4 some of those projects to put on the shelf so that we can maintain the
5 pavement. But the intent of this study is to start looking at the major
6 sections that need re-construction. Developing a scope, a prioritized list
7 and looking at funding options to re-construct that road. Until then, it's just
8 a matter of us holding it together with some band-aids. And so, the
9 patches you're talking about, that's my maintenance staff basically doing
10 just some blade patches, throwing in some patching material. Just doing
11 everything we can, because you're right, it's very literally in front of our
12 eyes from one day to the next depending on the moisture it falls apart.

13 I will tell you Mayor that there's a large portion of it that we're
14 starting to lose the seal coat off the top. So although it does sound very
15 loud and it looks like it's falling apart it's basically the seal coat. So the
16 road itself is in decent shape. Specifically the area between Deming and
17 the Arizona State line, that's the area that, like I said, very literally from
18 day-to-day we're having blowouts.

19 So we'll do what we can to maintain it. We are trying to be pro-
20 active to come up with a Pavement Preservation Project until we can get
21 the re-construction done. I can't recall if I shared with you all last month or
22 not, but I recently had a request from the Secretary to provide unfunded
23 major projects and my number one priority was the I-10 corridor. The re-
24 construction of I-10 is estimated at about a \$850,000,000. So that just
25 gives you a perspective. That's 165 miles of roadway. So take your \$850
26 million and divide it by the 165 miles that gives you a cost per mile. It's
27 very expensive, but we're at that point where we're going to have to bite
28 the bullet and figure it out. But I understand you concern Mayor. It's
29 rough.

30
31 Barraza: Thank you. Yes and the ride is very rough and switching from lanes to
32 lanes just trying to get a smooth ride in there, but also I have seen a
33 dramatic increase of the bigger trucks, the semi-trucks on the interstate.
34 This past couple of weeks ago, we were heading into Arizona and I think it
35 was like one car for every ten semi-trucks and a lot of, I guess the
36 snowbirds are coming into Arizona, so it was heavily traveled by heavier
37 vehicles.

38 So it's just a concern to me plus also a safety issue with that also
39 because cars do go at a high rate of speed and when you're hitting these
40 bumps its yes, pretty dangerous. But thank you for that information.
41 Thank you Mr. Chair.

42
43 Eakman: Thank you. Mr. Doolittle, could you review for me where your budget
44 revenues come from, the different sources of those?
45

1 Doolittle: I'll try to remember Mr. Chair. We get fuel tax, weight distance, vehicle
2 tax, vehicle registration I'm sorry. I think that's our major four, gas tax,
3 diesel tax, weight distance because of our commercial vehicles and
4 vehicle registration I think are our major four.
5

6 Eakman: And there's no revenue coming from the Legislature in Annual Allotments?
7

8 Doolittle: Every year about this time that becomes a hot topic of discussion and at
9 this point I guess we'll wait and see what the new administration brings.
10

11 Eakman: Very good. Thank you so much for that. I appreciate that.
12

13 **9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS** 14

15 Eakman: Now, if that's your presentation, I think I'll go to any comments from Board
16 Members they would like to make. Hearing none.
17

18 **10. PUBLIC COMMENT** 19

20 Eakman: How about public comments? Is there any member of the public? Staff
21 comments? Andrew.
22

23 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We do have a rather big announcement to make to
24 this Committee. We have the dates and locations solidified for the initial
25 phase, the first round of public comment for the next MTP. Our kickoff
26 meeting is going to be November 29th at 4:30 in the Bank of the West
27 lobby here in Downtown Las Cruces. We have three more meetings
28 subsequent of that in December: December 3rd, 4:30 to 7:30 at the Sage
29 Café out on the East Mesa, December 10th 4:30 to 7:30 at the Radium
30 Springs Community Center and December 13th at the Vado Del Cero
31 Community Center.

32 Do want to again mention to this Committee, I know we've
33 discussed this multiple times in the lead up to this public involvement
34 phase. While we do intend to have a couple more sort of public meetings
35 under the MPO banner in the first part of 2019, our emphasis for this
36 round of public involvement really is we want to go to other people's
37 meetings with respect to the Councilors. If the Councilors would like for us
38 to come and speak at their District Meetings we want to do that. For the
39 County Commissioners we're more than happy to come and speak at your
40 jurisdiction meetings. Same thing for the Town of Mesilla, we want to go
41 to other people's meetings this time as opposed to last time. We really
42 want to go where the people are instead of expecting people to come to
43 us is really the emphasis that MPO staff would like to have for the public
44 engagement of this MTP. Again it's not to say we do intend to have a
45 couple more meetings under our own flag in 2019, but we really would like
46 to go to other organizations to speak to where people are. So we are

1 going to have a press release about this sent out to our master mailing list.
2 We'll get it in the paper. We hope to see all of you at some of our public
3 meetings during this initial phase.
4

5 Eakman: Very good. If I may, Andrew, I'd like to very much compliment you on the
6 professionalism of this meeting today. I think you're doing an excellent job
7 in this interim role. Wishing you good fortune.
8

9 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. That's very gratifying to hear. I really appreciate
10 that.
11

12 Barraza: Mr. Chair. Just one last question, when is our next scheduled MPO
13 meeting?
14

15 Wray: I will have to look. I believe it is on, it's on the regular time for next month,
16 but I will check the meeting calendar if the Committee will indulge me.
17

18 Sorg: It's the 12th of December.
19

20 Eakman: It would be the 12th I do believe. Yes.
21

22 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair it is December 12th, here in the City of Las Cruces Council
23 Chambers at 1:00 pm.
24

25 **11. ADJOURNMENT (2:16 PM)**
26

27 Eakman: Same time, same place cowboys. We are adjourned. Thank you.
28
29
30
31

32 
33 _____
34 Chairperson