



A G E N D A

Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization

SPECIAL JOINT POLICY & TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS

**MPO Office
Downtown Center
100 W Broadway
Farmington, NM**

**December 8, 2016
1:30 p.m.**

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SPECIAL JOINT POLICY & TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS
 December 8, 2016 1:30 P.M.

This special joint meeting will be held at the MPO office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico.

ITEM	PAGE
1. Call Technical Committee meeting to order	
2. Approve the minutes from the November 9, 2016 Technical Committee meeting	1-14
3. Technical Committee - Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) a. Review the project(s) in Amendment #4 b. Hold a second Public Hearing on Amendment #4 c. Consider recommending approval again of Amendment #4 to the Policy Committee Presented by: Duane Wakan	15!&*
4. Business from the Chairman, Members, Staff	
5. Business from the floor	
6. Adjournment	

DRAFT MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
November 9, 2016

Technical Members Present: Bill Watson, City of Aztec
Jason Thomas, City of Bloomfield
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Paul Brasher, NMDOT, District 5
Andrew Montoya, Red Apple Transit
Fran Fillerup, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Assistant

Staff Absent: Mary Holton, MPO Officer
Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner

Others Present: Kathy Lamb, City of Aztec
Steven Saavedra, City of Aztec
Nica Westerling, City of Farmington
Brad Fisher, NMDOT Northern Design Center
Robin Elkin, Planning Liaison, NMDOT
Nick Porell, San Juan County
Pam Valencia, Place Matters

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fillerup called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 12, 2016 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the October 12, 2016 Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. FFY2016-2021 TIP AMENDMENT #4

Subject:	FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- On October 31, 2016 the Farmington MPO advertised Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The amendment involves several projects in the TIP as described in the attached notice.
- The Technical Committee will consider the amendment and may make a recommendation at their meeting on November 9th.

AMENDED TIP PROJECTS

- **US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112)** - At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds bringing the new project total to \$15,900,000.
- **20th Street Project Phase III** - At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III** - At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Glade Run Recreation Area Trails** - At the request of the San Juan County, adds a new project to the TIP, \$700,000 local funds in 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100)**. At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) in FY2020.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming \$4M Local Funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16M in future federal funds in FY2021 in addition to \$2M in local match funds in FY2021.
- **East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091)** At the request of the City of Aztec, amends the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approx. .5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle-guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1B and 2, construction management and testing services. Utility infrastructure, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local match in FY2017.
- **Anesi Trail** - At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development.
- **Kirtland Schools Walk Path** - At the request of the San Juan County, shortens the project termini from 2.84 Miles to 1.66 Miles, shuffles construction and PE funds, but without changes to the overall project cost totals.

ACTION ITEM

- Staff recommends the Technical Committee review the projects in Amendment #4, hold a public hearing on Amendment #4 and consider recommending approval to the Policy Committee of Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that the MPO had solicited a call for TIP amendments/additions and those are on Page 1 of the Agenda. Mr. Wakan also noted that NMDOT had also made recommendation to delete several of the projects in the TIP. Mr. Wakan developed TIP Amendment #4 based on lead agency input. He reviewed the bulleted list of projects shown above:

US 64 - Phase 5 - NMDOT has requested to increase funding for this project by an additional \$833,356 in NHPP funding. The new project total will be \$15,900,000.

20th Street Sidewalk Project - Phase III - City of Farmington asked to add a new project to the TIP for \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 for engineering and construction of pedestrian facilities.

Foothills Drive Enhancements - Phase III - City of Farmington requested the addition of this new project at a cost of \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to construct pedestrian facilities and street enhancements.

Glade Run Recreation Area Trails - San Juan County requested the addition of this new project at a cost of \$700,000 in local funds in 2018 and 2019 for engineering and construction of these recreation trails.

Pinon Hills Boulevard - Phase I - The City of Farmington requested this project be amended by programming \$2,000,000 in local funds in 2019.

Pinon Hills Boulevard - Phase II - The City of Farmington requested this project be amended by programming \$2,000,000 in local funds in 2020 and 2021 and \$16,000,000 in future federal funds in 2021. The total cost of this project is \$20,000,000.

East Arterial Route - Phase II - The City of Aztec requested this project be amended to include right-of-way acquisition, construction from the end of Phase IB to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construction of detached multi-use trail, addition of 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approximately .5 miles (Phase IA); BLM requested wildlife and right-of-way fencing, cattle guard on NM 173 striping and signage on Phases IB and II (striping also on the overlay which is part of Phase IA), and construction management and testing services. Also included is utility infrastructure to include water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. The City of Aztec also requested \$1,000,000 in local non-match funds in 2017 to be moved to state severance tax funds totaling \$3,819,750.

Staff will work with Mr. Watson to ensure all the scoping details are accurate in the final TIP document.

Anesi Trail - The City of Farmington requested the addition of a new project in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development in a RTP grant they are pursuing.

Kirtland Schools Walk Path - San Juan County requested that the project termini be shortened from 2.84 miles to 1.57 miles. Additionally they also requested to move some construction and engineering funds, but not change the overall project cost total.

Mr. Fillerup asked if the sponsoring agencies had any additional comments to the TIP Amendment #4 as introduced. Mr. Fillerup opened the Public Hearing for FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4.

There were no comments received from the audience.

Mr. Watson commented that he had heard that NMDOT had recommended that the East Arterial project be removed from the TIP. Mr. Fillerup added that this information had been provided in an earlier e-mail sent to the Technical Committee by Staff and he asked if this was still NMDOT's recommendation.

Mr. Brasher said he thought the MPO was going to include in the amendment the deletion of the East Arterial. He stated that Amendment #5 to the STIP will reflect the deletion of \$3,500,000 for the East Arterial.

Mr. Watson said he thought that Mr. Brasher and District 5 had been onboard with the City of Aztec's plan and schedule for completing this project in 2017. Mr. Brasher said that he had met with the City of Aztec and, at that time, believed they were on track with all the components of the project. However, there are others within NMDOT that are not as optimistic that this project will be completed on time especially with the BLM land transfer and landfill disposition. Plans are to amend the STIP to pull back \$3,500,000 from this project in anticipation of delays in the land transfer and finding a location for the landfill material. Mr. Brasher noted that initially BLM representatives had indicated there was a fast track process for the land transfer; however, now with new management there are no quick land transfers and NMDOT believes the actual transfer could take several years. Mr. Brasher also expressed NMDOT's concern over where the landfill material would be taken and asked if the City of Aztec had secured a place for the material. Mr. Watson said there is a plan in place to take the material to Crouch Mesa landfill and the City of Aztec expects that an agreement will be reached in a few weeks. The landfill removal plan is part of the overall project and the City of Aztec remains confident that the project will be ready for PS&E in June 2017.

Mr. Brasher reiterated that he shared the City of Aztec's optimism, but with BLM's new management, NMDOT believes the land transfer cannot happen quickly and they plan to amend the STIP to delete the \$3,500,000. The Technical Committee asked if a project in the FMPO TIP can be changed by NMDOT or be shown differently in the STIP. Mr. Wakan replied that the TIP is approved by the MPO Policy and Technical Committees based on established CFRs. If the proposed TIP is consistent with the 2040 MTP, regulations provide that the STIP must then reflect the amendments as approved by the MPO. Mr. Fillerup said that, in the past, any changes proposed by NMDOT would be provided to the lead agency and the MPO in writing before the TIP amendment was presented to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Watson stated that since the City of Aztec is the lead agency on this project they do not understand how NMDOT would have control over the project and they should have been approached in advance of any NMDOT concerns or proposed project deletion. Mr. Wakan agreed that the MPO is put in a difficult position when NMDOT requests are made through the MPO and not directly to the lead agency. The lead

agency on a project is the one to make any change request. Mr. Watson explained that the City of Aztec would resist NMDOT's plan to remove funding for the East Arterial project because they believe they will be able to stay on schedule. He stated that the City of Aztec and BLM are still on target for June 2017. Mr. Watson asked if NMDOT had different information from BLM to please share that with the City of Aztec.

Mr. Brasher clarified that NMDOT understands the TIP amendment process and was not presuming to take project control away from the local entity projects. He added, however, that NMDOT Planning does not believe the East Arterial can be constructed within the deadlines and believes the money needs to be put elsewhere. Mr. Watson said the City of Aztec does not agree with this.

Mr. Fillerup stated that for the purposes of Amendment #4, the lead agency needs to direct all changes in the amendment. Any additional discussions on the East Arterial project need to be held with the City of Aztec as the lead agency. Based on those discussions, another TIP amendment may be needed, but consideration of TIP Amendment #4 will proceed today. Mr. Wakan noted that the TIP amendment form submitted by the lead agency asks if the details of the amendment have been reviewed by NMDOT engineers. This conversation should be had before the amendment is provided to the MPO so there are no issues when it is considered for approval. Mr. Fillerup commented that the MPO would not expect an amendment to come from someone other than the project lead.

Ms. Lopez thought that NMDOT's assumptions and concerns about the ability of an agency to meet project deadlines should be backed up with details and any information that NMDOT is aware of should be provided to the lead agency so they can follow up and make sure they are able to meet their obligations. Ms. Lopez said it seems unfair to base a TIP amendment on assumptions and with no documentation. Mr. Brasher added that NMDOT would like more certainty that the land transfer will take place so that the project is not jeopardized.

Mr. Watson referred to a meeting several months ago where Mr. Brasher agreed to give the City of Aztec until June of 2017 before the funding might be rerouted, and the City of Aztec has been working with this goal in mind. Mr. Brasher restated that with the management and philosophy change within the BLM, NMDOT believes the land transfer process will take several years and NMDOT's decision is to cut the funding now and not wait until June. Mr. Watson said the City of Aztec does not share this pessimistic approach and they remain confident that they can meet the June 2017 deadline. He added that any issues and concerns should have been discussed with the City of Aztec and having NMDOT try to pull funding for a local street from the TIP and STIP was not appreciated. Mr. Saavedra added that it did not make sense to halt a project with only assumptions and no concrete documentation or information.

Mr. Fillerup stated that it appeared that further discussions were needed but any new changes to the TIP need to be in writing and would need to wait until the next amendment cycle. For the time being, Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP would be considered as it was presented. The public comment period was closed.

ACTION: Ms. Lopez moved to approved Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as presented. Mr. Watson seconded the motion. Mr. Brasher opposed the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 1. Mr. Sypher suggested that this had been an interesting process and asked if a presentation on how the TIP and STIP process operates. He thought it was clear that the TIP is the local/MPO mechanism for addressing projects while changes to the STIP would fall to NMDOT. He thought further education on this would be helpful for the entire Technical Committee. The members agreed that this would be useful as a refresher on the intent and responsibilities of the MPO, the entities and NMDOT. Staff will look at getting this set up either as an agenda item for a future meeting or possibly a special study workshop.

4. 2017 ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

Subject:	2017 Annual Meeting Schedule
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- Each year the Technical Committee approves a resolution ensuring compliance with the open meetings act and establishes its meeting schedule for the coming year.
- In 2016, Technical Committee meetings were moved to the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 10:00 a.m. Meetings continue to be rotated among the entities to facilitate NMDOT attendance.

CURRENT WORK

- Staff will present a proposed meeting schedule for discussion with the Technical Committee.
- Technical Committee asked Staff to ask for Legal input on three considerations:
 - Agendas and supporting documents be provided one week prior to meeting date (this is already done by Staff and is outlined in the Bylaws on page 10: *“Written notice of meetings (agendas) and supporting documentation shall be provided to the Technical Committee members on the following schedule: Regular Meetings – one (1) week notice; Special Meetings – four (4) day notice”*);

Legal review (Jennifer Breakell-11/2/16): “My opinion is that we keep the Open Meetings Act Resolution for each committee consistent with what the law states. The law requires a 72 hour publication of the agenda and the resolution should reflect this deadline as well. Further, the legal department and the city like to keep the resolutions consistent with each other and the language to accurately reflect what the law states.”

MPO Officer Holton comment (11/2/16): “My direction is that the MPO establish a policy to deliver their agendas and background material at least one week in advance. I also recommend that all committee members be given the opportunity to add items to the agenda.”

- Agendas be reviewed by Technical Committee Chair (this is already provided for in the Bylaws on page 6):

"The MPO Officer shall be the primary staff person for the Policy Committee, responsible for directing all operational functions of the MPO".

Also see Ms. Holton's comments (11/2/16) on preparation and review of the agenda for addition in the Bylaws:

"My direction is that the MPO establish a policy to deliver their agendas and background material at least one week in advance. I also recommend that all committee members be given the opportunity to add items to the agenda."

- Only items with supporting information that can be provided with the agenda to be included on the agenda (this is already outlined in the Bylaws on page 10):

"Written notice of meetings (agendas) and supporting documentation shall be provided to the Technical Committee members..."

- Formal action to adopt the meeting schedule and Resolution will be done in November.
- Staff will prepare an Amendment to the Bylaws for Technical Committee review in December to allow for future Committee input to the meeting agendas.

ACTION ITEM

- Review and consider approval of the 2017 Technical Committee meeting schedule and Resolution 2016-1.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Fillerup noted that this was a previous agenda item from October. He summarized the three items that had been discussed and noted that those were outlined in the agenda item. Mr. Wakan reviewed those items and the responses received:

Legal review (Jennifer Breakell-11/2/16) regarding the Open Meetings Act Resolution retaining the 72-hour notice for agendas: "My opinion is that we keep the Open Meetings Act Resolution for each committee consistent with what the law states. The law requires a 72 hour publication of the agenda and the resolution should reflect this deadline as well. Further the legal department and the city like to keep the resolutions consistent with each other and the language to accurately reflect what the law states."

Providing Agendas and supporting documents one week prior to meeting date (this is already done by Staff and is outlined in the Bylaws on page 10): *"Written notice of meetings (agendas) and supporting documentation shall be provided to the Technical Committee members on the following schedule: Regular Meetings – one (1) week notice; Special Meetings – four (4) day notice";*

MPO Officer Holton comment (11/2/16): "My direction is that the MPO establish a policy to deliver their agendas and background material at least one week in advance. I also recommend that all committee members be given the opportunity to add items to the agenda."

Preparation and review of agendas (this is already provided for in the Bylaws on page 6): *“The MPO Officer shall be the primary staff person for the Policy Committee, responsible for directing all operational functions of the MPO”.*

Ms. Holton also commented (11/2/16) on the preparation and review of the agenda (add this to the Bylaws): *“My direction is that the MPO establish a policy to deliver their agendas and background material at least one week in advance. I also recommend that all committee members be given the opportunity to add items to the agenda.”*

Supporting and back up documents be provided with the agenda (this is already outlined in the Bylaws on page 10): *“Written notice of meetings (agendas) and supporting documentation shall be provided to the Technical Committee members...”*

Ms. Lopez commented that the City of Farmington’s Metropolitan Redevelopment Area (MRA) offers the commissioners an opportunity to add items to the agenda prior to preparation of the next meeting agenda. Mr. Wakan said that this opportunity to provide recommendations for the agenda could be extended to the Technical Committee. Ms. Lopez also stated that the Planning & Zoning Commission is a recommending body to City Council and members can request during a meeting that a specific item be included on the next agenda.

Mr. Fillerup asked if there were other comments from the Technical Committee members. Mr. Sypher said the answers and recommendations met his expectations to the items he proposed at the October meeting. Mr. Fillerup reiterated that those items not already addressed in the Bylaws be considered for inclusion and an amendment to the Bylaws come back to the Technical Committee in December.

It was noted that the meeting dates needed to be corrected to show meetings held on the second Wednesday of the month except for the November meeting which is moved up to the first Wednesday.

ACTION: Mr. Sypher moved to recommend approval of the 2017 Technical Committee meeting schedule and Resolution 2016-1. Mr. Watson seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

5. STATUS OF TIP PROJECTS

Subject:	Status of TIP Projects
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- The STIP Protocols, finalized in early 2014, indicate that each MPO shall develop a process to monitor the progress and status of each project in the first two years of the TIP. These monthly reviews help correct inconsistencies in the TIP, STIP, the MPO’s MTP, Agreement Request Forms (ARFs), etc.
- The next scheduled TIP Amendment cycle begins in late February 2017.

- NMDOT has requested a change for F100112 which will require a TIP amendment.

TRACKING INFORMATION (2016-2021 TIP)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local Agreement Status (ARF) ▪ ROW Certification ▪ Design Completion 30 - 60 - 90% ▪ Environmental Certification ▪ Utilities Certification ▪ Railroad Certification ▪ Archeology Certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ITS/Sys ENG Certification ▪ Public Involvement Certification

CURRENT WORK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Top Regional Priority Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ East Arterial Route Phase II- ○ Pinon Hills Boulevard Bridge Phases I & II ○ Kirtland School Walk Path System ▪ Surface Transportation Program Funds (STP)- funds can be used to repair structurally deficient bridges. ▪ Projects specified in the 2040 MTP and added to the TIP require review by the scoring committee.

ACTION ITEM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee members will have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding TIP project status and details and make recommendations for the scoring committee.

DISCUSSION: Since most of the current projects were already updated in the TIP amendment agenda item, Mr. Wakan briefly reviewed those remaining:

Pinon Hills Bridge - Phase III

The right-of-way mapping has been sent to NMDOT; a response was requested from BLM on the environmental evaluation to NMDOT as a cooperating agency.

US 64 - Phase VI

Design on this phase has been started.

US 550 Bridge

Construction on this bridge preservation project will happen in FFY2017. There were no other updates.

NM 173

Funding on this project will be moved out to a future year.

CR 350/390

This project will be rebid due to high construction bids received. It is still slated for construction in the spring of 2017.

Red Apple Transit - Operating
No changes to this project.

Ms. Lopez asked about the Main Street project and if written confirmation on the preliminary approval of the PFF is required. It was noted that all the TAP applications had received only verbal approval. Mr. Wakan responded that the PFF was required for RTPOs, but not required for MPOs and Mr. Fillerup concurred. Mr. Elkin said he thought this was correct, but that he could review this information in the TAP guidelines. The Technical Committee would like clarification on this to ensure their applications are considered complete.

ACTION: The review was conducted.

6. NMDOT REPORTS

District 5 - Paul Brasher

Mr. Brasher said more conversations on the East Arterial project needed to occur.

Another phase of US 64 has been completed. The next phase is expected to include a concrete intersection and drainage issues are also anticipated. Mr. Brasher noted that the two mile phases have been working well.

NMDOT recognizes the amount of heavy truck traffic on all the roads in the area and is putting added effort into rehabilitating and restoring these corridors along with adding emphasis on overall maintenance. Mr. Wakan said that he had asked Paul Sittig with NMDOT Planning to provide freight maps and volumes to assist with strategic access management planning and determine where all the freight is going. Mr. Elkin said Mr. Sittig is actively working on the data he would follow up with him on providing this information to the MPO.

Mr. Fillerup asked if the next phase of US 64 is planned for construction in 2017. Mr. Brasher said it was but could take a little longer due to the anticipated drainage issues.

NMDOT Planning - Robin Elkin

Mr. Elkin said that for training purposes the FHWA website has very good documents and information along with webinars on MPO processes and planning for governmental officials.

Mr. Elkin said he had expected a similar discussion on deletion of the Pinon Hills Boulevard project (CN F100101) that had taken place on deleting the East Arterial project from the TIP. Since it hadn't come up in the TIP Amendment discussion, he said he would not address it further at this time. Mr. Elkin said he thought the MPO meeting agenda should have better reflected NMDOT's requests on these two projects. Mr. Fillerup added that any item for the TIP should follow the MPO process and be provided in writing. Mr. Elkin agreed that all agencies should follow the established process.

Mr. Sypher noted that any discussion item on the agenda should have the necessary supporting documentation provided when the agenda is sent out. Mr. Elkin commented on the lack of detail provided in the public notice for Amendment #4. Mr. Wakan replied that the general legal notice about an upcoming TIP amendment provides interested parties the opportunity to attend the Technical Committee meeting where the project details will be discussed. The amendment details are also provided in the actual meeting agenda.

Mr. Elkin also addressed fiscal constraint and the reasonable possibility for a project to be funded in the term of the STIP. The STIP procedure manual does not specifically reference the planning years of the STIP which are the two outer years. Funding during the term of the STIP could be more or less abundant than anticipated. Mr. Sypher added that he had contacted FHWA and was told that there is clear guidance that says that in the planning years projects do not need to be fiscally constrained. Mr. Elkin said the manuals do not specifically reference this and asked if the information Mr. Sypher found could be forwarded to him.

Mr. Brasher reported that the Pinon Hills Boulevard project had not been totally ignored and that he and the City of Farmington are still currently discussing the project. Mr. Brasher, Mr. Sypher, Brad Fisher with the Northern Design Center and Nica Westerling with the City of Farmington will meet again after the Technical Committee meeting.

7. FFY2017-2018 UPWP AMENDMENT #1

Subject:	FFY2017-2018 UPWP Amendment #1
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- The MPO maintains a Unified Planning Work Program which sets forth the tasks the MPO will undertake in a given fiscal year.
- The Policy Committee approved the MPOs two-year FFY 2017-2018 UPWP in June of 2016. It mentioned the use of FAST Act funds to be applied in the 1st quarter of FFY 2017 towards the completion of the safety plan.
- The FAST Act increased the FMPOs planning award by \$8,509 in March of 2016.
- Any FFY16 balances remaining after 12/31/16 will lapse, unless there is a multi-year contract identified in the UPWP that allows a rollover.
- The delay in developing the Safety Plan will prevent the MPO from applying those funds by the end of December 2016.

CURRENT WORK and ATTACHMENTS

- FAST Act award of \$8,509 which includes the local match, must be spent by December 31, 2016.
 - Originally, this was programmed to the development of the Safety Plan.
 - Time constraints prevent the programming of these funds towards safety

- The MPO Civic Plus subsite is an optimal expense for the FAST Act Funds as the cost for services is just over \$9,000.
- Preliminary schedule calls for final delivery of a fully functional website by the end of May of 2017.
- A red-lined copy of the pages/sections of the current FFY2017-2018 UPWP impacted by Amendment #1 is attached separately.

ACTION ITEM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is recommended that the Technical Committee consider recommending approval of Amendment #1 to the FFY2017-18 UPWP to the Policy Committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that once each quarter the MPO can amend the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This amendment addresses the \$8,509 in FAST Act funds that NMDOT has said must be used by December 2016. The MPO designated that the funds would be used toward development of the MPO safety plan; however, with delays in developing the scope of work for the safety plan and time constraints, the MPO wants to move these FAST Act funds to the development of the MPO website. The development of the website is outlined in the UPWP, but use of the FAST Act funds for this activity was not designated.

The current MPO website is housed under the City of Farmington’s website and it cannot be customized to reflect the regional nature of the MPO. A consultant has been contracted for this development at a cost of \$9,200.00.

Mr. Fillerup clarified that the amendment was to designate spending the FAST Act funds on the website development and not for the safety plan. Mr. Wakan replied that this was correct.

Mr. Fillerup asked if there would be further discussion or a status update today on the safety plan. Mr. Wakan said that the remaining concerns and questions on the safety plan needed to be cleared up before it was brought back to the Technical Committee for discussion. It is expected that the safety plan scope and discussion will be part of the December meeting agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Lopez moved to recommend approve of Amendment #1 to the FFY2017-2018 UPWP. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. **AMPO National Conference.** Mr. Garcia attended the 2016 AMPO National Conference in Fort Worth, Texas on October 24-28, 2016.
- b. **FASTLANE Transportation Infrastructure Grants.** The USDOT is soliciting applications for \$850 million in funding available under the FASTLANE program. This program provides, dedicated, discretionary funding for projects that address critical freight issues facing our nation's highways and bridges. For additional information please reference Mr. Garcia's e-mail of November 1, 2016 sent to all Technical Committee members.
- c. **Implementation of Title VI Program by Local Entities.** Local government agencies (LGA's) that have received federal funds from NMDOT were contacted on February 12, 2016 about the requirement to implement a Title VI Program. The revised deadline for submitting these programs to NMDOT is January 13, 2017 (please reference letter from Damian Segura dated 10/24/16). Please ensure your entity's Title VI Program is completed and submitted to NMDOT on schedule.
- d. **Other.**

DISCUSSION: Mr. Garcia attended the AMPO National Conference on October 24-28. He will provide a report to the Technical Committee in December on the sessions he attended.

An e-mail was sent to all the Technical Committee members on the availability of FASTLANE Transportation Infrastructure Grants. Mr. Wakan noted that MPOs may also apply for these grants, but Staff has not done any additional research on the program. If members are aware of critical freight corridors in the area, it could be beneficial to make application for funding.

Mr. Wakan reported on a recent letter from Damian Segura with NMDOT about the requirement for local government agencies (LGAs) that have received federal funds to implement a Title VI program. These programs must be submitted to NMDOT by January 13, 2017. There is a boilerplate available on NMDOT's website to help streamline the process. Mr. Wakan said he would have to research whether a separate Title VI Plan was required for Red Apple Transit or if they could operate under the City of Farmington's Title VI plan.

Staff provided Complete Streets Design Guidelines documents to all present. Mr. Wakan recommended providing copies to all entity planning divisions, engineering, public works, developers, and a display for the public. Mr. Fillerup asked if the MPO was planning to present the completed product in public meetings. Mr. Wakan thought that some entities would prefer their own staff make the presentation, but MPO Staff is certainly willing to present the final document if entities desire.

9. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Fillerup introduced Nick Porell, the new Deputy Administrator for Public Works for San Juan County.

There was no additional business from the Chairman, Members and Staff.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the Floor.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Fillerup adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Fran Fillerup, Chair

June Markle, Administrative Aide

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Subject:	FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	December 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- On October 31, 2016 and November 23, 2016 the Farmington MPO advertised Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The amendment involves several projects in the TIP as described in the attached notice.
- The Technical Committee recommended approval of TIP Amendment #4 on November 9, 2016.
- The Policy Committee deferred their vote on TIP Amendment #4 on November 17, 2016.
- A Special Joint Policy/Technical Committee meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2016.

AMENDED TIP PROJECTS

- **US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112)** – At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds bringing the new project total to \$15,900,000.
- **20th Street Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Glade Run Recreation Area Trails** – At the request of the San Juan County, adds a new project to the TIP, \$700,000 local funds in 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct recreational trail systems.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) in FY2019.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming \$2M Local Funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16M in future federal funds in FY2021 in addition to \$2M in local match funds in FY2021.
- **East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091)** At the request of the City of Aztec, amends the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approx. .5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle-guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1A,1B and Phase 2, construction management and testing services. Utilities, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local non-match in FY2017.
- **Anesi Trail** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development.
- **Kirtland Schools Walk Path** – At the request of the San Juan County, shortens the project termini from 2.84 Miles to 1.57 Miles, shuffles construction and PE funds, but without changes to the overall project cost totals.

ANTICIPATED WORK
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Hold a second public hearing on Amendment #4 on December 8, 2016.▪ Seek approval of the amendment at the December 8, 2016 Special Policy and Technical Committee Joint Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Technical Committee meeting minutes from November 9, 2016.▪ Policy Committee meeting minutes from November 17, 2016.▪ The Public Notice re-advertising Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP.▪ E-mail from Rebecca Maes, NMDOT Project Oversight Division with attachments.

ACTION ITEM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ It is recommended that the Technical Committee consider recommending approval again of Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to the Policy Committee.

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Farmington MPO is re-advertising **Amendment #4** to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This public comment period meets all of the applicable requirements of the federal transportation bill MAP-21 and the federal transit requirements of Section 5307(c) (1-7).

As required by federal law and the Farmington MPO Public Participation Plan, the FMPO is holding an additional 15-day Public Comment Period and Public Hearing on **Amendment #4** to the FFY2016-2021 TIP. This additional 15-day comment period is from November 23, 2016 to December 7, 2016. The public may also make comments on the proposed amendment at the following meeting:

Public Hearing: During the Farmington MPO Special Technical Committee meeting at 1:30 p.m. on **Thursday, December 8, 2016** at the MPO Office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico 87401. Final approval on the proposed amendment will be taken during the Farmington MPO Special Policy Committee meeting which will follow the Special Technical Committee meeting on **Thursday, December 8, 2016** also at the MPO Office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico 87401.

Written comments may be sent to the Farmington MPO at:

Fax: (505) 599-1299

Mail: Farmington MPO, 800 Municipal Drive, Farmington, New Mexico, 87401

Email: dwakan@fmtn.org

The public may view this Amendment at www.farmingtonmpo.org. For more information contact Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, at (505) 599-1449.



Holton, Mary <mholton@fmtn.org>

Fwd: FW: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

1 message

Sypher, David <dtsypher@fmtn.org>
 To: "Holton, Mary" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Wed, Nov 30, 2016 at 9:57 AM

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT** <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>

Date: Wed, Nov 30, 2016 at 9:27 AM

Subject: FW: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

To: "dwakan@fmtn.org" <dwakan@fmtn.org>
 Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Lopez, Stephen, NMDOT" <Stephen.Lopez@state.nm.us>, "Armendariz, Armando M., NMDOT" <Armando.Armendariz@state.nm.us>, "Lujan, Anthony N., NMDOT" <Anthony.Lujan1@state.nm.us>, "Church, Tom J., NMDOT" <Tom.Church@state.nm.us>, "Fisher, Bradley F, NMDOT" <BradleyF.Fisher@state.nm.us>, "Cribbin, Brian, NMDOT" <Brian.Cribbin@state.nm.us>, "Roxlau, Blake R., NMDOT" <Blake.Roxlau@state.nm.us>, "Wessel, Rick, NMDOT" <Rick.Wessel@state.nm.us>, "Noedel, Ronald S., NMDOT" <Ronald.Noedel@state.nm.us>, "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>, David Sypher <dtsypher@fmtn.org>, William Watson <wwatson@aztecnm.gov>, "Kozub, Rosa, NMDOT" <Rosa.Kozub@state.nm.us>, "Salazar, David A., NMDOT" <David.Salazar@state.nm.us>, "Duran, Annette, NMDOT" <Annette.Duran@state.nm.us>, "Trujillo, Marcos B., NMDOT" <Marcos.Trujillo1@state.nm.us>

Duane – on 11/1/16, Stephen Lopez of D5 submitted the email below requesting TIP amendments to delete F100091 and F100100 from the current TIP. These amendments were not included on the agenda for the 11/9 TC and 11/17 PC meetings but the City of Farmington amendments requesting that the funds be moved to the outer years of the TIP were included. Action on the agenda items was deferred to a special meeting on 12/8/16 of both the TC and Policy Committee. NMDOT requests that the original amendment for F100101 submitted by Stephen via his email (and attached) be included on the agenda for action at the 12/8/16 meeting. The department will not move forward with the F100091 amendment that was submitted (and attached). Per the MPO bylaws, special meetings require 4 day notice, thus there is adequate time to revise and re-advertise the agenda to reflect these items.

Thank you,

Rebecca Maes

Staff Manager

Project Oversight Division

505-476-3785 or 505-946-7323

From: Lopez, Stephen, NMDOT
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2016 8:33 AM
To: Wakan, Duane (dwakan@fmtn.org)
Cc: Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT; Brasher, Paul, NMDOT
Subject: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

Duane,

Attached are the TIP Amendments to FMPO deleting F100091 and F100100 from the current TIP. The amendments to the STIP deleting these projects is in Amendment 5. Please review and advise if you have questions or comments on this information. Thanks.

Stephen Lopez, PE

NMDOT D5 Technical Support Engineer

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>

To: "mholton@fmtn.org" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Archuleta, Elias, NMDOT" <Elias.Archuleta@state.nm.us>, "Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT" <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>, "Haas, Tamara P, NMDOT" <TamaraP.Haas@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Wakan, Duane" <dwakan@fmtn.org>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>

Date: Mon, 7 Nov 2016 16:27:44 +0000

Subject: FMPO TIP Amendment Request

Hi Mary,

Please find attached a letter requesting an amendment to remove CMAQ-Flex funding from the FMPO FFY16-FFY21 TIP. Please don't hesitate to call with any questions or concerns you might have.

Thanks,

Dan Watts | Urban & Regional Planner

Government to Government Unit

NM Department of Transportation

PO Box 1149

Santa Fe, NM 87504

Cell: (505)470-8545

Email: Danial.Watts@state.nm.us

--

David M. Sypher, P.E.
Public Works Director

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>

To: "mholton@fmtn.org" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Archuleta, Elias, NMDOT"

<Elias.Archuleta@state.nm.us>, "Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT" <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>, "Haas, Tamara P, NMDOT" <TamaraP.Haas@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Wakan, Duane" <dwakan@fmtn.org>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>
Date: Mon, 7 Nov 2016 16:27:44 +0000
Subject: FMPO TIP Amendment Request

Hi Mary,

Please find attached a letter requesting an amendment to remove CMAQ-Flex funding from the FMPO FFY16-FFY21 TIP. Please don't hesitate to call with any questions or concerns you might have.

Thanks,

Dan Watts | Urban & Regional Planner

Government to Government Unit

NM Department of Transportation

PO Box 1149

Santa Fe, NM 87504

Cell: (505)470-8545

Email: Danial.Watts@state.nm.us

5 attachments

-  **F100100TIP Modification Form.pdf**
192K
-  **F100091TIP Modification Form.pdf**
200K
-  **2016_1107_F100101 TIP Amendment Request.pdf**
333K
-  **2016_1107_F100101 TIP Amendment Request.pdf**
333K
-  **noname.eml**
462K

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Template

This template will improve project detail accuracy and communication between the Farmington MPO and lead agency project managers when requesting amendments or modification to the TIP. Upon completion of this form, it should be re-confirmed as accurate by the D-5 Liaison or the STIP coordinator.

Project Name:

Project Termini

Project Descriptions:

Begin MP

End MP

TIP Amendment	TIP Modification	Control Number
Existing TIP Details	Amend/Mod Details 1	Amend/Mod Details 2
Existing Year	Amend/Mod Year	Amend/Mod Year

Existing TIP Details

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

Amend/Mod Details 1

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

Amend/Mod Details 2

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

TIP Amendment/
Modification Details

Is the Project identified in the 2040 MTP?

Do project details match the existing Agreement Request Form (ARF)?

Have Project details been reviewed by the NMDOT District 5 Engineering Liaison?

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Template

This template will improve project detail accuracy and communication between the Farmington MPO and lead agency project managers when requesting amendments or modification to the TIP. Upon completion of this form, it should be re-confirmed as accurate by the D-5 Liaison or the STIP coordinator.

Project Name:

Project Termini

Project Descriptions:

Begin MP

End MP

TIP Amendment **TIP Modification** Control Number

Existing TIP Details	Amend/Mod Details 1	Amend/Mod Details 2
Federal Funds	Funding Source	Funding Source
<input type="text" value="\$2,990,400"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
State Match	Match Type	Match Type
<input type="text" value="\$509,600"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
Local-Non Match	Match Other	Match Other
<input type="text" value="\$1,000,000"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
Existing Year	Amend/Mod Year	Amend/Mod Year
<input type="text" value="2017"/>	<input type="text" value="Select Year"/>	<input type="text" value="Select Year"/>

Existing TIP Details

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Federal HWY	STP - Sm Urb	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Local-Non Match	Select Category	Severance Tax	Select Category

Amend/Mod Details 1

2 Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Select Source	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Select Category	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category

Amend/Mod Details 2

3 Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Select Source	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Select Category	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category

TIP Amendment/
Modification Details

Delete Project from the FMPO TIP

- Is the Project identified in the 2040 MTP?
- Do project details match the existing Agreement Request Form (ARF)?
- Have Project details been reviewed by the NMDOT Distirct 5 Engineering Liaison?



November 7, 2016

Mary L. Holton
Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization
800 Municipal Drive
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

Dear Ms. Holton:

The purpose of this letter is to respectfully request that the Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) amend its FFY16-FFY21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to remove the \$250,000 of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds currently programmed in FFY2017 for the design of the E. Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase II project (F100101). As District 5 submitted a TIP amendment on November 1, 2016 to remove the project construction funds from FFY2020, the design funds must be deleted in order to ensure that the FMPO TIP is fiscally constrained, per New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Procedures and federal law.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (505) 470-8545 or by email at Danial.Watts@state.nm.us. Thank you for your timely resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dan Watts".

Dan Watts
CMAQ-Flex Coordinator
Statewide Planning Bureau

Cc via Email: Jessica Griffin, Chief, Statewide Planning Bureau
Elias Archuleta, Chief Engineer, Office of Infrastructure
Rebecca Maes, STIP Coordinator
Tamara Haas, Division Director, Asset Management & Planning Division
Paul Brasher, District Engineer, District 5
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, Farmington MPO

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6



November 7, 2016

Mary L. Holton
Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization
800 Municipal Drive
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

Dear Ms. Holton:

The purpose of this letter is to respectfully request that the Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) amend its FFY16-FFY21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to remove the \$250,000 of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds currently programmed in FFY2017 for the design of the E. Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase II project (F100101). As District 5 submitted a TIP amendment on November 1, 2016 to remove the project construction funds from FFY2020, the design funds must be deleted in order to ensure that the FMPO TIP is fiscally constrained, per New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Procedures and federal law.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (505) 470-8545 or by email at Danial.Watts@state.nm.us. Thank you for your timely resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dan Watts".

Dan Watts
CMAQ-Flex Coordinator
Statewide Planning Bureau

Cc via Email: Jessica Griffin, Chief, Statewide Planning Bureau
Elias Archuleta, Chief Engineer, Office of Infrastructure
Rebecca Maes, STIP Coordinator
Tamara Haas, Division Director, Asset Management & Planning Division
Paul Brasher, District Engineer, District 5
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, Farmington MPO

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6

POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SPECIAL JOINT POLICY & TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS
 December 8, 2016 1:30 P.M.

This special joint meeting will be held at the MPO office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call Policy Committee meeting to order	
2. Approve the minutes from the November 17, 2016 Policy Committee meeting	& !) &
3. Policy Committee - Consider approval of Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Self-Certification for Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP Presented by: Duane Wakan	53-65
4. Business from the Chairman, Members, Staff	
5. Business from the floor	
6. Adjournment	

DRAFT MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
November 17, 2016

Policy Members Present: Sherri Sipe, City of Aztec
Dorothy Nobis, Alternate, City of Bloomfield
Paul Brasher, NMDOT District 5
Jimmy Voita, San Juan County

Policy Members Absent: Curtis Lynch, City of Bloomfield
Nate Duckett, City of Farmington
Linda Rodgers, City of Farmington

Staff Present: Mary Holton, MPO Officer
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide

Staff Absent: None

Others Present: Josh Ray, City of Aztec
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Robin Elkin, Planning Liaison, NMDOT
Christina Morris, New Mexico Department of Health
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County
Steven Saavedra, City of Aztec

1. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Sipe called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 22, 2016 POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. Nobis moved to approve the minutes from the September 22, 2016 Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Voita seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

3. ANNUAL ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Subject:	Annual Election of Officers
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 10, 2016

BACKGROUND

- As outlined in the MPO Committee Bylaws, the Annual Election of Officers was moved to September to allow newly elected members to become familiar with Policy Committee proceedings.
- Each September the Policy Committee selects the Chair and Vice-Chair from their membership who will serve until the following annual election.
- The Chair presides over the meetings and is responsible for the other duties outlined in the Committee Bylaws and Operating Procedures document.
- The Vice-Chair presides over the meetings in the absence of the Chair.
- Councilor Duckett has been serving as the current Policy Committee Chair; Commissioner Sipe has been serving as the current Vice Chair.
- The Election of Officers was not conducted at the September Policy Committee meeting so is being held at the November 17, 2016 meeting.

ELECTION

- Elections will take place to select a Policy Committee Chair and Vice-Chair until September 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee accept nominations and vote to elect the Chair and Vice-Chair.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that the election of officers is held annually. The election is typically held in the fall to allow newly elected members to become familiar with Policy Committee proceedings. Mr. Wakan recommended that the Policy Committee accept nominations and vote for a Chair and Vice Chair. Commissioner Sipe asked if Councilor Duckett was willing to continue as the Chair for another year. Mr. Wakan said Staff had not spoken with Councilor Duckett.

ACTIONS: Ms. Nobis nominated Councilor Duckett for Policy Committee Chair. Mr. Voita seconded the nomination. The nomination of Councilor Duckett for Chair was passed unanimously.

Ms. Nobis nominated Commissioner Sipe as Policy Committee Vice Chair. Mr. Voita seconded the nomination. The nomination of Commissioner Sipe for Vice Chairs was passed unanimously.

4. FFY2016-2021 TIP AMENDMENT #4

Subject:	FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- On October 31, 2016 the Farmington MPO advertised Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The amendment involves several projects in the TIP as described in the attached notice.
- The Technical Committee recommended approval of TIP Amendment #4 on November 9, 2016.

AMENDED TIP PROJECTS

- **US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112)** – At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds bringing the new project total to \$15,900,000.
- **20th Street Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Glade Run Recreation Area Trails** – At the request of the San Juan County, adds a new project to the TIP, \$700,000 local funds in 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct recreational trail systems.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) in FY2019.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming \$2M Local Funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16M in future federal funds in FY2021 in addition to \$2M in local match funds in FY2021.
- **East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091)** At the request of the City of Aztec, amends the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approx. .5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle-guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1A,1B and Phase 2, construction management and testing services. Utilities, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local non-match in FY2017.
- **Anesi Trail** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development.
- **Kirtland Schools Walk Path** – At the request of the San Juan County, shortens the project termini from 2.84 Miles to 1.57 Miles, shuffles construction and PE funds, but without changes to the overall project cost totals.

ACTION ITEM

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee consider approval of Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Self Certification for Amendment #4 to the TIP.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that the Technical Committee had recommended approval on November 9, 2016. A public hearing was held with no comments received from the public. Comments were received and discussed by Technical Committee members. Mr. Wakan stated that the public noticing requirement for TIP amendments

was changed from 30 days to 15 days on a recommendation of NMDOT to align FMPO with the other MPOs. These public notices are general in nature with the project details discussed at the Technical and Policy Committee meetings.

Mr. Wakan presented the details of the projects in Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP:

US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112) – At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds to the next two-mile segment; the new project total to \$15,900,000;

20th Street Phase III – At the request of the City of Farmington, add a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds programmed in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities;

Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III – At the request of the City of Farmington, add a new project to the TIP; \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities from Rinconada to Lakewood;

Glade Run Recreation Area Trails – At the request of the San Juan County, add a new project to the TIP in \$700,000 local funds split between 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct recreational trail facilities;

Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100) - At the request of the City of Farmington, amend the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) to FY2019;

Mr. Wakan reported that NMDOT requested the removal of \$250,000 in CMAQ-Flex funding from the Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II project.

Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101) At the request of the City of Farmington, amend the project by programming \$2,000,000 in local funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16,000,000 in future federal funds in FY2021 and also \$2,000,000 in local match funds in FY2021;

Mr. Wakan stated that NMDOT requested the East Arterial Route project be removed entirely from the TIP and the STIP.

East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091) At the request of the City of Aztec, amend the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approximately 0.5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1A, 1B and Phase 2, construction management and testing services. Utilities, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local non-match in FY2017;

Anesi Trail – At the request of the City of Farmington, add a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development;

Kirtland Schools Walk Path – At the request of the San Juan County, shorten the project termini from 2.84 miles to 1.57 miles, shuffle construction and engineering funds, but make no changes to the overall project cost totals.

A verbatim transcription was requested for this portion of the November 17, 2016 Policy Committee meeting minutes. [Begin verbatim record]:

Commissioner Sherri Sipe: David's got his hand up.

Duane Wakan: Sure

David Sypher: Madam Chair and Council, I just wanted to make a clarification...I wasn't sure what I heard there, but I want to make sure for the record that we have it right. On the Pinon Hills Boulevard program, the first planning year out, fiscally non-constrained planning year, I thought I heard Duane say that 2021 was the first and the second was 2020, fiscal year 2020; and we had requested for the second planning year. That is not the case if I heard it correctly. We're asking for the first planning year for that to be in... Duane, is that where you've got it?

Wakan: Yes. Two million dollars in local funds in 2020 and \$16,000,000 also in 2020.

Sypher: Perfect. And then the other piece...so I just heard that wrong, that's good, thank you. The second piece I, is back in May or June we wrote, well let me back up further. About two years ago the District committed to us when the CMAQ funds were administered by the Engineering Division, they committed to us \$250,000 for design of Phase II of Pinon Hills Boulevard. Then the Department of Transportation changed who administered the (inaudible) grant to the Planning Division. After several e-mails that were never responded to, we wrote a formal letter to Jessica Griffin in, I believe it was, May or June of this year, and have still not received a response. And then, by way of a response to the MPO, asked that that money be removed and we've had no discussions with them. So in the MPO meeting we asked that they stay "status quo" until we've heard back from the Planning Division. So that part, even though the Department asked to remove it, the Technical Committee did not recommend removing that money it's because we have not received any formal communication from Ms. Griffin and we are still waiting for that. Thank you.

Paul Brasher: Mr. Sypher, how long ago was that?

Sypher: That was probably June that the formal letter went out and there were several e-mails before that requesting status and what next steps were. The only notice we got through the grapevine was that the administrators of that grant went from the Engineering Department to the Planning Department headed by Ms. Griffin.

Robin Elkin: I do have a letter from Mr. Dan Watts who is the CMAQ-Flex Coordinator and it is the request to remove it...(inaudible)

Sypher: YES The City of Farmington...that was per the MPO...the City of Farmington still has not received any communication.

Wakan: I simply forwarded that on to them. Some of the issues that were brought up at the hearing were to request that the DOT, Planning and Engineering, if there was any

removal or discussion about projects – moving funds or removing projects from the TIP/STIP that they communicate directly to the local entities on any of those changes, and copy us. But the formal direction should not come through the MPO – us telling the entity to remove this for DOT. Traditionally, in the four and one-half years I've been here it has always been discussed behind the scenes with the entities and DOT. Because it is a local lead project, the locals have the right to direct or control their own projects. And so that generally comes with the discussion from District 5 and when it gets to me, I'm just doing as instructed. But in this case, I was receiving instructions to delete projects from the TIP and STIP without any discussion from the entities. So that was surprising to me. We wanted to make sure that we consistently maintained some type of communication between the District and the entities so we're not put into a situation where we're asked to (inaudible).

Sypher: Just to reiterate...it was represented to us from NMDOT by their spokesperson by their Engineering office that we had that money and that it was secure. And then it was verified by NMDOT accepting and adopting the STIP. So, we had no reason to believe it would be removed and we still have not been in any communication despite our attempts to get communication.

Brasher: Mr. Sypher you're talking about the \$250,000 CMAQ? Okay, um...Mr. Wakan it was requested by DOT to be removed?

Sypher: That is correct.

Brasher: How was that requested...what was the letter...what was the document?

Wakan: Basically through the Planning Division to me.

Brasher: Okay. Alright. And it went to the MPO. Okay. I'd forgotten that...Thanks.

Elkin: There was also a...and I think it bears on the CMAQ funds as well...there was also a request from the DOT to delete Pinon Hills Boulevard extension Phase II (CNF100101) that also went through the MPO. There was a request by the City of Farmington to basically have a counter-amendment which was to leave Pinon Hills on the agenda as it was written. We actually thought there should have been two proposed amendments, one to delete it and one to amend it, that would be discussed by the Technical Committee and then presented to the Policy Board. (inaudible)...there was only one as requested by the entity, the City of Farmington to move the funds out to the planning years. This is not a steadfast regulation that... FHWA policy on that is that funding has to be reasonably available and it is not clear that it is reasonably available. The STIP has to be fiscally constrained and there will be decisions made about whether this meets the fiscal constraint policy.

Sypher: To clarify that. On the 7th, I believe it was the 7th of November we received a letter from Armando Armendariz who is the Director and he asked us specifically to work with the MPO and get the Pinon Hills Boulevard project in there in order to move forward. That's what we did. We followed the directive as per his letter which was copied to Secretary Church and Ron O'Dell and several of the other higher echelon of NMDOT. That is what we did. We worked with the MPO Technical Committee. We did it to make it a two-step process. It really doesn't make any sense. And, again, we weren't contacted officially or in writing, that came directly to the MPO. So upon a vote of the MPO this TIP

was recommended as directed by Mr. Armando Armendariz. Yeah, there was never, ever any conversation, and both Robin and Paul Brasher were in the Technical Committee meeting and there was never any indication that NMDOT was requesting a two-step process. The first I heard of a two-step process was as represented by Robin today.

Wakan: My one question is for the City of Farmington. At the Technical Committee meeting we recommended, from my recollection, there was no instruction to leave the \$250,000 in CMAQ-Flex funds in Phase II. We just simply were moving all the programming funds as local.

Sypher: I think what we did, Duane, my recollection is different. We were talking about how the, in order to do anything different than we already had, that the request would be of NMDOT to talk to the entities and, short of that, we would leave things as they were. That was the discussion I heard, that is the vote that I understand (inaudible).

Wakan: So, just to clarify then, we have \$2,000,000 in local funds in 2020, \$16,000,000 in future federal funds in 2020, and an additional \$2,000,000 in 2021. You have currently \$250,000 in CMAQ-Flex funds programmed in 2017 that you are requesting to keep.

Sypher: My understanding is that what was voted on, yes.

Sipe: Duane, just for clarification, it says \$16,000,000 in future federal funds in FY2021 or...so is it...

Wakan: Uh, FY2021

Sipe: That's what it says in here so is it 2020 or 2021?

Wakan: Um, Mr. Sypher...

Sypher: The total should be \$20,000,000 so you should have a total of \$2,000,000 in those two years. Is that what you have?

Wakan: We have \$2,000,000 in 2020, \$16,000,000 in 2021 and \$2,000,000 in 2021.

Sypher: For a total of \$20,000,000...

Wakan: For a total of \$20,000,000

Sypher: That is correct.

Wakan: Alright. And then leaving this existing CMAQ-Flex \$250,000 in FY2017? Is that correct?

Sypher: That is correct.

Wakan: That is what's existing...

Sipe: So do we need to amend the...

Wakan: We will need to amend the Self-Certification on Page 5; pending approval we would have to do that to include \$250,000 in FY2017. Or just leave it there; it's existing, so I guess we wouldn't need to amend that portion...it would just stay like that.

Sipe: Okay

Wakan: So we can just go with what the amendment says...

Sipe: Okay

Wakan: I think that would (inaudible)

Sypher: I'm sorry, but one more point I neglected to leave out. So since that direction was made and recommendation by the committee on the 9th I believe it was and today is the 17th, there has been no contact from NMDOT despite the fact they had two representatives at the meeting to clarify the CMAQ issue or the other outstanding issue that's been brought up today about making a two-step process instead of a single amendment. Despite the fact that they were both there no contact has been made as directed or suggested by the MPO Technical Committee.

Sipe: Thank you. Is there any other discussion?

Wakan: I wanted to see if the City of Aztec wants to speak about their, that project which was also requested by the DOT to be removed entirely and the entities local lead said "no" we're keeping it and (inaudible). And I don't know if DOT wanted to say anything about that Phase, Phase II, or...

Paul Brasher: Well, the East Aztec Arterial has been taken out of the DOT STIP and doesn't show up anywhere in the future in DOT funding, either in the, in any years including the planning years of the six-year STIP. So when this, the technical coordinating committee here there was a, some discussion about the project being removed, a motion was made and passed to leave it in as you see it right here, but DOT has taken it out. The DOT has also by STIP Amendment #5, by the way, is taking out Pinon Hills Phase I and II. Pinon Hills (F100101) in the amount of \$250,000 in 2017 deleting it and then in 2020 deleting the \$4,500,000 from F100101 and then in 2021 deleting Pinon Hills in the amount of another \$4,500,000. That is STIP Amendment #5. STIP Amendment #5 also deletes the East Aztec Arterial in 2017 (F100091) in the amount of \$3,500,000. So the East Aztec Arterial won't show up in any STIP year.

Sipe: And why is that?

Brasher: Well, the project's been...that project has been taken out of the STIP as purely a local initiative project and DOT is not supporting it in terms of funding going forward. They have...there are issues, for one thing there are issues with it right now; some environmental issues and some right-of-way acquisition issues that are not resolved and it is the opinion of DOT that they are not going to be resolved in FY2017 and they are not going to be resolved in time to go to production, advertising, and letting by next August which is what we were all kind of counting on or been counting on happening. So the project has been taken out of the STIP altogether. Now, the committee last week on the 9th went ahead and left it in and left the Pinon Hills in, all the Pinon Hills in and so a motion was made to recommend that this committee adopt Amendment #4 as it is.

Sipe: Mr. Brasher, the City of Aztec has been working diligently with Jillian Aragon from the BLM and she assures us that we will have everything that we need by June of 2017 and, I believe, Mr. Ray met with BLM today and were told that our environmental stuff would be done by tomorrow, I believe, or should be done by tomorrow. I'm sorry, but it makes absolutely no sense to me for DOT to back out of a project when we have the two ends and you're going to back out of doing the middle. That doesn't make any sense. We're going to have a road to nowhere. That to me is not being fiscally responsible.

Brasher: Well, Madam Chair when you refer to the environmental being done what environmental are you referring to? There's a landfill for example...

Sipe: Right. Mr. Ray can you elaborate on that a little bit.

Josh Ray: Madam Chair and members of the committee, Josh Ray with the City of Aztec. So the process with the BLM is the land transfer over to the City of Aztec to take over the property that would include the landfill that Mr. Brasher is referring to. So that is the process that Ms. Aragon is handling for us. Ms. Aragon is someone who's been on the project for quite some time as has BLM been part of our bi-weekly conversations. So that's what Jillian is working on. We feel confident that after speaking with her the BLM will have their processes handled. The only concern we have at this point is DOT handling right-of-way acquisition through the state land office. That's the next big hurdle. I feel from Mr. Brasher's comments that DOT is going to be the largest hurdle as historically is the trend in our nation, now only New Mexico. That's what's concerning now, Madam Chairman is, as it goes back to the DOT is to see if we can get that process taken care of. But rest assured as agreed upon before, the City of Aztec will get our end taken care, BLM will get their end taken care of, and then we'll work with DOT to get the rest of it resolved.

Sipe: I think I'm a little bit confused. If DOT is not the lead agency on these projects I don't understand how they can pull the funding.

Brasher: Well, DOT doesn't support the East Aztec Arterial where it's going right now. May I ask you this just so I can take it back with me, when we talk about the environmental, there may be other issues besides the landfill, but may I ask Mr. Ray what is the disposition of the landfill, what is the deal on it, where is landfill going to go? How did the landfill part get worked out?

Ray: Madam Chairman and the committee, so we'll have a location and an agreement as brought up with the Technical Committee whereas the items that need to be removed from the landfill will have to go to another location. The agreement has not been approved at this point; however, we're in the process of removing (inaudible) from this old landfill and going to the current landfill that the county would have. So that's the agreement. I believe you referred to that at the Technical Committee meeting and that was the response given then. Same answer now, it hasn't changed in a week's time. We'll get that agreement worked out.

Brasher: Thank you. Madam Chair, Mr. Ray where is the debris going to go? What is the plan for the debris?

Ray: Same answer. The current landfill.

Brasher: To the current landfill. Okay.

Ray: Or we could even take it to the transit waste landfill. We've had discussions with both so we don't have any (inaudible).

Brasher: Okay. But you don't have a deal with them yet, do you? Do you have a signed deal with them?

Ray: I just stated that. Madam Chairman, it's the same as last week. We do not have an agreement in place...

Brasher: Right...

Ray:... but we're very confident we'll get that as soon as we need to have it well within the June 2017 deadline that was discussed with the City of Aztec and Mr. Brasher.

Brasher: Well, DOT hasn't been as confident that these things will go that quick.

Ray: And I understand and I don't want to have any issue with where you're at. You've been supportive of us since we've had this discussion and I can understand the concern of DOT having issues with this project because the City of Aztec has had issues with the project and DOT for 17 years, so we're all onboard. Now that we have funding lined up and we have projects ready to roll. We're very excited about it and I know you understand our excitement to get this project completed and it's a bigger regional project for us. So, that being said, we're very confident we'll be able to get that agreement in place ASAP and I say that so we can process that at our next phone call; get the agreements in place and hopefully the Policy Committee can have that same confidence in the project that we have.

Sipe: Mr. Brasher, just a comment. I know this project has been going on for 17 years, well before I was on the commission and, I mean it's been talked about, and I guess my frustration and confusion is that the place where the arterial, the route of the arterial had been in place and it hasn't been until just when things changed in the hierarchy of the DOT, that's when issues that have been discussed and known for all these years and have been dealt with and it's like now changing the game plan half way through, three-quarters of the way actually through the process. So, I mean, that's my frustration.

Brasher: Madam Chair, I understand your frustration if one of your frustrations with this is that the...Is this what you say the DOT has come along and said we don't like the alignment, but the alignment has been known for 17 years, is that what it is?

Sipe: That's a lot of it...That's a lot of it.

Brasher: Why didn't you not like it 17 years ago?

Sipe: Or even five years ago, six years ago – when did we do the first phase...

Brasher: Couple of years...

Sipe: Well, anyway, it seems like it's just kind of like throwing a new rule into a ballgame half-way through, you know, cause it's now that the two ends are done there's only one way to connect them basically. So, anyway, just food for thought.

Brasher: There's plenty of food for thought there. Your comment is well taken.

Sypher: Madam Chair, Committee, a couple of comments on this. First of all, I spoke that there were two representatives at the Technical Committee. I just remembered that there were actually three; Brad Fisher was also in attendance so they were well represented at the last meeting. The second thing I'd like to point out is that the way the TIP and STIP process is to be administered. The process is very important and is set out by federal regulations. The whole intent of the STIP, the current STIP that's being talked about, and the current TIP that's being talked about is the protocol goes like this, or the process goes like this. The whole reason to have the MPO suggest their projects is to be fully considered by the STIP so the state would wait before they made up their mind about the STIP until the MPOs have adopted their TIPs. They are then submitted, carefully considered, understood, and then the STIP is developed, and presented, and adopted by the state and presented to FHWA. That's the protocol, that is the process and it's very interesting and very telling that the fact is they've already, before receiving our TIP, have made up their minds what they're going to put in their STIP.

Wakan: Madam Chair that was also my concern. That the statements by Mr. Brasher that they were going to, regardless of this committee's recommendation, were going to remove Pinon Hills Phase I and II and the East Arterial Route. So, that needs to be verified by Mr. Brasher that that is indeed their course and then you need to discuss action as a Policy Committee based on whatever is noted by Mr. Brasher.

Sipe: Mr. Brasher...

Brasher: Madam Chair that is our course. The projects are being removed from the STIP despite the fact that they show up in the TIP (inaudible).

Sipe: Duane, what course of action do we have?

Wakan: You can either move forward with the recommendations as set forth knowing that they are going to be deleted would be one option. Option number two would be do not adopt the TIP and, in effect, the STIP would not be adopted at the state level without this Policy Committee's recommendation.

Sipe: But what happens if we don't approve the TIP now with this amendment, if we...

Wakan: Then the STIP will not be able to be amended at the state level.

Sipe: Okay.

Wakan: So that is your option...

Jimmy Voita: So what happens if the STIP isn't adopted?

Wakan: Then it would put projects in delay at the state level; all projects. And so that is a concern, but hopefully there would be some type of arrangement worked out with the

state and the Farmington MPO and the Policy Committee in terms of remediating that if that is the course of the committee... (inaudible).

Brasher: Madam Chair may I ask Mr. Wakan a question here? What is the timeline for acting, for this board to act on the TIP? Can it be done today? Can it be done next week? Two weeks from now? What is the urgency...

Wakan: So, as far as I know the calendar of next...the State Transportation Commission meets in usually December and they approve the STIP at that meeting based on all the TIPs that come in...TIP amendments from all the MPOs and RTPOs. So they have until December to officially adopt the STIP.

Brasher: Okay, but the point is the TIP, does this TIP have to be acted on today then? Ideally?

Wakan: The Policy Committee does not meet until January so this is the only meeting they have to act upon it.

Sipe: I was going to say, could we have a special meeting?

Wakan: Right, and...

Sipe: If there was some discussion between the MPO and DOT...

Brasher: That was what I was going to suggest.

Sipe: A special meeting?

Brasher: Yes.

Sipe: So would it be a...yes, Mr. Sypher?

Sypher: A couple things. First of all, if there were a vote today could there be then a subsequent change in a vote at a special meeting? That's one question. But the other point I want to reiterate is that Farmington was specifically asked by NMDOT to work it out with our MPO about programming the Pinon Hills Boulevard which we did, at their direction. I don't understand the mixed message here. We have it in writing from the November 9th letter, 7th or 9th, I'm sorry I don't recall which date it was, by NMDOT so I'm very confused at the mixed message here.

Brasher: Madam Chair, Mr. Sypher what is the mixed message that you're seeing on the one hand...

Sypher: On the one hand, without contacting us in writing or officially that they want to have Pinon Hills removed rather than amended. Then you have a separate letter that is crystal clear asking us to work with the MPO and change our TIP to allow for change in funding for the Pinon Hills Boulevard project, and we do that, and then now they insist, before ever receiving this Policy Committee's recommendation, determine what they are going to do in the STIP which is totally adverse to the public process as outlined in the federal regulations. The whole point of having MPOs is to create what the local priorities before the regions are and then take them under careful consideration to the state. I

wouldn't say there's been any consideration let alone careful when they've already chosen what they're going to put into their STIP. It's amazing to me.

Brasher: Mr. Sypher I understand your concern. Let me ask you this, is it impossible that, is it out of the question that we could have a special meeting to take this...

Sipe: I don't think it would be...I think we'd be able to do it I would imagine. It would just be getting a quorum for the Policy Committee.

Brasher: We're missing some communication links here obviously between DOT and Aztec and between DOT and Farmington.

Sypher: (inaudible) and the CFRs

Brasher: Not to mention. We would probably all benefit from it in the meantime.

Wakan: Madam Chairman, we would be available as Staff the second week of December to hold a special meeting but the question is...I just need to take a look at the calendar...I was going to jump on my Gmail account to see when the State Transportation Commission meeting is officially and then we can come up with a date. We just need to hold a meeting before they...

Brasher: act on it clearly.

Sypher: Duane do you happen to know the answer to my question which was in the event that it was adopted today and then you had a special meeting to alter the TIP is that a process that would work?

Wakan: Well, the problem is if you adopt today than they have the ability to delete. My recommendation is to either take no action until a special meeting or take an action to not approve the TIP and then approve it at a future meeting.

Sypher: Excuse me. Madam Chair...

Sipe: Yes...

Sypher: I don't understand that because what we've heard today they've already made up their decision on whether they're going to approve or disapprove. I don't understand by delaying our vote how that affects in a positive way our TIP. It's not the state's TIP, it's our TIP and this is our TIP, our plan, those priorities we have and I don't understand why a delay in the vote...I don't know what it accomplishes.

Sipe: Well, if I'm understanding, if we don't approve the TIP amendment, it basically gives us some ground to go back for discussion before the STIP comes up for vote, if I'm understanding correctly. So that's where the difference is.

Sypher: If we don't...

Sipe: If we don't take any action or don't pass, if we either don't take any action or we don't pass it...

Sypher: I see, I see...

Sipe: That gives...

Sypher: My understanding is just the opposite. My understanding is by passing this it's in conflict with the STIP and then there would be a mediation provision that we would work these things out. Whereas if we wait, I don't know what the consequence is.

Wakan: Well, I think either way we just ...it's a way for the DOT, FHWA, gives them all time to meet with the local leads on this, on their respective concerns and then come to a formal action at that future date. So you have the option, I think, of just saying that "no" we're not going to approve the TIP at this time, we will meet at a future date once we've had all that worked out.

Brasher: Madam Chair, he's right, but it would not be an action to not approve today...you said not approve it today, you don't mean by vote

Wakan: By vote they could...

Brasher: Table it in other words...

Sipe: We could vote to table it?

Brasher: Or set aside

Wakan: You'd have both, I think, options. You could vote to table it or you could vote to not approve it.

Sipe: Okay and would both serve the same purpose? Okay. I just want to make sure we're clear.

Wakan: So to me that's, you'd set up a future date and then discussions would be had.

Sipe: Mary?

Mary Holton: Madam Chair, I would not recommend to, I believe the MPO needs to vote on the TIP it wants. I think, I'm kind of an old-fashioned person and you need to vote on the projects you want and to send another message I think would be miscommunication just hand over fist so to speak. So I do think you all need to decide what the projects you want and vote accordingly. That's what I would recommend.

Sipe: Okay, but then what recourse would we have...if our approval of the TIP is...

Holton: The next opportunity...you would have the opportunity to vote those projects onto the TIP again.

Sipe: Yes, but it doesn't give us any teeth with the STIP...

Holton: I'm not sure you have any to begin with...

Sipe: I guess the way I'm looking at it is if we don't approve it and it holds up the STIP then people are going to be more willing to come to the table and talk about it.

Holton: Honestly, between you and me, I think we are just going to be ignored. I mean I have to be realistic. Our funds are being removed as we speak...

Sipe: Right.

Holton: ...continually and that seems to be the trend. So the only thing that we can do as an MPO is continually vote our projects onto the TIP. And if we're ignored, we're ignored. I don't know what else to tell you.

Sipe: But that doesn't leave us any recourse, right?

Sypher: (inaudible), by taking items off the TIP...

Holton: Sounds like we're okay with that.

Sipe: Well, but we're not taking them off, we're going to postpone it until there's more discussion is the way I'm understanding it.

Brasher: Madam Chair that's what I was suggesting so we could have a little more discussion in the meantime. If we postpone acting on this thing until...

Holton: And just leave it as it is?

Brasher: Leave it as it is, table it, if that's what you want to call it. But take it up again and give us some opportunity to talk about it more in the meantime.

Sypher: I think that's what Mr. Brasher is saying (responding to inaudible comments by Ms. Holton).

Holton: Well we have no control of the STIP anyway.

Sypher: No, we only have control on the TIP.

Sipe: But I think what we're...Dorothy and I have just...and I don't know what you're hearing Jimmy, but I think if we're not taking action there's still they're still going to be on our amendment process for when we come back and meet again, all these projects will still be on our...but it just gives us time to meet and, hopefully, change DOT's mind about the two, the three projects, Phase I, Phase II and the Arterial.

Voita: I think this sounds to me like a lot of miscommunication or no communication. I don't think it's going to hurt anybody to give us a little time so we can at least talk it out.

Sypher: If we don't miss any deadlines.

Voita: If we don't miss any deadlines, yeah.

Sipe: And that will be up to Duane to make sure we don't miss any deadlines.

Wakan: Madam Chair, the state meets on the 15th of December; the MPO has an MPO Quarterly meeting in Las Cruces on the 5th and 6th, so we could do a meeting on the 8th, it looks like it's open for us. If action is taken at that meeting to approve the TIP then that would give enough time for the state then to get all the information from the MPO to forward that on to the state for their discussion.

Brasher: Madam Chair, this is what I think would happen in the meantime. What we would do, what DOT would do and maybe FHWA, we would talk to particularly Farmington and Aztec and even if it doesn't change anything and even if the stand of DOT doesn't at least Farmington and Aztec might better understand the position of DOT given the opportunity to ferret out any confusion and clear it up. It may not make... Farmington and Aztec may never agree with DOT or FHWA, or DOT, but at least everybody, including myself, will understand each other's position just a little bit better. The other thing is, Madam Chair, I'd like to ask Mr. Wakan who knows all these things. Say we met, say this board met December 8 and acted on this, is there an advertising period or something following this...the action this board takes isn't official until it's run 15 days or something like that.

Wakan, Yes, there is an advertising requirement by the state and actually we have in past held meetings...in fact I actually talked to the DOT because this Policy Committee today we were fearful of not being able to meet a quorum because two people were absent, two members were absent and if one more could not have made this meeting we were actually going to push the meeting to the 8th. And I got a confirmation from DOT that that would work, that that date would have worked for our meeting to take action on the TIP.

Brasher: What I'm talking about is not just the advertisement of the meeting in advance of the meeting, but is...

Sipe: ...on the action?

Brasher: Yes. Is there public comment on the action? Until you...

Wakan: Oh, for the (inaudible)

Brasher: Board actions...the board acts on something and then there's a period of public comment or public response or something that follows that. It's not really official until...some boards work like that.

Wakan: So, for our purposes at the MPO we send out the 15-day public notice...

Brasher: In advance, right...

Wakan: ...in advance and it usually ends the day of or when we meet with the Technical Committee.

Brasher: Okay.

Wakan: And, so, those comments have already been...we've already had the open hearing for that, for those comments. So for the Policy Committee it's just kind of the standard process (inaudible).

Brasher: Sometimes with boards and commissions, like planning commissions, when they act on something, when they move on something, it's not official until some comment period has run after that, if there are no comments, after that then it's official. I just want to make sure that the 8th gave enough time for whatever the action was to be solidified legitimate and everything by the time the Commission meets again on the 15th.

Wakan: Yes, according to what I've been told by the DOT from their side, their reporting requirements the 8th would have worked for...

Brasher: Advance notice...

Wakan: Uh, huh...

Sipe: I think the confusion is coming for the 8th, we would have met the notification of the meeting, but if we vote on this amendment on the 8th and I think, we don't have to wait any period before it goes into effect.

Wakan: Right. We only have a 72-hour open meetings act that we have to comply with so as long as we advertise within 72 hours of that meeting on the 8th and that would be easily done by us...

Brasher: Okay. Right.

Wakan: So let's count back in time, so we do have sufficient time June to put out another public notice hearing for the amendment...

Sipe: Oh, we'd have to do it again?

Inaudible sidebar between Holton, Sypher and Wakan.

Holton: We could actually have...you can have a joint meeting. That would be the easiest way to deal with it there.

Wakan: Then, our Chairman's not here, I'll have to work through the Technical Committee Chairman, but we will schedule a joint meeting with the Technical Committee and the Policy Committee. We can do a 15-day public notice for the hearing on that date and we'll make sure that we advertise that again. We definitely have enough time to do that (inaudible between Wakan and Sipe).

Wakan: In the meantime we'll keep the same public comment, public notice that went out in the paper we'll just re-advertise the same one.

Sipe: Now, once again, once we vote on it on the 8th, whichever way it goes, there's not going to be another waiting period. I think that's what Mr. Brasher keeps asking.

Brasher: So what's effective on the 8th is effective the 8.0 there's no additional...

Sipe: There's no additional waiting time

Wakan: No.

Sipe: Good. That's what he keeps trying to make sure of. Okay

Derrick Garcia: I'd just like to add a little comment. It's not the 8th anymore; I think it's going to be the 14th, the day before the State Commission meets. Right? Or will it still be on the 8th?

Wakan: It'll be on the 8th. We have enough time to meet our advertising...

Sypher: We have 4 business days to advertise.

Garcia: Oh, I thought I heard 14 or 15 days. Sorry about that.

Sipe: That's alright. We're all confused at this point.

Voita: I've got a question Madam Chair, and you may have gone over this, but why was the Pinon Hills extension removed by the state? Was it a funding issue?

Brasher: I think the philosophy of the state in removing Pinon Hills is that the state DOT felt as though DOT should not be putting state road funds toward a local project. Mr. Sypher may have a comment on that.

Sypher: They failed to see, at the 11th hour they failed to see the regional significance. They committed \$14,000,000 in the Phase II project and when the new director saw that decided against honoring their word on fulfilling the funding for that project based on the fact that the project had not been approved. The right-of-way purchase was made in advance of ever receiving a grant in around the year 2000. We had received a full FONSI with readiness to proceed and then, at the direction of NMDOT, broke the project into two phases and had to do a FONSI reevaluation which is the environmental document. Upon applying for the FONSI reevaluation which was supposed to be an automatic, quick process, the rules changed in the middle of the game. They decided that they needed a much tighter and closer scrutiny on the right-of-way purchases. Upon doing so it was found out during the reevaluation, surprise, that the purchases were made prior to the processes that were approved and the only way to do it was to apply for a waiver. I'll call it a waiver, it's not really a waiver, it's a CFR 1.9 Sub B requirement. After at least dozens of e-mails back and forth with no response from the right-of-way division we finally, after the funding was in jeopardy with two months to go, finally met with FHWA and they finally talked to us and told us, well what we would have to do was apply for this waiver. We applied for the waiver, but it was too late, the funding had run out. They had taken two years to respond to us to tell us what we needed to do and now they have responded to that letter saying that we can clear up this right-of-way issue and they would be willing to do that for us so that it would be in the files and shelf-ready even though they've taken \$20,000,000 away, and they're willing to do that if we just work with the MPO and get it rescheduled. That's what we did.

Sipe: I think we've about beat this horse to death. So, I guess we need a motion to table any action...is that what you're recommending Duane? Is that we just table it...any action on this for now until December 8th.

Wakan: Uh...

Brasher: Not that you're recommending it, but that would be the verb, the action.

Sipe: Okay. Mr. Ray did you have something?

Ray: Yes. Madam Chairman and committee, if you table it do you have to re-advertise it still? I don't know. I don't care. Duane will handle that. My point being is as long as you're tabling it, the advertising in Roberts Rules or Order standard they say you wouldn't have to advertise it again; the MPO may follow something different as Mr. Brasher is pointing out. It's just a point of reference as you said the appropriate action would be to table it therefore (inaudible).

Brasher: Actually there is another, besides tabling it, there is a deferred. There is a deferral. You could defer action on this until December 8th. A motion could be made to defer action on Amendment #4 until, to the next meeting on December 8th. You defer the action.

Wakan: What is the difference? I'm sorry...

Brasher: Table sort of sets it aside with no other consideration and tabling kind of runs indefinitely sometimes or sounds indefinite. Deferring to a specific date really makes it solidified that that is the action this committee is taking on this right now. We actually want to defer it to date certain. Tabling sounds like, well, we'll take it under advisement, we'll think about it later or something like that. It sounds less definite to me and I want to be definite. But I want to use this time in the meantime to at least getting a, if not consensus, certainly a meeting of the minds so that everybody understands, whether they agree with it or not, they understand DOT's position and DOT understands Farmington and Aztec particularly. That's what I'd really like to happen, so I would suggest or offer tabled or deferred, but I certainly would prefer defer.

ACTION: Mr. Voita moved to defer the issue until December 8th. Ms. Nobis seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

[End verbatim record].

5. 2017 ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

Subject:	2017 Annual Meeting Schedule
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 9, 2016

BACKGROUND

- Each year the Policy Committee approves a resolution ensuring compliance with the open meetings act and establishes its meeting schedule for the coming year.
- NMDOTs STIP Procedures Manual outlines an annual calendar for TIP Amendments which may impact the meeting schedule on a quarterly basis.

CURRENT WORK

- Staff will present a proposed meeting schedule for discussion with the Policy Committee
- It is suggested that the Policy Committee hold seven regular meetings during 2017.
- Meetings are recommended for January, February, April, May, August, September, and November. TIP & UPWP amendments occur quarterly in the February, May, August and November meetings.
- Meeting can continue to be held on the fourth Thursday at 1:30 pm, unless otherwise indicated, on a rotating basis among the entities.
- Formal action to adopt a meeting resolution will be done in November.

ACTION ITEM

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee consider approval of the proposed 2017 meeting schedule.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that generally the Policy Committee meets seven times per year. Several of the meeting months are scheduled to align with the TIP amendment calendar each year.

Mr. Wakan referred to Page 7 of the Agenda which showed the meeting calendar and the rotation of meetings throughout the entities. Some of the entities have asked if their meetings could be held outside of their city hall location. Mr. Wakan said some of the location sites could be adjusted based on entity feedback during the year.

ACTION: Mr. Brasher moved to approve the proposed 2017 meeting schedule. Ms. Nobis seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. FFY2017-2018 UPWP AMENDMENT #1

Subject:	FFY2017-2018 UPWP Amendment #1
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	November 10, 2016

BACKGROUND

- The MPO maintains a Unified Planning Work Program which sets forth the tasks the MPO will undertake in a given fiscal year.
- The Policy Committee approved the MPOs two-year FFY 2017-2018 UPWP in June of 2016. It mentioned the use of FAST Act funds to be applied in the 1st quarter of FFY 2017 towards the completion of the safety plan.
- The FAST Act increased the FMPOs planning award by \$8,509 in March of 2016.
- Any FFY16 balances remaining after 12/31/16 will lapse, unless there is a multi-year contract identified in the UPWP that allows a rollover.

- The delay in developing the Safety Plan will prevent the MPO from applying those funds by the end of December 2016.
- The Technical Committee recommended approval of Amendment #1 to the FFY2017-2018 UPWP.

CURRENT WORK

- FAST Act award of \$8,509 which includes the local match, must be spent by December 31, 2016.
 - Originally, this was programmed to the development of the Safety Plan.
 - Time constraints prevent the programming of these funds towards safety
- The MPO Civic Plus subsite is an optimal expense for the FAST Act Funds as the cost for services is just over \$9,000.
- Preliminary schedule calls for final delivery of a fully functional website by the end of May of 2017.

ACTION ITEM

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee consider approval of Amendment #1 to the FFY2017-18 UPWP.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan explained that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the MPO's two-year work plan for FFY2017-18. The MPO was awarded an additional \$8,509 in FAST Act funds in March 2016 and NMDOT directed that those funds be programmed into the previous UPWP and Staff intended to use these funds toward development of the safety plan. The FAST Act funds were then allowed to be moved to the current UPWP and they were again programmed to be used for the safety plan.

Mr. Wakan reported that the safety plan was put on hold until the details could be worked out. The FAST Act funds, however, must be used by the end of December 2016. Another work item identified in the UPWP was the development of a stand-alone MPO website. The MPO is currently housed under the City of Farmington's website structure and prohibits the addition of an MPO logo or for customization to allow for regional input.

The cost for this sub-site design and development is \$9,200 with completion expected in May 2017. Amendment #1 to the UPWP is to apply the \$8,509 in FAST Act funds forward the website development. The Technical Committee recommended approval of Amendment #1.

Mr. Voita commented that he thought the quote of \$9,200 sounded pricey. He said the County Assessor's website was redesigned at a cost of \$3,000.

Mr. Wakan replied that the MPO is using the same vendor that re-designed the City of Farmington's website about a year ago. The MPO sub-site will include not only the design and development of the site, but also some future upgrades. It allows the MPO to maintain some of the City of Farmington structure, but also allow for MPO regional customization and some independence.

ACTION: Mr. Brasher moved to approve Amendment #1 to the FFY2017-2018 UPWP. Ms. Nobis seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Elkin added that now, following approval by the Policy Committee the MPO will seek approval from NMDOT by a written request for an Administrative Amendment.

7. REPORTS FROM NMDOT

District 5 – Paul Brasher

Mr. Brasher reported that NMDOT is closing out the latest phase of the US 64 project (CN F100110) from milepost 54 to 56. The project has been highly successful with one slight sight obstruction that is being addressed now. The expectation is that the next phase from milepost 56 to 58 will progress just as successfully. Mr. Brasher said that during construction there was minimal inconvenience to businesses and they were able to maintain access to properties.

Planning Division – Robin Elkin

Mr. Elkin noted that he did not typically attend the Policy Committee meetings. He said the discussions today were interesting and that he would report back to Ms. Jessica Griffin on those items of note.

8. CONGESTION MITIGATION & AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)

Subject:	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program
Prepared by:	Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	November 8, 2016

BACKGROUND

- The Technical Committee requested more information be provided by NMDOT on the process for applying for CMAQ-Flex funds while NMDOT develops their planned competitive process for these funds.
- Projects using mandatory CMAQ funds must be a transportation project, must generate an emissions reduction, and it must be located in or benefit a “nonattainment” or “maintenance” area.
- Flexible CMAQ funds can be used anywhere in the State for projects eligible for either CMAQ or the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP).
- This information was pulled from Nov. 12, 2013 FHWA Publication, “The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program Under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act – Interim Program Guidance”

CURRENT WORK

- Investigate how funds will be distributed statewide while the competitive process is being developed.

INFORMATION ITEM

- FMPO Technical Committee asked this information be presented to the Policy Committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Garcia reported that at the last MPO Quarterly in October, the MPOs received an update from Danial Watts on CMAQ-Flex funds. NMDOT is working with a consultant to conduct a best practices review on how CMAQ-Flex funds are prioritized and distributed.

Mr. Garcia updated the Technical Committee on this in October and they asked for the Policy Committee to also be updated. This best practices review will be conducted on DOTs nationwide to identify how the CMAQ-Flex funds are prioritized and outline whether the process will remain within the DOTs or go before a committee that would determine eligibility.

The consultant is expected to be hired early in 2017 with the competitive and transparent process outlined and ready by FY2019. The Technical Committee asked how these funds are going to be awarded from now until the new process is identified in 2019. Mr. Garcia has been working with Mr. Watts on gathering updates, but this specific question has not been answered. Mr. Garcia asked if Mr. Brasher or Mr. Elkin had any information on this.

Mr. Brasher had no additional information on how these funds are distributed. Mr. Wakan added that the concern is that there is no process from now until 2019. The question is how the entities can have a say in how the funds are currently being distributed. Mr. Elkin said that he could add little clarity to the process, but that his understanding is that the funds are distributed at the discretion of NMDOT.

Mr. Garcia added that the Technical Committee was concerned with the lack of a process in distributing the CMAQ-Flex funds and waiting the Policy Committee made award of that concern. Mr. Wakan encouraged the Policy Committee members to speak with their staffs to ensure entity communication with District 5 and Mr. Brasher on these funds.

9. INFORMATION ITEMS

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	November 9, 2016

INFORMATION ITEMS

e. Staff Trainings/Conferences

- **National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO).** Mr. Wakan attended this conference in Seattle, Washington on September 25-30, 2016.
- **Road Diet Workshop.** Mr. Wakan attended this workshop in Albuquerque on October 5-7, 2016 hosted by FHWA and NMDOT.
- **AMPO National Conference.** Mr. Garcia attended the 2016 AMPO National Conference in Fort Worth, Texas on October 24-28, 2016.

f. FASTLANE Transportation Infrastructure Grants. The USDOT is soliciting applications for \$850 million in funding available under the FASTLANE program. This program provides dedicated, discretionary funding for projects that address critical freight issues facing our nation's highways and bridges. For additional information please reference Mr. Garcia's e-mail of November 1, 2016 sent to all Policy Committee members.

g. Implementation of Title VI Program by Local Entities. Local government agencies (LGA's) that have received federal funds from NMDOT were contacted on February 12, 2016 about the requirement to implement a Title VI Program. The revised deadline for submitting these programs to NMDOT is January 13, 2017 (copy of letter from Damian Segura dated 10/24/16). Technical Committee members were asked to please ensure their entity's Title VI Program was completed and submitted to NMDOT on schedule.

h. Presentation on TIP/STIP. The Technical Committee has requested that Staff present on the development of the TIP and STIP, how they are amended, and what are the responsibilities of the entities, NMDOT, and the MPO in managing both.

i. Other.

DISCUSSION: a. Mr. Garcia reported that Staff has had a busy fall and expects the winter months to be just as busy. Mr. Wakan attended the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) in September and a Road Diet Workshop in October in Albuquerque; Mr. Garcia attended the AMPO National Conference in Fort Worth in October.

b. The FASTLANE Transportation Infrastructure Grant was forwarded to all several weeks ago by Mr. Garcia. This program provides dedicated, discretionary funding for projects that address critical freight issues.

c. Mr. Wakan said NMDOT had sent letters to the local government agencies that have received federal funds about the requirement to implement a Title VI plan by early next year. Mr. Damian Segura with NMDOT sent out a boilerplate that allows entities to simply enter their own information into the boilerplate to develop their own plan if they do not already have one in place. The MPO has their Title VI plan that is available on the MPO website.

d. The Technical Committee requested a presentation from the MPO, perhaps in partnership with FHWA and NMDOT on the CFRs regarding the TIP and STIP processes and a background on the formation of MPOs and enabling legislation. Staff will work on putting together this training presentation.

e. Copies of the final Complete Streets Design Guidelines document were made available for the Policy Committee members. Mr. Wakan said the intent is to share these with city staffs, elected officials, as well as developers and community members.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

There will be a special joint meeting with the Policy and Technical Committees on December 8, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. at the MPO Office (Staff will confirm the availability of the meeting space at the MPO Office).

There was no additional business from the Chairman, Members and Staff.

11. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the Floor.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Commission Sipe adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Sherri Sipe, Vice Chair

June Markle, Administrative Aide

POLICY COMMITTEE

Subject:	FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	December 1, 2016

BACKGROUND

- On October 31, 2016 the Farmington MPO advertised Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The amendment involves several projects in the TIP as described in the attached notice.
- The Technical Committee recommended approval of TIP Amendment #4 on November 9, 2016.
- The Policy Committee deferred their vote on TIP Amendment #4 on November 17, 2016.
- A Special Joint Policy/Technical Committee meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2016.
- The Technical Committee will again be considering recommending approval of TIP Amendment #4 during their portion of the Special Joint meeting on December 8, 2016.

AMENDED TIP PROJECTS

- **US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112)** – At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds bringing the new project total to \$15,900,000.
- **20th Street Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Glade Run Recreation Area Trails** – At the request of the San Juan County, adds a new project to the TIP, \$700,000 local funds in 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct recreational trail systems.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) in FY2019.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming \$2M Local Funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16M in future federal funds in FY2021 in addition to \$2M in local match funds in FY2021.
- **East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091)** At the request of the City of Aztec, amends the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5" asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approx. .5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle-guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1A,1B and Phase 2, construction management and testing services. Utilities, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local non-match in FY2017.
- **Anesi Trail** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development.
- **Kirtland Schools Walk Path** – At the request of the San Juan County, shortens the

project termini from 2.84 Miles to 1.57 Miles, shuffles construction and PE funds, but without changes to the overall project cost totals.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Seek approval of Amendment #4 at the December 8, Special Policy and Technical Committee Joint Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Technical Committee meeting minutes from November 9, 2016.
- Policy Committee meeting minutes from November 17, 2016.
- The Public Notice re-advertising Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP (see above under the Technical Committee).
- The Self Certification for Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP.
- E-mail from Rebecca Maes, NMDOT Project Oversight Division with attachments.

ACTION ITEM

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee consider approval of Amendment #4 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Self Certification for Amendment #4.

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Farmington MPO is re-advertising **Amendment #4** to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. This public comment period meets all of the applicable requirements of the federal transportation bill MAP-21 and the federal transit requirements of Section 5307(c) (1-7).

As required by federal law and the Farmington MPO Public Participation Plan, the FMPO is holding an additional 15-day Public Comment Period and Public Hearing on **Amendment #4** to the FFY2016-2021 TIP. This additional 15-day comment period is from November 23, 2016 to December 7, 2016. The public may also make comments on the proposed amendment at the following meeting:

Public Hearing: During the Farmington MPO Special Technical Committee meeting at 1:30 p.m. on **Thursday, December 8, 2016** at the MPO Office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico 87401. Final approval on the proposed amendment will be taken during the Farmington MPO Special Policy Committee meeting which will follow the Special Technical Committee meeting on **Thursday, December 8, 2016** also at the MPO Office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico 87401.

Written comments may be sent to the Farmington MPO at:

Fax: (505) 599-1299

Mail: Farmington MPO, 800 Municipal Drive, Farmington, New Mexico, 87401

Email: dwakan@fmtn.org

The public may view this Amendment at www.farmingtonmpo.org. For more information contact Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, at (505) 599-1449.

MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION
Amendment #4 to the
FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

The Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby certifies that the following amendment is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of 23 CFR 450.218 and 23 CFR 450.324 and the federal transit requirements of Section 5307(c) (1-7). The TIP Amendment was made available to the public via a notice in the local newspaper and on the MPO website. A 15-day public comment period was held from October 31, 2016 through November 14, 2016 and again from November 23, 2016 to December 7, 2016.

The following projects are part of Amendment #4:

Added/Amended/Deleted Projects

- **US 64 Phase V - (CN F100112)** – At the request of NMDOT, increase FY 2017 funds by adding \$833,356 in NHPP funds bringing the new project total to \$15,900,000.
- **20th Street Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$867,300 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase III** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP, \$1,291,400 in local funds in 2018 to engineer and construct pedestrian facilities.
- **Glade Run Recreation Area Trails** – At the request of the San Juan County, adds a new project to the TIP, \$700,000 local funds in 2018 & 2019 to engineer and construct recreational trail systems.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase I (F100100)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming all funding sources (\$4M in local match) in FY2019.
- **Pinon Hills Boulevard Phase II (F100101)** At the request of the City of Farmington, amends the project by programming \$2M Local Funds in FY2020 while also programming \$16M in future federal funds in FY2021 in addition to \$2M in local match funds in FY2021.
- **East Arterial Route Phase II (F100091)** At the request of the City of Aztec, amends the project scope to now include ROW acquisition, construction from end of Phase 1B to NM 173, landfill waste removal, retaining walls, construct detached multi-use trail, add 2.5” asphalt overlay at NM 173 south for approx. .5 miles (Phase 1A), BLM wildlife and ROW fence, cattle-guard on NM 173E, striping and signage on Phase 1A, 1B and Phase 2, construction management and testing services. Utilities, including water, sewer, and electric along the length of the entire project. Increase State Severance Tax funds to \$3,819,750 and eliminate \$1,000,000 in local non-match in FY2017.
- **Anesi Trail** – At the request of the City of Farmington, adds a new project to the TIP in the amount of \$1,070,000 to build a bridge and trail development.
- **Kirtland Schools Walk Path** – At the request of the San Juan County, shortens the project termini from 2.84 Miles to 1.57 Miles, shuffles construction and PE funds, but without changes to the overall project cost totals.

Nate Duckett
FMPO Policy Committee Chair

Date



Holton, Mary <mholton@fmtn.org>

Fwd: FW: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

1 message

Sypher, David <dtsypher@fmtn.org>
 To: "Holton, Mary" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Wed, Nov 30, 2016 at 9:57 AM

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT** <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>

Date: Wed, Nov 30, 2016 at 9:27 AM

Subject: FW: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

To: "dwakan@fmtn.org" <dwakan@fmtn.org>
 Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Lopez, Stephen, NMDOT" <Stephen.Lopez@state.nm.us>, "Armendariz, Armando M., NMDOT" <Armando.Armendariz@state.nm.us>, "Lujan, Anthony N., NMDOT" <Anthony.Lujan1@state.nm.us>, "Church, Tom J., NMDOT" <Tom.Church@state.nm.us>, "Fisher, Bradley F, NMDOT" <BradleyF.Fisher@state.nm.us>, "Cribbin, Brian, NMDOT" <Brian.Cribbin@state.nm.us>, "Roxlau, Blake R., NMDOT" <Blake.Roxlau@state.nm.us>, "Wessel, Rick, NMDOT" <Rick.Wessel@state.nm.us>, "Noedel, Ronald S., NMDOT" <Ronald.Noedel@state.nm.us>, "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>, David Sypher <dtsypher@fmtn.org>, William Watson <wwatson@aztecnm.gov>, "Kozub, Rosa, NMDOT" <Rosa.Kozub@state.nm.us>, "Salazar, David A., NMDOT" <David.Salazar@state.nm.us>, "Duran, Annette, NMDOT" <Annette.Duran@state.nm.us>, "Trujillo, Marcos B., NMDOT" <Marcos.Trujillo1@state.nm.us>

Duane – on 11/1/16, Stephen Lopez of D5 submitted the email below requesting TIP amendments to delete F100091 and F100100 from the current TIP. These amendments were not included on the agenda for the 11/9 TC and 11/17 PC meetings but the City of Farmington amendments requesting that the funds be moved to the outer years of the TIP were included. Action on the agenda items was deferred to a special meeting on 12/8/16 of both the TC and Policy Committee. NMDOT requests that the original amendment for F100101 submitted by Stephen via his email (and attached) be included on the agenda for action at the 12/8/16 meeting. The department will not move forward with the F100091 amendment that was submitted (and attached). Per the MPO bylaws, special meetings require 4 day notice, thus there is adequate time to revise and re-advertise the agenda to reflect these items.

Thank you,

Rebecca Maes

Staff Manager

Project Oversight Division

505-476-3785 or 505-946-7323

From: Lopez, Stephen, NMDOT
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2016 8:33 AM
To: Wakan, Duane (dwakan@fmtn.org)
Cc: Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT; Brasher, Paul, NMDOT
Subject: TIP Amendments - F100091 & F100100

Duane,

Attached are the TIP Amendments to FMPO deleting F100091 and F100100 from the current TIP. The amendments to the STIP deleting these projects is in Amendment 5. Please review and advise if you have questions or comments on this information. Thanks.

Stephen Lopez, PE

NMDOT D5 Technical Support Engineer

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>

To: "mholton@fmtn.org" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Archuleta, Elias, NMDOT" <Elias.Archuleta@state.nm.us>, "Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT" <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>, "Haas, Tamara P, NMDOT" <TamaraP.Haas@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Wakan, Duane" <dwakan@fmtn.org>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>

Date: Mon, 7 Nov 2016 16:27:44 +0000

Subject: FMPO TIP Amendment Request

Hi Mary,

Please find attached a letter requesting an amendment to remove CMAQ-Flex funding from the FMPO FFY16-FFY21 TIP. Please don't hesitate to call with any questions or concerns you might have.

Thanks,

Dan Watts | Urban & Regional Planner

Government to Government Unit

NM Department of Transportation

PO Box 1149

Santa Fe, NM 87504

Cell: (505)470-8545

Email: Danial.Watts@state.nm.us

--

David M. Sypher, P.E.
Public Works Director

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Watts, Danial, NMDOT" <Danial.Watts@state.nm.us>

To: "mholton@fmtn.org" <mholton@fmtn.org>

Cc: "Griffin, Jessica, NMDOT" <Jessica.Griffin@state.nm.us>, "Archuleta, Elias, NMDOT"

<Elias.Archuleta@state.nm.us>, "Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT" <Rebecca.Maes@state.nm.us>, "Haas, Tamara P, NMDOT" <TamaraP.Haas@state.nm.us>, "Brasher, Paul, NMDOT" <Paul.Brasher@state.nm.us>, "Wakan, Duane" <dwakan@fmtn.org>, "Elkin, Robin, NMDOT" <Robin.Elkin@state.nm.us>
Date: Mon, 7 Nov 2016 16:27:44 +0000
Subject: FMPO TIP Amendment Request

Hi Mary,

Please find attached a letter requesting an amendment to remove CMAQ-Flex funding from the FMPO FFY16-FFY21 TIP. Please don't hesitate to call with any questions or concerns you might have.

Thanks,

Dan Watts | Urban & Regional Planner

Government to Government Unit

NM Department of Transportation

PO Box 1149

Santa Fe, NM 87504

Cell: (505)470-8545

Email: Danial.Watts@state.nm.us

5 attachments

-  **F100100TIP Modification Form.pdf**
192K
-  **F100091TIP Modification Form.pdf**
200K
-  **2016_1107_F100101 TIP Amendment Request.pdf**
333K
-  **2016_1107_F100101 TIP Amendment Request.pdf**
333K
-  **noname.eml**
462K

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Template

This template will improve project detail accuracy and communication between the Farmington MPO and lead agency project managers when requesting amendments or modification to the TIP. Upon completion of this form, it should be re-confirmed as accurate by the D-5 Liaison or the STIP coordinator.

Project Name:

Project Termini

Project Descriptions:

Begin MP

End MP

TIP Amendment	TIP Modification	Control Number
Existing TIP Details	Amend/Mod Details 1	Amend/Mod Details 2
Existing Year	Amend/Mod Year	Amend/Mod Year

Existing TIP Details

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

Amend/Mod Details 1

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

Amend/Mod Details 2

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Local * Other * State * State SP Prog.

TIP Amendment/
Modification Details

Is the Project identified in the 2040 MTP?

Do project details match the existing Agreement Request Form (ARF)?

Have Project details been reviewed by the NMDOT District 5 Engineering Liaison?

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Template

This template will improve project detail accuracy and communication between the Farmington MPO and lead agency project managers when requesting amendments or modification to the TIP. Upon completion of this form, it should be re-confirmed as accurate by the D-5 Liaison or the STIP coordinator.

Project Name:

Project Termini

Project Descriptions:

Begin MP

End MP

TIP Amendment **TIP Modification** Control Number

Existing TIP Details	Amend/Mod Details 1	Amend/Mod Details 2
Federal Funds	Funding Source	Funding Source
<input type="text" value="\$2,990,400"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
State Match	Match Type	Match Type
<input type="text" value="\$509,600"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
Local-Non Match	Match Other	Match Other
<input type="text" value="\$1,000,000"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>	<input type="text" value="\$"/>
Existing Year	Amend/Mod Year	Amend/Mod Year
<input type="text" value="2017"/>	<input type="text" value="Select Year"/>	<input type="text" value="Select Year"/>

Existing TIP Details

Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Federal HWY	STP - Sm Urb	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Local-Non Match	Select Category	Severance Tax	Select Category

Amend/Mod Details 1

2 Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Select Source	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Select Category	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category

Amend/Mod Details 2

3 Federal Source * Funding Category A * Funding Category B * Federal Transit

Select Source	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category
Local	* Other	* State	* State SP Prog.
Select Category	Select Category	Select Category	Select Category

TIP Amendment/
Modification Details

Delete Project from the FMPO TIP

- Is the Project identified in the 2040 MTP?
- Do project details match the existing Agreement Request Form (ARF)?
- Have Project details been reviewed by the NMDOT Distirct 5 Engineering Liaison?



November 7, 2016

Mary L. Holton
Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization
800 Municipal Drive
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

Dear Ms. Holton:

The purpose of this letter is to respectfully request that the Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) amend its FFY16-FFY21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to remove the \$250,000 of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds currently programmed in FFY2017 for the design of the E. Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase II project (F100101). As District 5 submitted a TIP amendment on November 1, 2016 to remove the project construction funds from FFY2020, the design funds must be deleted in order to ensure that the FMPO TIP is fiscally constrained, per New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Procedures and federal law.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (505) 470-8545 or by email at Danial.Watts@state.nm.us. Thank you for your timely resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dan Watts".

Dan Watts
CMAQ-Flex Coordinator
Statewide Planning Bureau

Cc via Email: Jessica Griffin, Chief, Statewide Planning Bureau
Elias Archuleta, Chief Engineer, Office of Infrastructure
Rebecca Maes, STIP Coordinator
Tamara Haas, Division Director, Asset Management & Planning Division
Paul Brasher, District Engineer, District 5
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, Farmington MPO

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6



November 7, 2016

Mary L. Holton
Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization
800 Municipal Drive
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

Dear Ms. Holton:

The purpose of this letter is to respectfully request that the Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) amend its FFY16-FFY21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to remove the \$250,000 of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds currently programmed in FFY2017 for the design of the E. Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase II project (F100101). As District 5 submitted a TIP amendment on November 1, 2016 to remove the project construction funds from FFY2020, the design funds must be deleted in order to ensure that the FMPO TIP is fiscally constrained, per New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Procedures and federal law.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (505) 470-8545 or by email at Danial.Watts@state.nm.us. Thank you for your timely resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dan Watts".

Dan Watts
CMAQ-Flex Coordinator
Statewide Planning Bureau

Cc via Email: Jessica Griffin, Chief, Statewide Planning Bureau
Elias Archuleta, Chief Engineer, Office of Infrastructure
Rebecca Maes, STIP Coordinator
Tamara Haas, Division Director, Asset Management & Planning Division
Paul Brasher, District Engineer, District 5
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner, Farmington MPO

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6