MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held January 13, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (departed 2:43)
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Wayne Savage, NMSU/Arrowhead Center
Wyatt Kartchner, Molzen Corbin
Charles Clements
Kristen Woods, Bohannan-Huston
Denise Weston, Bohannan-Huston
Melanie Bishop, Bohannan-Huston
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:05 p.m.)

Flores: All right. It's five minutes after one so I'm going to call this meeting to order and have a determination of quorum.

Murphy: Okay. Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Here.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Here.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Here.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Here.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Here.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Here.

Murphy: We're unanimous.

Flores: Yay. All right.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Flores: And so the first order of business is Election of Officers. So do you want to talk about our tradition and what we might do, have a discussion on that?

Murphy: Certainly.

Flores: Or should we have a motion?

Hancock: No I …

Flores: Well go ahead.

Murphy: Okay, that's …

Hancock: That's not the way we do it.

Murphy: Certainly Madam Chair. The ...

Hancock: He can tell us.

Murphy: MPO Bylaws require that we elect a, a Chair and a Vice-Chair on a annual basis and do it the first calendar, first meeting of the calendar year and it's, it's been, it's not a requirement but it's kind of been an informal tradition amongst this Policy Committee that they rotate the Chair and the Vice-Chair through the three jurisdictions. This, the last calendar year the Town of Mesilla held the Chair and the City of Las Cruces held the Vice-Chair so continuing that tradition would have the County be in the Chair position and, or the City in the Chair position and the County in the Vice-Chair position. But, and I, I need to you know put this out there that is no, by no means a requirement. You are free to elect from your membership whoever you choose to, to those two positions and we'll leave it, leave it at that.

Flores: Okay. Do we have any discussion about this? Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Is Trent a voting member and is he part of that process?

Murphy: The, Mr. Doolittle was added a couple year, in 2013 when we amended the Bylaws and the District 1 Engineer position was placed as a voting member on the Policy Committee and I guess it's up to this Committee to decide whether to put that position into the rotation or to elect Mr. Doolittle in any capacity for, for those offices as I said it's, it's completely, completely up to, to this body.

Flores: Okay.

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: I'm sorry, if I could respond to that a little bit. I, I appreciate the, the opportunity to sit in on that rotation but typically in the past with discussions with executive staff because of conflicts with you know budgets and our STIP and those types of things that we have control over, the position has been both with this body and with the El Paso MPO that we typically don't sit in as a Chair or Vice-Chair. We participate in the committees but don't accept the nominations for any of those Chairs so I got out of that one.

Hancock: I, I thought we should, Madam Chair I thought we should at least put him on the spot.

Flores: Okay. Thank you.

Doolittle: You, you did and I got out of it.

Flores: Any other comments or nominations?

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Just, just to clarify if it's the normal rotation it would be, who would be in the Chair slot?

Flores: Somebody from the City of Las Cruces.

Garrett: Some, somebody from the City. And then somebody from, Vice-Chair would be someone from the County.

Flores: From County, right.

Garrett: Okay. I, personally not knowing exactly who's going to be interested or available I think it really has helped us to just continue the, the cycle unless somebody, the only exception I can think of is if someone in particular has a burning interest to serve as the Chair and work through a number of, of issues. And that could happen but I'm not sure if that's the case today.

Flores: So I'll ask if anybody has a burning interest that they are, to pursue any goals that they have for the MPO.

Eakman: Madam Chair. I think his point was do you have any burning passions about, that you need to follow through on. Am I correct?

Garrett: Well that, I wasn't excluding her.

Flores: I think it was out there for anybody so.

Garrett: For anybody, yeah, yeah. Otherwise I would, I would feel that the default should be to stay with the regular rotation.

Flores: I agree. So anybody, anybody have any nominations?

Hancock: Madam Chair. I would nominate Gil Sorg.

Flores: Okay. Do I hear a second?

Eakman: I would second.

Barraza: Madam Chair. I second.

Flores: Okay. I, I heard two seconds from Mr. ...

Eakman: Eakman.

Flores: Eakman and from Mayor Barraza. So we'll just take the second from Mr. Eakman. Any more comments? Should we take a vote on that then?

Murphy: You want to close the floor for nominations and with ...

Flores: Any more nominations? Okay. Seeing none we'll close the floor and take a vote.

Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: It doesn't matter. Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Flores: Now from here does he take over for the nominations for Vice-President?

Murphy: Let's go ahead and …

Flores: Finish off and …

Murphy: Nominate the Vice-Chair and then turn over.

Flores: And then I'm not, and then I'm done. Okay. All right. Do I hear any nominations for Vice-President, or Vice-Chair, sorry.

Sorg: Shall I nominate? Commissioner Hancock.

Flores: Okay. And I saw a second from Mayor Barraza and Olga Pedroza was also hand in her hand but I, I'm going to take Mayor Barraza on that one. So any other nominations? Olga were you trying to nominate anybody else or …

Garrett: I just have a question.

Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Does Chair Hancock feel that he has the time to serve as the …

Hancock: No.

Garrett: As the Vice-Chair. I'd be willing to do this but I, I need to allow a, a sort of a caveat. I've taken on the responsibility to represent the County in two insurance pools for the State which will mean that based on the schedule of those meetings which are mostly in Santa Fe that I will probably have to miss three meetings. Now as long as Councilor Sorg is here you, you

don't need me for backup but I'm, I'm really interested in what's being done with this body and with the understanding that I have those three that I probably am not going to be able to get to, I'd be happy to serve in that capacity as long as you would take sort of a, a wounded duck you know for ...

Flores: You know actually I had a question about that is if the Chair doesn't show up and the Vice-Chair doesn't show up does, could the Vice-Chair send a proxy? Is that fine with the Bylaws? What do the Bylaws actually say to that? Could, you know ...

Murphy: Madam Chair, yeah Members of the ...

Flores: What would happen in that case?

Murphy: Members of the Committee. The, the Bylaws call for any one of you can have a, another, another elected member of your, of your government serve as a, as an alternate or proxy for you at any one meeting. If there were a meeting where the, both the Chair and the Vice-Chair were absent the, then the, the, the members that did convene would elect a ...

Garrett: Exactly.

Murphy: Temporary Chair ...

Garrett: Right.

Murphy: For that meeting.

Garrett: Yeah.

Hancock: Madam Chair. I, I would then be able to do a, like a second Vice-President.

Flores: All right.

Garrett: So you could be the backup.

Flores: Okay.

Garrett: So I, I'd be willing if someone wanted to note, nominate me I would be willing to accept that.

Flores: Okay.

Hancock: I nominate.

Flores: Do I hear a nomination?

Hancock: Nomination for Commissioner Garrett.

Flores: Okay. Do …

Barraza: Okay, so do we need, I'm sorry. Madam Chair.

Flores: Do we need a vote on the first one?

Barraza: Do we need to rescind the first motion?

Sorg: No. It dies from a lack of second.

Hancock: No, I …

Barraza: There was a second.

Flores: There was a second and …

Barraza: There was a second.

Sorg: Oh, there was.

Hancock: But …

Sorg: I'm sorry.

Hancock: But, but …

Murphy: I think it was, the nomination was refused.

Hancock: Right.

Flores: Okay.

Barraza: Okay.

Flores: So the nomination being refused, do I hear a second on the nomination?

Benavidez: Second.

Flores: Okay. So Commissioner Benavidez seconded the motion to nominate Commissioner Garrett for Vice-Chair. So any more nominations or comments? Seeing none, I'd like to, let's take a vote.

Murphy: Okay. I guess closing the floor and taking the vote. Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Flores: Oh, I don't, you don't get, give us the results and I don't get to say "Congratulations."

Murphy: I'll let you.

Flores: Okay. Well then it looks like we have a new Chair and, and a Vice-Chair. Congratulations to Commissioner Garrett and Councilor Sorg. Do we want to change, do you want to change seats so you, going to conduct the meeting from where you're at?

Sorg: I'm comfortable here if everybody else is.

Flores: Okay. All right.

Sorg: So we go on? I'll take over the meeting then.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Who said that? Commissioner Hancock, okay.

Hancock: Yes.

Sorg: Maybe I'm not in a good place.

Hancock: We'd like to thank the past Chair for her service and good luck in your endeavors.

Sorg: Yes.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: You're welcome Commissioner Hancock.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Sorg: The first, next order of business rather is the Conflict of Interest Inquiry. Does any Member of the Committee or any member of staff have a conflict of interest on any item on the agenda today?

ALL NO.

Sorg: Okay. Hearing none.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Then we'll go on to Public Comment. Is there any member of the public would like to speak to the, to the Committee today? If you so raise your hand. Okay. Seeing none.

5. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: We'll move on. The Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

Hancock: So moved.

Pedroza: Mr. Chair. I make a motion we approve the, the consent agenda.

Hancock: Second.

Sorg: Okay. Uh oh, motion has been made and second to approve the consent agenda. Would the, would, would Tom poll the …

Murphy: Okay.

Sorg: Committee.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: I'll abstain because I was not here in December.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: I'll abstain also.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Abstain.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: And Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES.

Sorg: All right then.

6. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

6.1 * December 9, 2015

- APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA VOTE.

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.1 * Resolution 16-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for 2016 Calendar Year by the Mesilla Valley MPO

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

7.2 Resolution 16-02: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue Phase A report

Sorg: Moving on to Action Item number 7.2, Resolution 16-02: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue Phase One report.

Benavidez: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Benavidez: Can I make a motion to approve Resolution 16-02?

Sorg: Yes you may. Is there a second?

Hancock: Second.

Sorg: Motion was made and seconded to approve the, to approve the resolution. Is there a presentation?

Murphy: We do have a presentation, Denise Weston from Bohannan-Huston who worked on the study for the MPO has a, I guess will give you a presentation if, and then we'll ask for a vote.

Pedroza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Go ahead.

Pedroza: I had, I have a question about the resolution. I have 16-01 followed by 16-02. So are we skipping 16-01?

Sorg: I believe it was on the consent agenda, 16-01.

Pedroza: 16-01 was on the consent agenda?

Murphy: Yes.

Sorg: Yes, it is.

Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Fine. That's what.

Sorg: If that's what the ...

Pedroza: Thank you.

Sorg: Asterix stands for still today. Okay.

Pedroza: Ah. Thank you.

Sorg: What's the difference between the colored one and this one? Anything? Oh. Changes. Thank you. You may proceed. Gosh I hate this chair.

Weston: Good afternoon. Thank you so much. As Tom said I'm Denise Weston with Bohannan-Huston. I've been the Project Manager on this project and have really enjoyed working with the MPO on this. Thank you for the opportunity. I'll do a presentation of the recommendations for you and particularly discuss the stakeholder and outreach that we've done for this project and then I'll go over a few of the edits we've made, two tiny edits we made to the document before we request your approval on it, and of course answer any questions that you may have.

So we'll start with giving you an overview on the purpose and need for this project. It was, it is funded with Federal Highway Administration planning funds so it was really important that we follow the New Mexico

Department of Transportation Location Study Procedures and that we develop a purpose and need for this particular project. The purpose of the University Avenue Corridor Study was to provide an enhanced multimodal transportation corridor along University Avenue between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla. And the need as many of you know was established due to safety concerns due to the potential pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular conflicts along that corridor particularly tied to the location of Zia Middle School and the residential areas around there.

There are some physical deficiencies that were identified. There are basically no, there are no shoulders along there, very few pedestrian facilities, and no bicycle facilities. And then there's always the potential for economic development whenever you improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities along a major corridor within the city.

The outreach activities we did, we've been, we spent a fair amount of time this year on this project and we did a public meeting in June which was well-received and then we have been to the BPAC once and to the TAC three times, and we did another public meeting in October and I'll give you some results and the information that, the input we received from, from those committees, stakeholders, and as well as the public. The public meeting in October we had about 30 attendees. Some of the concerns that were raised, I heard it was actually a pretty busy meeting. I unfortunately was unable to attend but there were a lot of people there and they had a lot of really interesting things to say so some of the concerns were speed, noise, and lighting along the corridor; questions on funding which again I'll reiterate this was paid for with Federal Highway Planning funds; at this time there are no design or construction funds identified for this project; concerns with the vehicular-bicycle-pedestrian conflicts as well as the transit system; support, overall support for bicycle facilities has been, has resonated throughout this project as well as the support for pedestrian facilities. There's, the concern with the limited right-of-way remains and is an issue that will have to be dealt with as the project goes forward but is pretty minimal and over, and really overall there's been great support for the project and the need for improvements along this corridor has just been amplified by every person that we communicate with.

The combination of what we've heard from BPAC and the TAC is again bicycle facilities in the roadway is a critical feature. The bicyclists clearly want that facility type; a separate space for pedestrians primarily because we're talking about children, we're talking about young people that need to have a safe place to walk to and from school. There was a request for a consistent typical section along the corridor as best as that could be designed, just not to confuse the users, to make it really clear for the bicycles and pedestrians where they should be so that it makes it a clear access to and from that school and those residential areas and again I'll just reiterate we've had really strong support.

Some of the issues and concerns that we've dealt with in this study and also still some of them will remain as this project moves forward in project development is that limited, that the right-of-way is limited in some areas and would require further coordination with the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, the Las Cruces Public Schools system, and potentially private landowners. I do have a map and a few slides that will give you sort of a snapshot of where they may or may not need right-of-way for the recommend, the recommended alternatives. The Elephant Butte Irrigation District is currently considering some improvements along the lateral that runs south of University Avenue, potentially piping that. We have been working with them quite closely on ensuring that we're coordinating those efforts and that what we recommend in this plan does not preclude what they need to do to make their facility effective and efficient but that if there are ways to coordinate on that going forward, that we can bring community you know comprehensive benefit to the corridor but that each project can handle its own recommendation separately. But if there's a way to coordinate those efforts that's even better. And then the utilities, there are utilities along there. I have a map that'll show you, give you a snapshot as well of where those utilities are located but we have made recommendations to minimize the relocation of those utilities primarily because that reduces the cost.

So we're, here you have the right-of-way width. These figures are all in the report but this is just an overall snapshot of what we're looking at here. If you start from the east, the green indicates that, that the, there's enough right-of-way for the recommended alternatives. The yellow-orange means that it may be a little bit tight in there and that we would have to utilize the Elephant Butte Irrigation District right-of-way to put in the recommended alternative. Again it gets green near the school and then tightens up as we head west, again needing either some right-of-way from the School District or potentially private property owners. We're not, we did not do on-the-ground surveys so we cannot give you an exact footage on that. That would be, we would not be able to give you that but it's really not a, it's not a significant amount of land so I think it's definitely the recommendations are viable and then we do all, we do as I'll go to the alternatives that we recommend shortly, there are two alternatives so that we can ensure that they fit within the right-of-way that's available with some slight modifications if additional right-of-way is available.

Utilities, these are a little hard to see up on the screen but in your book you can see them. There's some overhead electric utilities along the entire corridor. There's some water utility lines and there's some gas utility lines. The ones that are most difficult for us to avoid are those overhead electric utility poles so there could be potentially some weaving of a sidewalk that may move around those poles just to minimize the cost of that relocation.

So the recommended alternatives, we have two like I said. One is the 60 point foot right-of-way; that is, that is the ultimate recommendation

and then an alternative of Typical Section G in places where it may or may not need to be tightened up. So I'm going to actually jump to the pictures cause I think it's easier to see. This one here you have two 12-foot driving lanes, the five-foot bike lanes in the roadway, you have a curb and gutter, a five-foot buffer on one side, a two-foot buffer on the other with a six-foot sidewalk and a ten-foot multiuse trail. We did not make a decision specifically. Our assumption is that that multiuse trail would go on the south side just because of the opportunity to use that EBID right-of-way so that's what, that's what we would be recommending but certainly there's some ability to modify that if needed. This provides in-road bicycle facilities, it provides separate pedestrian facilities, and then it also provides that multiuse trail option for maybe younger children riding their bike or families on the corridor and just provides a, you know a more pleasant use of the corridor for the community. So the smaller, the smaller typical section can be squeezed down to 44 feet at its tightest. It could be reduced to 11-foot driving lanes, maintain the five-foot bike lane within the corridor, still has the curb and gutter, does not have room for the buffer, and then the four-to-six-foot sidewalk on both the north and south side. Again it seemed really important to have those pedestrian facilities on both sides of the roadway and this is just what we could put in there with modifications as land and right-of-way became available.

In addition to this throughout the project we have offered up this opportunity not, it's not mutually exclusive of the other alternatives it's in addition to it, to look at a multiuse alternative that actually uses the EBID laterals that surround this corridor both north and south and you can see in the green they travel around, I don't, I never end up with a pointer, sorry. They travel around the laterals that exist there and that just provides an opportunity for additional bicycle and pedestrian use in the area. If people want to not be on that corridor they could, this could you know be a viable solution. EBID is in full support of this. They're willing to work with the City on what it would take to do this. They gave me that verbal response yesterday. They're not here today to speak for themselves but they were very clear that they supported this alternative. So we felt like it was important to put that in this plan given that when something is in a plan and it's in an approved plan it just has better opportunity for funding so we kept this throughout the entire planning process. And again not, not instead of the others, in addition to.

These are just some renderings we built for the public. They're fun to look at to give people an idea of what it would look like. This area on the western edge is the tightest portion of the corridor so that is where we would potentially have to put, squeeze in the 11-foot lanes and the four-foot sidewalks without taking any right-of-way. This is, is tight in there but still gives you a good use of that corridor. This is in the middle and this gives you an idea of how we would, if we were, if we had the availability with EBID we could skirt around those electric poles, not having to actually relocate them, might not have to be quite a harsh turn but, but the idea is

there. And then this is on the eastern edge and again we show where we have a sidewalk here but if that, if we could utilize the EBID right-of-way and even if they pipe it or they don't pipe it, either way there's plenty of room to put in the multiuse trail if that right-of-way could be utilized or shared with EBID on that section of the corridor.

So one thing I want to go over are the two changes from the version that you have. One comment we got from the Traffic Engineer, City of Las Cruces Traffic Engineer was to be very clear about the bicycle facility design and since this is just a planning document I didn't want to put any clear recommendations on design type for bicycle facilities but I, there is a statement that clearly states that as the project goes to design all coordination on bicycle infrastructure specifically and pedestrian infrastructure will go through the City of Las Cruces and make sure that it matches their current standards, the current accepted standards for bicycle facilities cause they are constantly in flux and we want to make sure when this is designed it's designed to current standards. The other change that, that, so that change is in the hard copy that you just got today that's bound, but then we had one other change come in this afternoon so we would have to make that change. That is on page 13, section 4b. There's a discussion of future conditions and we would like to recommend striking that entire paragraph just to minimize any liability to the City or to the MPO or to the DOT with regard to safety concerns because we don't actually have the appropriate level of traffic data to make the statement that in the future there could potentially be more traffic which would potentially have, raise the risk of more accidents but we would like to, we would like to actually strike that entire paragraph.

Sorg: Ma'am, would you repeat that paragraph, future conditions?

Weston: Page 13, page 13.

Sorg: There, future conditions?

Weston: Yes.

Sorg: Yeah, okay.

Weston: That entire paragraph. It doesn't affect the recommendations in the plan. It really just minimizes liability to the City and to the, to the New Mexico Department of Transportation.

Sorg: Okay. Very good.

Weston: I, I think those are the only two changes we had from the most recent TAC. We just, they presented it at the TAC in January so I apologize that the comments are just coming in this late but those are the only two

changes otherwise. The version you have there does include the comment about the, about the bicycle infrastructure so.

Sorg: Thank you.

Weston: I'm happy ...

Sorg: Any comments or questions from the Committee?

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Trustee Flores. Oh. I'm sorry. I should be in the middle, maybe. Mayor Barraza, yeah.

Barraza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to thank Denise from Bohannan-Huston for the study. The collaboration I think that we have had with them and with the MPO has just been fantastic and it's a project that I have supported for many, many years due to public safety reasons on University Avenue. I, I, I'm very visual and so this handout that you gave us is very good and, and actually seeing what it could look like is very beneficial for me also and I, I just hope that the rest of the Committee can support this Phase A, the study for this project that is I feel long overdue because it has been looked at in the past and the public participation was great. The second one that we had in October the turnout was just fantastic and the comments that were made by the citizens and the surrounding area, especially the bicyclists that were there supporting the project and encouraging adding the bike lanes into this project and also collaborating with the Department of Transportation and with the City of Las Cruces I'm just very thankful so I just want to say thank you.

Weston: You're welcome.

Sorg: Very good. Thank you. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Does, does the Town of Mesilla have a complete streets policy?

Barraza: I, I don't think I've heard the term "complete streets project." I know we have rules and regulations regarding streets, roadways. If this is a, a roadway that is from the Department of Transportation that they have ownership of that road so any regulations that go into it have to comply with New Mexico Department of Transportation.

Hancock: The, they're, Mr. Chair. I know the, I know the City of Las Cruces has a complete streets policy.

Sorg: Correct.

Hancock: And I, Commissioner Garrett do we have a complete, have we accepted complete streets yet?

Garrett: I don't think so.

Hancock: I, I didn't think we had yet. Complete streets is a, is a, a, a design. Can you, can you tell us a little, I'm sorry, I'm taking over your meeting.

Weston: Sure.

Hancock: I don't mean to.

Sorg: That's okay. You go right ahead.

Hancock: I, I'd like to know about complete streets.

Sorg: You're Vice-Chair, no ...

Weston: Absolutely. So the, the concept of complete streets is to ensure that you have considered all possible modes within a certain roadway and that would be vehicular traffic, bicycle traffic, pedestrian traffic, and in some cases even equestrian traffic and that not only have you looked at the use of the, and the operations of those for all modes but how they interact with the land use adjacent to that roadway. It becomes a land use-transportation unifying process so yes.

Hancock: Good.

Weston: Do you want to ...

Hancock: I, I know there's ...

Weston: Say something ...

Hancock: A, a, Mr. Chair.

Weston: About the City's policy?

Sorg: Yes.

Hancock: I know there's a strong effort of this legislative session in Santa Fe to encourage the state to adopt complete streets.

Sorg: That's, we're, correct. Yes.

Hancock: And, and ...

Sorg: I'm aware of that.

Hancock: And so we would naturally want to be sure that, that we're all on the same page with this kind of thing.

Sorg: Right.

Hancock: So I just wanted to bring that up to, to kind of throw it out there. Thank you.

Sorg: Well done Commissioner.

Hancock: Thank you.

Sorg: Well done. I, just to add and then I'll let Tom speak. Well described complete street policy. Very well described there. And I, I wish that, I also join with you in, in wanting to keep that policy going. Tom.

Murphy: Uh, thank you Mr. Chair. The MPO Policy Board itself I believe it was in 2008 or 2009 adopted a complete streets resolution and at that time I believe that each, the, the County, the Town, and the City all joined in and had adopted their own in that time frame. It might be, it might serve us well to kind of renew that since there's been much turnover since that time but I believe we, and if you, probably if you look on the National Complete Streets Coalition all three jurisdictions are, are listed as having complete streets policies in place and I know when the County's redid their design standard several years ago the complete streets policy was one of the driving factors for that and the City's currently working on, on that as well under their complete streets resolution. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Tom. Did Trustee Flores have something to say?

Flores: I just wanted to say that I attended the October meeting as well and it was standing room. All the seats were taken and I was just very impressed by the amount of people that were willing to stand for such a long period of time because they really wanted to see something done. In addition to that I've seen a group of just regular people running on University and I was very concerned for them because it is not a safe place to go if you're a pedestrian and you know there was actually a group from Las Cruces, they get online and, and they meet at different places and everybody just runs to that place and in this case they were going to the Spotted Dog and you know I, I've seen them once and I just think something like this would make it so much more easier for them, safer for them. I've seen kids that

are walking home from doing like a baseball or softball practice at Zia and it's dark. And I just, I wince every time I see it because it's not safe right now. So I encourage everybody to accept the Phase A. That's it.

Sorg: Thank you Trustee Flores. Someone else? Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah I, I appreciate the work that's been done here and it, it seems to me that this is a very practical approach and, and solution to, to the needs. My reservation or concern has to do with the fact that just in terms of the future, I think that University's going to get more and more and more traffic. It's, you know you're either going to get traffic along Boutz and that's not an optimum situation there for either the City or, or the Town or University and by the time you get down to Union it's, you know it's pretty much out of, of a lot of the, the major circulation paths and, and there's only so much that can, can do Avenida de Mesilla so I don't think we're going to see traffic go down in, in this area and my concern is that right now there are places that are not yet developed. It's, it's sort of that if we're ever going to have any widening in order to get to the optimum all the way through there so we, we didn't have bottlenecks at the, at the, the west end it would be about being aware that it's important try to acquire some of that additional right-of-way when we can in order to, to have that as a contingency the, for the future. And I have no idea how that fits into this but if I'm reading this right it's a little narrow at the west end and you got a big open space on the, on the south side that hasn't yet been developed. I don't know what it does to the alignments because some of it's on the south side and some of it's on the north side of the overall alignment. Is there, how does, how does the, this study at this point anticipate that and, and, and what thoughts do you have in terms of being able to kind of work, working toward a, a broader corridor for the entire length or, or, or the, the recommended full width of the 60 feet?

Weston: Thank you. I'm happy to answer that. So our ultimate recommendation is that 60.5-foot alternative and I tried to write it very clearly that that is the recommendation and that would be including the need to acquire right-of-way. And like I said at this time we can't tell you exactly how much but going forward to let's say a Phase B study for, under the DOT Location Study Procedures that's exactly what would be determined, how much right-of-way. The alternative to include the smaller, the 44-foot one is just to give you a buffer because of funding. It's actually not, it, it, it's not intended to be an either/or. It's really recommended in a way to do your very best to get the 60.5-foot right-of-way. That includes that full two 12-foot driving lanes, the bike lanes, the, the multiuse path, and the sidewalk. Cause I agree, if we're planning we need to plan for the future. Now, so, so it is written in there to carry that on forward. The other one doesn't have to be carried forward if you don't need it and I think it's very clear and if you go to the next phase you could eliminate that on day two of the next

phase of this study. So I think that that is totally a viable solution. I think your other concern about capacity and you're talking about if we're really looking at four travel lanes over two, we did some preliminary analysis and it did not indicate that in future years that that corridor would need four lanes. We've never at any time recommended four lanes along that corridor. We felt like at this level even looking in those future years out to 2035 that this corridor does function well to City standards as a two-lane facility so I think that that is not being recommended to look at forward but I feel strongly that, that we are recommending that full 60.5-foot in response to exactly what your concerns are.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Sorg: Yes.

Garrett: I wasn't suggesting the, the, a four-lane.

Weston: Okay. I just wanted to make sure …

Garrett: I simply was saying …

Weston: If you thought …

Garrett: We're going to have more traffic I think.

Weston: Yes.

Garrett: And that going to the full 60 feet is, is important.

Weston: Yes.

Garrett: I don't know what the next steps are but Mr. Chair I would suggest that one of the things that, that the MPO should know is where and, and more specifically how much additional right-of-way is needed as soon as possible because that can't do anything except go up in price, particularly …

Weston: Right.

Garrett: If development happens in the area.

Sorg: Yeah.

Weston: And, absolutely.

Garrett: So I, I would suggest that that's important information for us to have and then to be able to understand how that additional right-of-way could be acquired and, and how we could help with that.

Sorg: Very good. Yes, I agree.

Garrett: Thank you.

Sorg: Good point. Thank you Commissioner Garrett. And Mayor Barraza, you have some more to say? Go ahead.

Barraza: I do. First I appreciate those comments by Commissioner Garrett in terms of looking into the future and I sincerely agree that at this time since the land is not developed it would be the perfect time to acquire that right-of-way, just because in the future I, I know something is being planned out there so definitely now is the time. The other is my concern was the berm, excuse me the EBID ditch that's on the east side of McDowell. On one of the drawings I saw that the sidewalk was still there and the berm was still there. Is that including leaving the canal as it is, the ditch as it is or was it putting it underground?

Weston: So at the end of this study so that we didn't conflict opportunities for either agency we ensured that each project has sort of its own independent utility. So in that picture the rendition is the ditch is just how it is just because, because we can't sort of dictate what EBID is going to do with their facility but they fully agreed, they're full supporters of the study and they fully agree with participating with the land use so in that picture it's like that but there are, there is language in the plan that states that if they do cover that, if they do pipe that ditch they need to consider, coordinate with the neighbors and understand exactly what impact that would, would have along that corridor because they're very comfortable with that ditch right now so that coordination would have to happen when EBID decides to go forward and do those ditch improvements.

Barraza: Okay. And that was ...

Weston: But I wanted to leave the roadway project to have its own independent utility just so that we don't slow either project down or limit funding opportunities for either project.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you. Because that was a concern of the residents ...

Weston: Yes.

Barraza: That their homes are in the backyard of that berm and the noise factor.

Weston: Yes.

Barraza: They were very much concerned. The other was lighting as Trustee, or Mayor Pro-Tem Flores mentioned that it's very dark there in the evening. Was lighting taken into consideration?

Weston: The lighting was taken into consideration. It was, it was stated as a concern. I didn't put a commitment whether there would be lighting or there wouldn't be lighting but as the design details are worked out the opportunity for lighting exists and that would be something that you would take back to the public when, and when you're ready to show the design and get their reaction again about the lighting cause not everybody agreed that lighting was a great thing.

Barraza: Correct. Correct. Yes.

Weston: So yes. But, but certainly nothing, this study sets you up for proposing lighting as you go forward with the design.

Barraza: Very good. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Mayor. Oh dear.

Pedroza: Pedroza.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza. Yes.

Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Sorg: I had something else I was going to say.

Pedroza: Oh, I'm sorry.

Sorg: That's okay. Well I, I, could I make something very clear here?

Weston: Yeah.

Sorg: It's a little confusing in my mind. You showed us different typical sections for the, the corridor. Are, you aren't proposing to have different typical sections along the corridor, it'll be just one all the way from the east to west end, right?

Weston: Yes. All, so, and I'm actually glad to have an opportunity to reiterate this. We are recommending this alternative from east to west.

Sorg: Okay.

Weston: Okay. But I included this alternative just because you have a couple of tight spots that are owned by private property owners and it would be up to you to determine if you could or could not get that private land. I wanted to give you the ability to, to do a tight section if you have to just to give the project some viability going forward. That's really ...

Sorg: Okay.

Weston: Where that stands. You don't ever have to put this one in.

Sorg: Okay.

Weston: But I didn't want to trip the project up ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Weston: Entirely just because of those tiny tight spots with private land.

Sorg: Okay.

Weston: So here. Let's just all look at this beautiful picture.

Sorg: Okay. Yeah, right, very good. Okay. Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. In fact you asked exactly the same question I was going to ask because I wanted to know are we having to choose today.

Weston: No. No, you don't, no.

Pedroza: No, okay. That's good. Cause I do like this one better.

Weston: Yes.

Pedroza: But thank you.

Sorg: I have one more comment to make if, oh, Councilor Eakman. Go ahead.

Eakman: Yes. A rookie question. Where Zia Middle School is located and they now have an existing left turn lanes.

Weston: Yes.

Eakman: Are, is there accommodation for that to continue or what seems to be the plan there?

Weston: No, this actual typical would be applied to that same location but it would, the left turn lane would remain. We just didn't put the left turn lane in this visual but they would have the 12-foot driving lanes and then the bike lanes and this same sort of scenario. The left turn lane would remain for the school. Now we, we are not proposing any improvements to the drop-off or pick-up at Zia Middle School. I did speak with the school today to get their input and they'd also agree just to verbalize, share their verbal support for the study. They're perfectly comfortable with what's in the report and that we left it so that they have the opportunity to deal with their drop-off and pick-up issues on their site when they do their site, they're planning to do a site reallocation and a re-look at their site plan in 2018, I think Todd told me this morning. But, so nothing we do will preclude them. Nothing we, nothing we're proposing will change the vehicular access to the schools right now. It'll just enhance the opportunity for the bikes and the peds to get to and from school, hopefully minimizing the vehicular drop-off in the parking.

Eakman: Thank you.

Weston: So I hope that answers your question.

Eakman: It does. Thank you.

Weston: But yeah. And I appreciate the opportunity to share their support that they gave this afternoon so, so and to go back to the alternative discussion this is really a preliminary level and so the detail on the, you know we're at Phase A and so we don't want to exclude every, anything really that we feel comfortable with. So that's why all three of these alternatives would go into Phase B and have a much more detailed look, both this one, the 44-foot one, as well as that multiuse alternative along the EBID ditches and then we would look at all of them carefully and at that time if the 44-foot one isn't necessary, nobody's interested in it, it simply goes away.

Sorg: Okay. You're welcome. Any other comments or questions from the Committee? Yes Trustee Flores.

Flores: I just had one on the actual resolution. It just looks like there is a typo or a, on the one, two, three, four whereas-es up it talks about us listing input on the proposed amendment and I just think that was a, you know we're talking about a resolution here so. This is on page 26, or is it ...

Sorg: Isn't the, it, it's ...

Flores: I don't have my glasses so I'm having a hard time ...

Murphy: It's page ...

Flores: Reading this.

Murphy: Page 29.

Flores: Right. So I would just ask that we kind of redo the language a little bit.

Barraza: Madam, Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Barraza: Okay where, where's that?

Sorg: We're on page 29.

Flores: The, four whereas-es up.

Sorg: Fourth whereas, yeah.

Flores: From the bottom.

Sorg: Oh, from the bottom.

Flores: From the bottom. Sorry, did I not make that clear?

Sorg: Big difference.

Murphy: It is, the whereas ...

Flores: MPO staff held two public ...

Murphy: "MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the proposed amendment, seek alternatives to the requested amendment, evaluate the alternatives, and ...

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: Discuss recommendations to the MPO Transportation Plan." What that really should read instead of "amendment" in each of those cases, the proposed ...

Barraza: Resolution.

Flores: Resolution or Phase A.

Murphy: Yeah or, or study. I think ...

Flores: Study, yeah.

Murphy: We do need to reword that or we may strike that whereas. We kind of cut and paste from a previous study corridor that we had done and, but that particular one actually required an amendment to the Transportation Plan itself, whereas the adoption of the Phase A does not require an, an amendment to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. So I think we can work to, to kind of change up that language or we could strike that altogether.

Sorg: What is the will of the Committee here?

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Commissioner Hancock, or Garrett rather.

Garrett: It seems to me that it's not a bad idea just as a, as a record to say that, that there had been these two public input meetings. I think we could modify this just to say "the MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the study."

Flores: I would agree with that.

Sorg: If you would like to make a motion Ms., Commissioner.

Garrett: It, it's not, it's not, it's, this isn't a proposed study. This is actually a, this is a study. So yes I'd like to move, move to amend the resolution to have the fourth whereas from the bottom read "Whereas MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the study; and"

Pedroza: Are we striking amendment to *(inaudible)*?

Sorg: Which words are you striking out there Commissioner?

Garrett: I, from, from the beginning of "the first proposed amendment," I think the, the point is that on the study there were alternatives looked at and there evaluate, so if we just say that there was to solicit input on the study, it encompasses everything that was done by the study.

Flores: Right.

Sorg: Yeah.

Garrett: So all I'm saying is that we would say "whereas MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the study; and" and that's the end of that whereas.

Sorg: And discuss recommendations to the MPO Transportation ...

Garrett: No.

Sorg: Plan.

Garrett: I, I, I'm ...

Sorg: Oh.

Garrett: I'm just saying this could be ...

Sorg: Strike all of it.

Garrett: A really short whereas.

Sorg: Okay.

Garrett: And the main point is that there were two public, yeah it could be that we had, the MPO staff held two public meetings to solicit input on the study.

Sorg: I understand now.

Hancock: Mr. Chair. I'd second.

Sorg: Okay. Very good. Any further discussion?

Hancock: Mr. Chair. Was there a motion, an original motion made?

Garrett: I, I moved, oh.

Flores: Yeah.

Hancock: Did we make an original, okay so we have original motion and we have now an amendment and a ...

Sorg: Right. Right.

Hancock: Second on the amendment.

Sorg: Right.

Hancock: Okay.

Sorg: So, if no further discussion I'll poll the Committee.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Any public, any public discussion?

Sorg: Good call. Seeing none, let's vote.

Murphy: This is a vote on the ...

Garrett: We're voting on the amendment.

Murphy: On the motion to approve the Phase A study, motion made by Mayor Barraza, seconded by Commissioner Hancock.

Sorg: No, no, no, no. This is the ...

Murphy: Oh. The ...

Barraza: First the amendment.

Eakman: On the amendment.

Sorg: This is a vote on the amendment.

Murphy: Okay. Vote on, vote on the amendment as proposed by Commissioner Garrett and was seconded by Commissioner Hancock. Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: And thank you for that catch there, Trustee Flores. That was good. So there we are on the original motion. Is there any further discussion on the original motion? I have one little piece here really quick. It's just a kind of a question about the lanes, the driving lanes. One of the concerns of the public is that speeding is too much on there. Don't we understand that a narrower driving lane would slow people down? We could still do a 11-foot lane there even if we approve this ...

Garrett: Complete streets.

Weston: Yes.

Sorg: Resolution. Okay. Very good.

Weston: Yes. We definitely could.

Sorg: And then ...

Weston: And I, I'll actually just add one comment to you ...

Sorg: Sure.

Weston: That there is a section on traffic calming under the recommendation that traffic calming be considered when design, when you get to the design phase.

Sorg: Very good.

Weston: So that would address your lanes ...

Sorg: Sure.

Weston: Or any other components that could be added.

Sorg: Okay.

Weston: Just to give you extra support for that.

Sorg: And I just want to give a shout-out to Safe Routes to School. This is a excellent thing to do for that program. Awesome. And, and then there is money in Safe Routes to School. Maybe we could tap into a little of that and to get this project done somewhere, somehow. I'm just suggesting not knowing what, whether we can or not.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Just one short comment also. Safe Routes to School's coordinator Ashleigh Curry was very active and participated at the public meetings on this and the initial ...

Weston: And the project, she's part of the project team.

Barraza: Meet, yes. So I just wanted to make that.

Sorg: Oh, yeah. Very good.

Barraza: Thank you.

Sorg: Good to point that out, yes. She would be.

Barraza: Yes. Thank you.

Sorg: Well if there's no further discussion let's vote. Tom.

Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

Bernal: Yes.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Arrowhead Research Park Presentation

Sorg: And the next item is Discussion Items, 8.1: Arrowhead Research Park presentation. Take the floor Mr. Wayne Savage.

Savage: So Chairman Sorg, Members of the Commission. Thanks for allowing me to come today. My name's Wayne Savage. I know some of you but I've not met all of you. I look forward to that in the future. I wanted to speak to you for a few minutes on a subject that is not entirely unfamiliar to some of you. It's the proposed interchange off of I-10 currently targeted at Arrowhead Drive. So I wanted to walk through a few slides with you then and open it up for any questions that you may have. As a condition of my employment I'm required to give a shameless plug for Arrowhead Center and I hope that after a few slides if you'll indulge me in this you'll see that it is relevant to the conversation.

Arrowhead is a unit of New Mexico State University. We exist in two parts, one on the academic side and one a, a nonprofit but together we're really focused on leading New Mexico State University's economic development efforts. As you can see in the diagram we focus heavily on education and training in the areas of entrepreneurship and business incubation. We do all of the intellectual property commercialization for the university, trying to get those good ideas out into the marketplace. And then we do a lot of work partnering with both the local communities and with industries to do that top bubble there which is creating businesses and job growth, very much a, a key function that we exist for. This is a slide that tries to summarize some of the, the quantitative impacts of our work. We do work across the state: Middle school, high school, college level, faculty researchers, and with private businesses to create jobs and to facilitate economic development. But the two numbers on the right, the 90 and the 230, these were mid-2015 numbers. Currently we have over 130 college students working and starting new businesses right now. That's an exciting thing for us to be involved in and this year for 2016 we're going to have 365 students at middle school and high school levels across the state involved in the Innoventure program which trains them in business startups, business incubation, and entrepreneurship. So very exciting things that we're doing there across the state.

We like to think that we've got a, quite a successful track record both regionally and nationally with over $5 million in grants we've received in the last three years. The Economic Development Administration and their challenge grants, the first one for us was on the topic of regional innovation. That came three years ago. We received another award from the EDA for commercializing technologies and that is a statewide role that we play. The Daniels Fund out of Colorado gave us an award this, this last year to expand our high school and college level program statewide so you'll be hearing more about our incubation programs going out to all the community colleges statewide. The EDA also provided a grant through their Regional Innovation Strategies Program for Arrowhead Park and a part of that work is the, the work on the I-10 interchange that we'll

talk to you about today. We have 13 fulltime staff. We employ 30 graduate students every semester so they get hands-on work in the area of entrepreneurship and starting businesses and then we've got a very broad network of advisors that contribute to this from around the region.

Just an update on recent activities: We just completed a business plan competition under contract to Mexico City and the USAID program and we had 400 business plans submitted, narrowed it down to ten, made our awards in December, and this year we expect six of those to come work on growing their businesses here at New Mexico State University in our community so we're excited about that, and we have already signed the contract to do it again this coming year. Aggie Shark Tank, if you've seen the TV show we actually did three episodes of our own this last year and Lou Sisbarro assisted us in this. We had students again present for business ideas and three of them were funded by local businessmen to the tune of $55,000 and they're working with those businessmen to make those a reality right now. The Borderplex Alliance has a task force on entrepreneurship, a regional task force and we chair that task force working with them. We have a new group called Craftbox which is an assembly of a wide variety of design professionals throughout the region that we host on a weekly basis and we bring in speakers and, and train them in their profession but also work to collectively find work opportunities for them. We're putting on commercialization/technology workshops in Albuquerque and around the state this year. We're working with the City, with the University and the Community College, and partnering on a film studio project here in our community. We're excited that that will go forward this year. And then we've also developed what's been called the Arrowhead Innovation Fund which is a million-dollar technology development fund that'll focus on NMSU, technologies, commercializing those, and hopefully starting businesses around them. So I, I give you that background just to let you know that we're very active both locally and statewide and we feel like the key to our region's future in addition to the good planning work that you do revolves around economic development opportunities.

The I-10 interchange: NMSU is very active with the MPO on your committees and looking at planning needs for transportation in all of its forms around the region. We work with DOT once or twice a year to update on the projects they're working on and how that affects the university and the region and through these meetings it's been known over time that there were no funds available to complete the next round of studies for the I-10 interchange and it was suggested that we find a way to provide those funds. Through the EDA grant this last year we received $250,000 to put towards this so now we're working with DOT on an MOU whereby we would fund the contractor, Molzen Corbin in this case, to perform the needed studies and then DOT will oversee the process to ensure that it's done according to Federal Highway Standards. The target is to have the new justification document prepared for submittal to the

Federal Highway Administration this summer and once it's approved at that level then we can look to work with DOT and our communities to get it on the New Mexico State Transportation Plan.

This project, to my surprise goes back to a study done in 1991 and just to compliment the communities here, executing a long-range plan over a 25 period, 25-year period's a difficult thing to do but if you look at this list you can see that the Arrowhead interchange is about the only item that hasn't been done, so good study and good execution over a very long period of time. In 2007 it was reviewed as a part of the corridor study looking at I-10 from Las Cruces all the way down to the state line. Again in 2009 the study and the approval of the work at I-10 and I-25, it was considered there but not approved in the, in the final Federal Highway Administration approval for budget reasons. And then in the construction at I-10 and I-25 with, with direction from the Federal Highway Administration there were pieces of this interchange that were built and my understanding is so that when the interchange was approved in the future at some point portions of the work that was done would not have to be redone. So the bridge over Cholla was widened, the ramp from eastbound I-10 onto I-25 north was widened or the span over that was widened, the eastbound ramp from I-10 coming off of a future Arrowhead interchange was constructed, and some right-of-way was acquired by DOT as well. So all these things looking forward to a time when this project could move forward were done in the last construction effort.

This is a diagram of the I-10/I-25 work and then the Arrowhead interchange work and it's very complicated to see. There's a whole lot of changes going on here but it's just a diagram which shows the work that was done during the construction at I-10 and I-25 to facilitate this next phase that we're looking to. Going back to the '91 study and subsequent studies there are some very specific regional benefits that have been identified to come from this next piece of work: Reducing congestion at I-25 and the University Avenue interchange; reducing congestion along University Avenue from, on it, across its full length; improving traffic on I-10 from North Main down to Mesquite and again on I-25 from Lohman to the I-10/I-25 interchange; regional events, concerts, games, graduation events you've all experienced some of the congestion that can occur around campus when those things take place; and then peak hour circulations in and around the NMSU campus along University and the area would also be improved.

The work that's being done this period of time that we're in now and going into will do several things: The Federal Highway Administration has replaced their prior IJR or Interstate Justification Request process with a new process called the IACR which is an Interstate Access Change Request and so this new document will reflect the requirements of the new IACR process as well as updates to the Federal Highway Design Standards that were passed in 2011. In collaboration with the MPO the project will provide updates to traffic data in the VISUM model, I don't

know if I'm saying that correctly, and so there's work ongoing with the MPO to make sure the data and the models are current and updated. There will be an updated environmental document performed on the site in question here. Strike that next bullet, that shouldn't be there. But then there will be alternates evaluated as in any Federal Highway Review project. And the interchange that you see proposed in that picture we'll also be looking at the possibility of applying a roundabout design as opposed to the typical diamond interchange and then routing alternatives for Sam Steele along the freeway there.

So just in closing we think outcomes that could be expected from not only this project but the implementation of it, we think the goals of the MPO for efficiency in regional transportation capacity would be supported by this project. The transportation and economic development goals at NMSU for our campus and our surroundings would be supported. We think it would enhance regional economic development opportunities and this has been discussed, it would help with developing this gateway to the south end of Las Cruces. We're also looking as part of the grant and as a part of this project to figure out how we can tie the bike paths and the multiuse trails around the campus into the system and so we'll be working with your, the BPAC I think is the name of that committee as well. And then we think it gives an opportunity to really better integrate the campus as a whole into the community and, and create a better relationship there. So with that I'll, I'll stop and open it up for any questions.

Sorg: Any questions or ...

Savage: Yes sir.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you. In looking, there's no page number. On this particular one ...

Savage: Yes sir.

Hancock: There is a, a problem there at the interchange between 25 going onto 10 going west. There's a very short on-ramp right there that is very dangerous.

Savage: An existing ...

Hancock: An existing ...

Savage: Okay.

Hancock: Is, is that dealt with in this?

Savage: I'm going to ask Wyatt Kartchner with Molzen Corbin, our design firm to kind of answer that one.

Sorg: Commissioner are you sure you have the right street, road there? There is a Cholla Road. We're not talking about that. We're talking about Arrowhead and, and it doesn't really identify it very clearly on the map.

Hancock: Is, is Arrowhead further up?

Sorg: Yeah. It's further west than Cholla.

Hancock: Up there where the green line starts going jagged, is that ...

Sorg: Can you point out ...

Hancock: I, I can't read the, the ...

Sorg: At, on the screen?

Savage: Yeah. It's hard to make ...

Kartchner: Commissioner, Members of the Committee. I'm Wyatt Kartchner with Molzen Corbin.

Hancock: You could talk in the microphone.

Kartchner: We did, we did the actual design for the I-10/I-25 interchange and as part of the, the Arrowhead interchange we looked at the future considerations which Wayne described. One of the future considerations as part of the Arrowhead interchange is this underpass at Cholla and I-10. That bridge itself goes away with this new interchange. And so in the design of the I-10/I-25 interchange this ramp from I-25 southbound to I-10 westbound was, did not have the acceleration lanes that you see on the other side ...

Hancock: Right.

Kartchner: For the northbound movement. However it does meet the design standards but because that bridge is going to be eliminated we didn't want to spend money to widen that bridge at this time. And when this Arrowhead interchange is built this bridge will be eliminated and then we can widen that, that acceleration out to improve that ...

Hancock: Oh, I see.

Kartchner: Safety consideration.

Hancock: I see. Okay. So, so eventually it'll be dealt with.

Kartchner: Yes sir.

Hancock: I, I thought that was the right spot. Very good. Thank you. Appreciate that.

Savage: Thanks Wyatt.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Savage: I couldn't have answered that one. Thank you.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I, I feel like we need semaphores or Morse code or some, some, some, some telegraph system. Thank you very much for the, the presentation.

Savage: Absolutely.

Garrett: I think the, there, there are two immediate reactions I have. I mean I, I appreciate the presentation in part because I think it helps bring us current on this issue. I, language is always very interesting and how we label things. Quite honestly I see this as simply the south NMSU entrance. And, and to some degree I, I appreciate the fact that this is going to be, benefit Arrowhead. It seems to me that there is a huge impact in terms of NMSU as a whole: The various big events that happen; the overall circulation within the campus and so forth; the idea of reducing congestion at I-10 and University or I, I-25 and, and University as well as I-10. I mean it, it seems to me that, that one of the things that's happened is that we actually need to understand that this is an interchange that is not just about Arrowhead, that Arrowhead is right there and that there's, that, that's kind of an entrance now for Arrowhead at, when, when this would be done. But I think we need to look at it in, in terms of the overall circulation system of that area and that this has real implications for the whole area. So to the degree that we talk about that I'm almost inclined to say that this is NMSU South/Arrowhead and, and that we need some way of, of making sure that we're real clear about that. Because frankly I'm not sure that the millions and millions of dollars that are going to be required for this are justified just by Arrowhead but I do believe that it's justified by the overall flow of traffic in and around that area. So that's sort of a semantics point but it has to do also with perception of the project.

Savage: Yes.

Garrett: Frankly in the past when I would, just saw it listed as Arrowhead I was not convinced that this was all that important. So this has helped me understand a little bit more about that. I think the other thing is that it's interesting that you show us the 1991 list of projects and that now 25 years later we're trying to get the last one on the list taken care of, or next to last. I'm almost inclined to think that we need to see what the current list is and I am mindful of the fact that this project is going to be both complementary to and competing with other improvement projects that are very important to Dona Ana County including "How do we ever get the Upham interchange taken care of in terms of the spaceport access?" and "How do we deal with the connection between Santa Teresa and I-10 before we get into El Paso?" issue which would be the interchange at NM404.

Savage: Right.

Garrett: I'd like to see a more, an updated list of important projects that are going to be for the next 25 years and I wouldn't have a problem seeing that this project was not another 25 years out but I think that we need to see it as part of a new system that has to do with economic development and new traffic patterns that we want to work toward over the next decade or so. So that's not directly to the points exactly that you're making. It's actually to say that I think we need an update and I don't know how we'd do that but having an updated list, I'm sure that this would play a central role in terms of those improvements and so I'm asking for our MPO staff to brief us at some point about how we might look at such an updated list if we don't already have one, but I'm not aware of one that actually deals with this and in particular takes us all the way from Upham down to Santa Teresa which gets into another MPO. Thank you.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Since you shamelessly brought up all the things that Arrowhead does I had a question about that part of the presentation. Thank you for the presentation also.

Savage: Yeah.

Hancock: Is, is there a particular requirement in, in developing these entrepreneurial ventures that the ventures stay local or stay within the state?

Savage: There is not a requirement as far as working with Arrowhead that they stay locally. Some funding sources may require that they grow their business in New Mexico but we actually work with businesses all throughout the region.

Hancock: Okay.

Savage: We invest our dollars in training, though we invest those locally in, in the state.

Hancock: Very good. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Hancock. Any others? If not.

Savage: Okay. Thank you very much.

8.2 Interstate Access Request Training

Sorg: We'll proceed on to the next discussion item: The Interstate Access Request Training. Mr. Wray.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. MPO staff thought it prudent to follow-up on Mr. Savage's presentation to give a little bit of an overview over what FHWA is looking for when they are considering interstate access change requests. This presentation is meant to be more informative on the process in, excuse me, in general. I will touch on the, the proposed Arrowhead interchange periodically in my presentation as it's appropriate but do keep in mind this is, this is a general presentation. This is the sort of thing that FHWA looks at in all of the requests that they receive. The Title 23 US Code Highway Section 111 specifically delegates to the Federal Highway Administration the, to, ability to approve all points of access to or exit from the, the interstate system. FHWA holds that full control of interstate access is critical to its mission and requests to approve new or revised access points must be supported by justifying information and documentation, i.e. that is what the Interstate Access Change Request is. FHWA's interest is they wish to have a decision-making process that's based on information and analysis. It has to have environmental design safety and operational aspects considered. A very important key piece of the puzzle is that the request must support the intended purpose of the interstate system and I'll get into that in a little bit more detail when I get down to the specific requirements. The request must also not have an adverse impact on the safety or operation of the interstate system and it must also connect to a local roadway network or other elements of the transportation system and it must be designed to acceptable standards.

Now there is a piece of nomenclature that Mr. Savage did allude to. The, the new name of the process is an Interstate System Access Change Request. That is however good only for the FHWA. They do not prescribe a particular nomenclature down to the state DOTs so while FHWA does refer to it as such individual DOTs can, can refer to it by different means which does kind of lend itself to a bit of confusion. I'm not

sure what, I, I believe NMDOT generally refers to it as Access Change Request but I have heard NMDOT staff still say IJR so it, it, it's kind of fluid. Early coordination between the state DOT and Federal Highway is encouraged to determine project feasibility basically from the word go and to allow for the review process to be as efficient and cost-effective as possible.

There are a couple common reasons why Interstate Change Requests, or Interstate Access Change Requests are made: Obviously system linkage or connectivity, road user benefits, access to areas not currently served, addressing existing congestion or safety problem, and prevention of future congestion or safety problems. And I want to, to note at this point though that and I'll, I'll mention this again that FHWA does not look favorably upon using the interstate system to solve local traffic problems. It is a tool that is intended for regional transportation, regional and national transportation. A proposal that just focuses on local transportation situations, congestion, what have you FHWA is not going to be very inclined to look favorably on that request.

Now there are eight specific policy requirements laid out that the Federal Highway Administration looks at for each change request. The, the first one is that the need being addressed cannot be adequately satisfied by the existing facilities. Now again this is tying into what I just said, the requirement is to ensure that it's regional and national transportation facilities, or transportation impacts that are being considered. This is not, FHWA does not want the interstate system to be used for purely local purposes. The second one is that the need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by alternative measures to, i.e. geometric design improvements, or other improvements. This also includes HOV lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, also implementation of mass transit in the vicinity of the proposed interchange that might have an alleviating effect on the congestion in the area. The third one is a requirement that there be an operational and safety analysis, that the proposal does not have a severe, or a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation. This must include all of the surrounding collector and distributor roads and must provide a comprehensive analysis of the, what the no-build and the build options would be in the intended design year. It, it can be beneficial for, during the review of an application for the, the request to expand its scope beyond just the minimum requirements. Sometimes the FHWA does require such an extension of scope in urban areas where there are already existing frequent points of access to the interstate system. Again this is also intended to ensure, or that the analysis must give priority to the intended purpose of the interstate system, again regional and national connectivity and this has to, this, that particular consideration does have to take priority over the requirements of local planning. The fourth requirement, proposed access connects only to public roads and will provide for all traffic movements. Again it, it's, should be obvious that this is becoming a theme now. FHWA

wants this to only be used for regional transportation purposes and not local. The, the interchange must also provide for all the eight basic movements. Partial interchanges can be provisionally approved by FHWA, provisionally might not be the best word but the, they can be approved but FHWA is almost certainly going to want there to be commitments on down the road for there to be a full interchange built at any existing, at any point of access. This, points of access can also include special transit lanes, HOV lanes, access to park-and-rides, those can be approved but FHWA considers each one of those on a case by case basis. And the, the fifth one is very important to this body: The proposed access change must be consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans, i.e. it must be in conformance with the MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan. As Mr. Savage alluded to in his presentation, we do have a reference to the Arrowhead interchange currently in our MTP but depending on the year when they wish to begin work on it, it may require an amendment to the MTP in order to go forward. The sixth one, again this is also one that Mr. Savage alluded to in his presentation with regards to the recent completion of the I-10 and I-25 interchange. The, that was constructed with the potential for the Arrowhead interchange in mind. That is a requirement of FHWA is if there are multiple access or potential interchange additions that all of those must be considered as a part of the application. They don't want to see a situation where a, a lot of work and money is poured into one particular area and then just a few years later it has to be done all over again because there's a new issue that may or may not have been foreseen and if it was foreseen they're not going to be pleased. The seventh one is basically FHWA wants to make sure that all of the parties, all of the relevant stakeholders are closely coordinating with each other from before the, the access change request is made through the process all the way up until the end. They want to make sure that the, the process is comprehensive from start to finish. Anything that comes along that is a surprise is likely to cause the, the request to be rejected. And lastly the, there is a possibility for the application to be, basically essentially it's a two-step process. FHWA will review initially to see operational and engineering acceptability but at that point the process has to go through the NEPA process in order to be, receive final approval from FHWA. This is the case regardless of funding source. Any changes to, to interstate access have to go through the NEPA process.

Once the, the request has been submitted FHWA will evaluate, find out whether the, the request complies with the FHWA policy requirements. It has to satisfy every single one of the eight policy requirements. Any, basically they're kind of almost eight points of failure. If any one of the policy requirements is not met the request will be denied. If the access point is approved the state DOT will then be responsible for following the project development stages before construction can begin. And that concludes my presentation and I'll stand now for any questions.

Sorg: Any questions? Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: I could barely see your hand.

Pedroza: Oh, I'm sorry. Do I understand you to say then Andrew that the presentation that we just saw of the proposed Arrowhead interchange, has that already been approved by the, the, these folks, the Federal Highway Department or, or is that, does it not apply or …

Sorg: Somebody's phone is ringing here. Can you check your phones please? Thank you.

Pedroza: Excuse me, it's me.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It has not. The request has not been submitted to FHWA yet.

Pedroza: And is it going to have to be?

Wray: Yes.

Pedroza: I see. Okay. Is there any input or anything that this body can do or should be doing in terms of either …

Wray: Formerly this body if, if it becomes necessary would have to amend the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to allow this to go forward depending on the, the intended year of construction.

Pedroza: And the gentleman who presented the previous, made the previous presentation is no long here so we don't know …

Sorg: Yeah. He's no longer here.

Pedroza: Yeah. So we don't know how soon they're, they're expecting to, to put this forward to FHWA.

Wray: He did say in his presentation that they were hoping to have it done before the end of this year I believe but I, I do not know as, as far as when their intended date of construction or anything like that. I, I don't know that information.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza. Mr. Doolittle has a word.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Andrew's correct. The NMSU is currently working with Molzen to design or, or put together the modifications to the original Interstate Justification Request that they submitted as part of the entire I-10 corridor study. That MOU that we currently are working with NMSU to execute will be the first step in that process so once we enter that MOU to oversee and handle the funding that they received for that study or that, that request to Federal Highway, NMSU and Molzen will then begin the, the formal process of that request to Federal Highway.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you Andrew.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Chair. According to this presentation the Upham interchange would need to have an IACR, is that correct? Is that, is that part of the ...

Wray: In order for there to be a change in capacity I believe so, that there would be.

Garrett: No, that's not what I'm asking. What I, right now there's no plan, there's no document, there's nothing in anybody's stream of planning or projections of work that calls for an interchange at Upham that is anything more than a farm road.

Wray: Then yes.

Garrett: Okay so ...

Wray: It, it would have to.

Garrett: So that, that's partly what I'm trying to clarify. That's also outside the boundaries of this MPO, correct?

Wray: Yes.

Garrett: Okay. We have talked about coordination with the El Paso MPO in terms of planning and we have agreed that we would have exchange of information and so forth. What I'm wondering is whether or not staff could come back to us with recommendations at the next meeting about how we might work with I believe it's the RPO in developing the information that would be necessary to develop an IACR for the Upham interchange. The reason for the change being that this is the southern end of the southern road between Dona Ana County and the spaceport and in order to understand what the jurisdictional issues are as well as the requirements of information so that such a request could be put together, it seems to me that that needs to start somewhere and that potentially that could start

here and I'd like for the MPO to be able to consider that at a future meeting. I'm not calling for a study. I'm, I'm asking for the information about what could, what's necessary and what are the steps to move us out of the limbo that we're in on that particular project.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. Could I just ask if the rest of the, of this Committee in general agrees that that's an important thing for us to understand?

Sorg: Yeah I'm, that's what she should do, yeah. Is there any opposition to this idea that Commissioner Garrett has given?

Garrett: I'm just asking that we have a presentation from staff to explore that ...

Sorg: Right.

Garrett: How we would work through that ...

Sorg: Right.

Garrett: Including the fact that we would have to be coordinating with the RPO.

Sorg: Right. And how the process might have to go, yes.

Garrett: And, and how, how might that, that work.

Sorg: Very good. Okay let's, then in that case I, I will task the staff to do that. Mr. Doolittle has a word.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Commissioner Garrett I think that's a good idea because it, it, it's not only at Upham but we're, we're talking about doing some improvements for, for instance at the Hatch interchange because right now if you're headed southbound and you get off you can't cross over that bridge to the north side of Hatch so ultimately that type of discussion could be representative of many interchanges within the Dona Ana County where we cross MPO or RPO boundaries so I think it's a good idea.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Doolittle. If there's no further discussion on this item.

8.3 FY 17/FY 18 UPWP Discussion

Sorg: Let's go to the next one: FY 17/FY 18 UPWP Discussion.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. It's that time. Every two years we put together the MPO Work Program and we'll be doing this for the, for the Federal Fiscal Years of 2017 and 2018 and we'll have this back several times over the next month, next few months as this comes, comes into development. This is the time where we're, we're really putting you on notice that we're starting to do it and we're looking for ideas of what kind of work do you want to see staff pursue over the next two years. The, you know it's called our Unified Planning Work Program. It's a required federal document out of the federal regulations. The time period it'll cover is from October 16th of this year to September 30th of 2018. Below that you'll see the, as prescribed by the New Mexico DOT's Policies and Procedures Manual that they apply towards MPOs and RTPOs the, statewide we're to begin our UP development, UPWP development and have a draft document to them by May 1st. The setup I'm, you know we provide this in your MPO 101 books, it's on our, our website but just to kind of go over the basic framework the UPWP has an introduction. It tells a little bit about the requirements of having an MPO. It tells a little bit about the history of this particular MPO and about the work in the document. The main body of the, of the UPWP is broken into work program tasks and those are the things that we do each I guess day in, day out for lack of a better term. So I'm going to break, break, I'm going to go through these a little bit at a time.

Task 1, program support and administration: These break down into the, to the more mundane things, making sure that we advertise, you know advertise our committee meetings in the newspaper, that we do the reporting, that I sign the time sheets for, for the employees. Probably the most exciting thing coming out of this one is we are looking to you know as part of our public participation we are looking at garnering our, or developing our own web page. Got a little screen shot of the Lauren Ipsum mock-up of what that website could look at but it's something that we're hoping to appear a little, appear more independent from the City, kind of give the MPO more regional stature and presentation, have a, a web address that doesn't, is not tied to the City so that we, you know so that we can appear more independent.

The second task is the maintenance of the Transportation Improvement Program, kind of put down the kind of the whole UPWP section on that. It, it specifies our times for releasing our call for projects and then this, you know the steps that we take up until we get that Transportation Improvement Plan adopted and then the steps that we take to maintain it and you know we process administrative modifications and amendments throughout the year and then it finally culminates in each, each year we do an annual listing of, of obligated, obligated projects that we present to, to you here to show what federal funds have been expended in the MPO area.

This, task 3 starts getting us into kind of the more, more interesting or more I guess groundbreaking aspects of transportation planning. It's

where we do general development data collection. I guess only, only a planner could stand here and tell you that data collection is more interesting but this, this is a you know we have, we have some ongoing duties that we've been doing you know since the 19, you know since even before the 1991 IHAS report was out there and that's, we do the traffic counts on, on all the road, all the major roadways in the region. We collect population and land use data. We maintain a forecast model known as the VISUM. Mr. Savage referenced it in his presentation so it's a very important thing that we do. We you know time, time we purchase upgrades to that model so it's a software upgrade. And then we did another little screen shot there, one of the more interesting things that's a subtask listed under three, it's under if you go into the UPWP it's under 3.1. We're going to, we're working with RoadRUNNER Transit. I've probably mentioned it here a few times. We've purchased automated, automated passenger counting units and the way that works into our, into our traffic counting, it's part of counting the transportation system so that's probably the most in, one of the interesting things that we're doing, undergoing under that task.

Task 4 is the transportation planning. The big one over the last two years was our work on the adopting the Metropolitan Transportation Plan which we do every, every five years. We do have some room in the UPWP in case we need to amend it. The, you know the previous Arrowhead the, may require that we amend that transportation plan here in the next couple of months or years. Another big activity upcoming in this one, we're going to be updating the Safe Routes to School Action Plan. That was a plan that was, you know allowed us, we got a half a million dollars of Safe Routes to School money to, to do infrastructure improvements, sidewalk, ADA improvements in the vicinity of several schools within the MPO area. We're back out, or we're continuing to meet with the Safe Routes to School team, members of the, the Transportation Department, the Public Schools, the police, and kind of find out what the, what are the big needs now, what should we, what should we pursue for improvements for our schools. This also, this task also represents our, you know it gives us our tie-in to work with the Regional Transit District.

And then task 5, special studies, plans, projects and I, I posted, I posted the wrong thing there I believe but under this, this is the, this is the one that, where we list our commitment to participating in the RLC, the Regional Leadership Consortium we discussed last meeting. We wanted to devote, you know from our Transportation Plan we have the Asset and Safety Management which we hope to you know develop into strong performance measures as required by FHWA.

And then, and then the last three I kind of put out a couple of suggestions that, that will be new for us and these replace in the current one where we have the university study area, we have the Missouri study area, and we have the short-range transit plan. We're looking to do some participatory mapping activities, kind of partnering with Place Matters,

some of the work that they've done in the, in the far south part of Dona Ana County outside of our MPO area we would be looking at replicating closer, closer to, or further north in Vado, Berino, La Mesa, some, some of those areas that are in our MPO area and also possibly partnering with the City. I'm doing some participating, participatory mapping within the city itself so having an urban and rural things. What that is is it's, it's kind of a combination of data collection and public involvement where we, we go out, we work with community groups, get them kind, get them apps for their phones or, or temporary phones where they can identify transportation shortfalls in the area, allow us to map them. We feel that this could be a, a, a very important tool for further transportation planning so we want to investigate that. We'll probably be asking the DOT Planning Office to, to help us out with some additional funding on that but the way it gets started is we put it into our work program and we start on that. This body I believe, I believe it was the last meeting talked about the need to do an A Mountain study area given some of the potential developments happening there so we'll be putting that into our work program if you all agree and, and seek some funding to, to fund a study on that. BLM has suggested to us that we do a transportation study to see how the national monument designation affects our transportation system, how our transportation system could support that national monument. And then also I, as I'm standing here and I, I kind of heard one a little bit earlier, do we update, do we update the IHAS, if so we, we put it in here. And so with that I will ask if you have any questions or wish to give me any direction.

Sorg: Anybody? Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. And I would just say Mr. Murphy to you and your entire staff that your planning for your work plan is among the best that I have ever seen just consistently so you've really got that down and I really appreciate that. I, I think it's important that the MPO continue to be involved with the, the Camino Real Consortium and the Regional Leadership Committee as we work into implementation of the various projects that we've got going and I think there's an important role to be played by the MPO as far as transportation in a number of those projects and we don't know yet quite the, what that's going to look like but leaving space for that is important. The more that we, we've had these discussions the more that I'm concerned with what happens at the fringes and I just had reflected that in my earlier comments so the idea of updating the IH ...

Murphy: IHAS.

Garrett: IHAS I think is important. I'm wondering if it would be worthwhile as part of that to look at specific projects that call for collaborative planning at both

the north and the south ends of our jurisdiction and we have touched on the idea of coordination with the El Paso MPO but I'm not sure that we want to simply leave that as an annual coordination meeting. It seems to me that Dona Ana County and this MPO have a real vested interest in what happens in terms of transportation planning in the south part of this, of the county and in order to move beyond simply accepting what the El Paso MPO is doing, in a sense I would like for us to have some space in the work plan to address joint planning interests in the south part of the county and in the north part of the county. We need to be thinking regionally and I don't see any other entity being in a position to do that. The County Comprehensive Plan, the new one is pretty vague when you actually get to some of the transportation planning pieces and I think that the MPO is the logical group of professionals to help flesh that out. So I would like to see that reflected in the work plan or brought before the Committee for consideration.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett. Any other comments? Questions? Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you. I'll be, I'll be quick. In the Organ Mountains/Desert Peak, the Dripping Springs, and, and the Baylor Canyon, is that work to be done to, to help identify how Baylor Canyon should be modified or if it should be modified for making it a, a more mountain-friendly, more tourist-oriented kind of a, a thoroughfare in, to include some of the planning stuff like recreational vehicles and parks and other kinds of things or, or does it include any of that? Thank you Mr. Chair.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. It's, probably the, the best answer I can give you at this time is that, that really has not been scoped out as of this moment. I gave a, a variation of this presentation to the Technical Advisory Committee last week and Bill Childress of the BLM suggested that we need to be doing this, how the transportation system affects and is affected by the national monument so and it, the, said yeah, you know yes that is a very, a very big development for our region and by all means we need to look into that ...

Hancock: Okay.

Murphy: And that's where we're, we're standing at this moment.

Hancock: Good. Understand. It's, it's on the radar. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Good. Thank you Commissioner Hancock. Any other comments or questions?

9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Sorg: Then we'll move on to general comments and questions from the, for the, with the staff and the Committee. Seeing none.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: I will move to Public Comment and there's no new public here so I assume there's no new public comment.

11. ADJOURNMENT (2:57 p.m.)

Sorg: With that I'll ask for a motion to adjourn.

Garrett: So moved.

Sorg: Okay. All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Gil M. Sorg

Chairperson