

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
February 10, 2016

Technical Members Present: Teresa Brevik, City of Bloomfield
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Andrew Montoya, Red Apple Transit
Dave Keck, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: Bill Watson, City of Aztec
NMDOT District 5 Representative

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

Staff Absent: None

Others Present: Brian Degani, NMDOT Planning (via phone)
Robin Elkin, Planning Liaison, NMDOT (via phone)
Jessica Griffin, Planning Director, NMDOT (via phone)
Brad Fisher, Northwest Design Center, NMDOT (via phone)
Lawrence Lopez, Northwest Design Center, NMDOT (via phone)
Mary Gardocki, City of Farmington, PRCA
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 13, 2016 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the January 13, 2016 Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

3. STATUS OF TIP PROJECTS

Subject:	Status of TIP Projects
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	February 3, 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 January 2016.
- There were no projects identified for 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 <p>- Deadlines -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) April 15 Signed T/LPA agreements2) June 15 Obligation deadline <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- T/LPA agreement- Construction- 9 Day Letter |
|--|--|

CURRENT WORK

- Staff has learned that NMDOT Planning Division has decided to not fund the English Rd- E. Main Street RSA
 - Plans were already at 95%
 - HSIP application process opens in the fall of 2016
- The South Side River Road River Trail TAP project was put on hold due to lacking documentation
 - Letter of Intent from the COF to NMDOT- expressing their intent to use forces to construct trail
 - Engineering Estimate & Labor Estimate (on file and submitted)
- Ongoing ROW issues with the following projects
 - East Arterial Route Phase II
 - Pinon Hills Boulevard Bridge Phases I, II and III
- HSIP Intersection issue- San Juan Blvd and Scott Ave (2014-2019 TIP)
- Others?

INFORMATION ITEM

- This is an information item only. Committee members will have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding TIP project status and details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan noted that several of the items noted above had changed since the agenda was distributed last week. Those will be addressed and updated during the meeting today.

Mr. Wakan reported that the MPO received no projects from the entities or NMDOT to be included in the current TIP amendment cycle.

The following TIP projects were reviewed:

East Arterial Route - Phase II

The City of Aztec representative was not in attendance, but Lawrence Lopez and Brad Fisher with NMDOT had some comments on the project:

Mr. Lopez said he and Mr. Fisher had met to get clarification on the right-of-way (ROW) issue on this project and anticipate forthcoming correspondence from District 5 to explain the concerns in detail.

Mr. Lopez added that he was unaware of any milestone meetings being held. He stated that a 60% meeting needed to be scheduled to look at the design and review some of the questions that have come up with the ROW. Wilson & Company is leading the project and they should be aware of the NMDOT process of holding 30, 60, and 90-day project meetings.

Mr. Lopez said NMDOT is concerned with the huge amount (450 feet) of right-of-way in the current design. A milestone meeting is not only required, but could help explain concerns and help to get all parties on the same page. He stated that there should be four of the meetings held along with the PS&E. Mr. Wakan said this information would be communicated to Mr. Watson.

Mr. Wakan also asked about a possible future road exchange with NMDOT for Main Street in Aztec. When this was first discussed, Mr. Quintana said that if NMDOT were to give up four lanes of roadway, than they would want four lanes in exchange on Phases I and II of the East Arterial Route. Mr. Lopez said he has not seen any documentation on this, but understood that NMDOT would be willing to exchange but that there has been no formal discussion on whether if four lanes are built, there would be an exchange.

Mr. Lopez reiterated the need for milestone meetings. Questions have arisen on the right-of-way needs, the four lanes, how the four lanes might relate to the existing environmental documentation, and whether or not these things have been looked at and evaluated. Mr. Lopez stated that this is where the project is at now and expects that Wilson & Company would be scheduling an official milestone meeting soon.

Pinon Hills Boulevard - Phase I

Mr. Lopez stated that he appreciated the work done by Mr. Sypher and the City of Farmington in getting the ARF on this project signed and that NMDOT was working on drafting the coop agreement. Mr. Lopez said this process typically takes several weeks to put together this agreement. Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher have been pushing for information on this project, as well as the East Arterial Route.

Mr. Lopez stated that there are questions on this project from the ROW and environmental departments. These issues have been discussed with District 5 and Mr. Lopez hoped that District 5 could communicate some of the issues from their side. Mr. Lopez said he and Mr. Bert Thomas hand delivered the ROW maps to the ROW department to review, which was a necessary preliminary step prior to getting ROW approval.

Mr. Sypher said he appreciated the help provided by Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Sypher reiterated some of what has transpired over the past year on this project. He

said that the signed contract was provided to NMDOT over a year ago and it was never executed. A draft of this agreement already exists and should require only minor changes to some dates.

Additionally, the City of Farmington spent significant time and money last March to provide information in response to the environmental justice comments that were raised by NMDOT. Mr. Sypher said that no reply to this information has been received from NMDOT and the City of Farmington still does not know what the environmental comments are because NMDOT says these are waiting on the ROW concerns. Mr. Sypher said the City of Farmington could be working on these issues simultaneously to meet NMDOT deadlines, but with no information from NMDOT, the City cannot move forward on anything and noted the City's frustration in not having received any response from NMDOT.

Mr. Sypher reported that holding the pre-PS&E meeting was essential to meeting the NMDOT deadlines of March and July. He asked if Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher would do whatever they could to get this meeting set up.

Mr. Sypher said that the ROW maps have been submitted. As background information for Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher, Mr. Sypher added that last July, the City of Farmington had met with Commissioner Butch Mathews and NMDOT to try and move this project along. Although the City of Farmington had provided the required documentation to the ROW division, they insisted that documents were missing, but could not provide details as to what those documents were. The City of Farmington then hired a consultant to review the NMDOT regulations and to provide them all required documentation. What was determined was that NMDOT had all the same documents as the City of Farmington had.

The ROW division then asked for an affidavit to clarify a ROW acquisition complicated by a divorce in early 2000. The City of Farmington provided this affidavit. During this time period, there were not responses to the submittals or requests for additional information. The ROW division then asked for another affidavit and the City of Farmington went through all their documents and records and tried to explain everything. While going through all the documentation, the City of Farmington found some missing appraisals and appraisal reviews certified by an NMDOT appraiser. These documents, plus all the background information, and ROW acquisition files were again submitted to NMDOT. Mr. Sypher said as of today, the City of Farmington has still not received one comment back from the ROW division. About a month ago, Mr. Ron Noedel asked for a waiver which Mr. Sypher submitted. In the waiver Mr. Sypher stated that all known documentation has been submitted, but in case something is deemed missing by NMDOT, the City of Farmington is submitting this waiver.

Mr. Lopez commented that he was not involved in this project until late fall last year so much of what has transpired he has just learned. He said he understood Mr. Sypher's frustration. He said he knew the environmental comments had not been provided to the City of Farmington, and understood the reason for this was that they were waiting for the ROW comments. Mr. Lopez said he was aware of the waiver requested and a letter was generated from NMDOT to FHWA requesting a follow up.

Mr. Lopez agreed that a pre-PS&E meeting would be very helpful in the process. He acknowledged that milestone meetings have taken place and noted that the March deadline is only for an executed coop agreement and that June is the deadline for this project. The pre PS&E meeting would be to review the project, and go over the current certifications and the contract book begin compiled, but it would still be minus the ROW and environmental documents. Mr. Lopez said he was aware of the frustrations and promised he would take the concerns up the chain within NMDOT.

Mr. Sypher asked if Mr. Lopez could send out the invitation for a pre-PS&E. Mr. Lopez said he could do this and saw no harm in sitting around the table and discussing this project again. He added that the pre-PS&E does not do away with the need for a formal PS&E. Mr. Sypher said he understood this, but thought this was the way to possibly get things moving again on this project.

Pinon Hills Boulevard - Phase II

Mr. Sypher asked Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher to review and confirm the programmed CMAQ-Flex funding currently scheduled for 2017 for the final design for this Phase. This was programmed in by David Quintana and the City of Farmington is counting on this money. Mr. Lopez agreed to confirm this funding.

Pinon Hills Boulevard - Phase III

Mr. Keck said the County has had to back up somewhat on the purchase of ROW. He has a meeting scheduled in Santa Fe on February 22 to meet with NMDOT's ROW division and the County's new consultant, Tierra Right-of-Way. Tierra will be taking over all the ROW activities on this project. Other than ROW, the project is in good shape. Mr. Keck invited Mr. Lopez and Mr. Fisher to also attend the meeting.

US 64 - Phase V

No representative present from District 5 to report on this project.

CR 390 & 350

Mr. Keck said the 90% PS&E has already been completed. This project will forward soon with construction planned for May.

Vereda del Rio San Juan River Trail - Phases II and III

Ms. Brevik reported that she is waiting an update on the PIF letter from Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher said NMDOT and FHWA what is acceptable and what the process is and who should be doing the certifying. Mr. Fisher stressed to FHWA the City of Bloomfield's schedule on the project and he has not heard back from them. Ms. Brevik asked if a line item could simply be added to explain the addition of the light. Mr. Fisher replied that any addition approval if it was not on the original pre-approved list. Ms. Brevik stated that time was of the essence since the City of Bloomfield plans to go out to bid when they receive the approval letter.

Kirtland Schools Walk Path

Mr. Keck said the County has signed the design agreement and it is now with NMDOT. He anticipates receiving the signed agreement back at any time.

Red Apple Transit

Mr. Montoya reported that everything is ready for signatures, but is now on hold due to

FTA's updating their TEAM grants management system to TrAMS and being unable to accept funds transfers until that is complete. Mr. Wakan added that it was hoped that if delays in the transfer process are experienced that some leniency on deadlines would be granted.

NMDOT Planning Division

Ms. Jessica Griffin stated that the project design agreements must be signed and submitted to the Northwest Region Design Center by March 15. The obligation deadline is June 15 which means that all the certifications are due, designs have been completed and nine-day letters received.

Current Work

English Road and East Main Road Safety Audit (RSA)

Ms. Griffin said this RSA has been on the schedule, but there has not been an on-call contractor available through the HSIP program. This RSA is expected to be completed this summer. Ms. Griffin asked if the City of Farmington had already begun the design of a project for this intersection. Mr. Sypher replied that there was an ADA improvement planned for one of the corners of the intersection which was previously approved by NMDOT. The City of Farmington then put the project on hold and applied for an HSIP grant. NMDOT responded with the RSA commitment and no further work has taken place at this intersection waiting on the RSA.

Ms. Griffin said that the RSA process identifies any needed safety projects and those projects can then be funded through HSIP. She stated that the project already started by the City of Farmington cannot be guaranteed funding through HSIP; it has only been awarded an RSA.

The group discussed how the RSA would review the entire intersection, identify any safety issues, and then develop the best engineering strategy and project to address the issues. The project was previously considered by the HSIP Committee and before they would consider funding the project, they requested an RSA to validate the safety concerns and the cost estimate presented. Ms. Griffin quoted from Mr. Steve Eagan's meeting notes that said following an RSA and confirmation of the project needs and costs, HSIP would "conditionally approve \$68,000 for project design and certification for FY2016 and \$120,000 for construction for 2017". All agreed that if the RSA concurs with the safety concerns in the proposed project, then HSIP funding can be applied for to complete the project.

Mr. Sypher said he hoped that the RSA would finally be completed this summer as this is the third date given to the City of Farmington for this RSA. Ms. Griffin stated that the lack of on-call consultants/contracts has caused the backlog of RSAs.

Southside River Trail

This is a TAP project in the 2014-2019 TIP and funds have already been obligated. The City of Farmington's Parks & Recreation Department has already completed 30% of the construction of the project. NMDOT has now told the City of Farmington to stop work on the project and called for a meeting on February 23.

Ms. Mary Gardocki with the City of Farmington's Parks & Recreation Department and the project manager explained that all this transpired due to an out of the blue, vague

e-mail from Mr. Octavio Burrola stating the project needed to be halted, but providing no reason for the stoppage. Preferring not to stop the construction for a month to wait for the February 23 meeting, a conference call was set up on February 1 with Mr. Lopez and Mr. Juan Rael.

Ms. Gardocki explained that during the conference call, Mr. Rael asked for copies of all documentation again. She forwarded all information to him the next day: engineer's estimate, labor estimate, letter of concurrence, coop agreement, PS&E meeting minutes, pre-con meeting minutes, and the PIF. However, Ms. Gardocki has still had no contact from Mr. Burrola-Chavez to explain what the problem is. What has been gleaned from others is that the issue is with the City of Farmington using their own workforce.

Ms. Gardocki stated that since the beginning of the project in 2014, the City of Farmington has made it clear that an in-house workforce would be used. For the project to now be stopped with no clarity on the issue is extremely frustrating. The City has been told to put the project on hold for three to four weeks and yet they do not know what the wait is for. Ms. Gardocki said a letter was supposed to have been provided by Mr. Rael or Mr. Lopez on why the project had been suspended.

Mr. Lopez agreed that the e-mail from Mr. Burrola was vague. Once the design center completes their portion of the project, it goes to the Construction and Civil Rights Bureau (CCRB) where Mr. Burrola and his supervisor, Mr. Juan Rael, work. Mr. Lopez said the issue is with the use of the in-house workforce, but he did not have any details. He offered to contact Mr. Rael and asked him to contact Ms. Gardocki to provide a response. At the conclusion of the conference call, Mr. Rael said that if the City of Farmington again provided all the information to CCRB, a letter would be forthcoming detailing the issues. Ms. Gardocki restated that she provided all the same information to them the very next day, but no reply from Mr. Rael or Mr. Burrola has yet to be received.

Mr. Wakan stated that the City of Farmington identified from the beginning in the TAP application and the PIF that in-house forces would be used and the price tag for those forces was documented. The TAP application is a NMDOT application, and it was accepted, reviewed and approval to proceed given. Now NMDOT is saying they need a "letter" explaining the same information that was provided in the PIF.

Mr. Lopez commented that he had a sense of what the issue is but did not want to speak for the CCRB and he was not aware that the use of in-house forces would be an issue. He said he would follow up with Mr. Rael to see about getting a response to the City of Farmington.

Mr. Wakan asked if there was any influence the Planning Division could provide to assist in moving this TAP project along. Ms. Griffin said that if a TLPA wants to use their own forces on a project, they must work with the appropriate NMDOT entity on that issue and it is not something the TAP application process makes a decision on.

San Juan Boulevard/Scott Avenue Intersection

Mr. Sypher explained that no additional NMDOT funds are available for this project. The project cost estimate came in \$200,000 higher than expected. Mr. Sypher said the

City of Farmington will have a meeting on February 16 to see if the project can be completed.

Mr. Sypher said the project was submitted for final award approval, so that if the additional funds were found, the approval did exist. The City of Farmington's Purchasing Department submitted this request approximately two weeks ago and they had also posed this question. Mr. Sypher said he needed a response from NMDOT by Friday, February 12. Mr. Sypher reiterated that if the City of Farmington could fund the project by some means and award the project, is everything approved by NMDOT and can NMDOT provide written confirmation by February 12 that the project can be awarded. Mr. Lopez said that per the coop agreement, the funding is for the project as designed. Any overage is paid by the City of Farmington however the funds are secured. Mr. Sypher again asked if he could receive concurrence that the project may be awarded if the City of Farmington finds the funding. Mr. Lopez said he would have to check on the language to ensure there is no contradiction to the language already in the coop agreement. Mr. Lopez said he would provide a concurrence letter and reference the part of the coop agreement that addresses any overages on the project, and that he would provide this letter by February 12.

Mr. Sypher then commented that there are acceptable reasons for an entity to pull out of a project with no penalty of paying back funds. Mr. Sypher added that if the project is scraped because the funding is not available from any source, is the City of Farmington eligible to request reimbursement of the \$20,000 for the design. Mr. Lopez said he thought the answer was "yes" because there were two separate cooperative agreements - one for design and one for construction. He said he would verify this, but thought that because the design portion of the project was under a separate coop agreement and the City had followed through on the design portion, they should be eligible for reimbursement.

Mr. Lopez had to leave the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Mr. Sypher added that the City of Farmington had received the go-ahead from NMDOT to bid the 20th Street project.

ACTION: The report was received.

4. RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CITIZENS (CIVIC) ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

Subject:	Development of a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Prepared by:	Fran Fillerup, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	February 3, 2016

BACKGROUND

- At the November 19, 2015 Policy Committee meeting, Staff presented

introductory information on Citizens Advisory Committees (CAC) as part of the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The Policy Committee recommended the MPO form a CAC to have broader input on transportation planning issues, and that such input could be a benefit to the MPO and in their work on their respective councils and commissions.

- Membership of CAC's are intended to be representative of the variety of residences of an area with regard to race and ethnicity, age, sex, ability and the many other interests and characteristics of a region.
- A CAC is an advisory committee to the Policy Committee, similar to an MPO's Technical Committee. Development and amendment of the UPWP, MTP, and TIP, along with other studies and reports, are presented to a CAC for their review and recommendation.
- MPO Staff would provide the staff support for this committee and recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee would be provided to the Policy Committee.
- The Farmington MPO had a Citizen Action Committee during the development of its first MTP in 2005. However, it appears to have been convened on a temporary basis. (It was not a standing "advisory committee".)

CURRENT WORK

Common Practices for CAC's

Following is a summary list of research and a review of common practices of Citizen Advisory Committees at other MPO's.

- FHWA published "Public Involvement Techniques for Transportation Decisionmaking" which gives general guidance on many public engagement tools, including CAC's. An excerpt of the document is attached. It describes CAC's as including:
 - Representation from interest groups throughout a region;
 - Regularly-held meetings;
 - Recorded comments and points of view of participants; and
 - Consensus building, but consensus is not required.
 - An important assigned role in the transportation planning process.
- According to the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO), Citizen's Advisory Committees:
 - Act in an advisory capacity to MPO on public involvement strategies;
 - Meet regularly to review and develop plans and also assists in organizing and managing public meeting and comments; and
 - Are comprised of members of the public, often appointed by localities and MPO policy board, who may include representatives of interested parties.
- Many MPO's throughout the country have CAC's. Some CAC's have been functioning for decades and in some states it is required and organized under state law. Staff performed research of CAC's across the country, and contacted several by phone. Attached is a table of 6 such groups at MPO's.
- In New Mexico, only the Mid-Region MPO has a committee similar to a CAC - a Public Involvement Committee, or PIC. This committee convenes on an as-needed basis, does not provide recommendations to their Policy Board, and currently sees very little participation.
- Some MPO's and other regional planning organizations convene citizen and stakeholder groups on a temporary basis. Others call on a collection of

workgroups focused on a multitude of disciplines and interests (i.e., active transportation, demographics, environmental, freight, and so on).

- Some hold joint meetings with staff from government agencies to increase interaction of stakeholder groups and government.
- CAC's from those surveyed vary in the way voting membership is set up. This is typically set forth in bylaws.
- Some CAC's limit the number of total participants. Others are open-ended and allow any organization or individual to achieve voting status. However, these CAC's have attendance requirements and can remove members who do not participate.
- Some are explicit about having representation from certain groups within a community. For example, at the MPO in Tampa, Florida, seats are designated for a person of Hispanic ethnicity, a person of African-American descent, a woman, a person under age 30, a representative of a neighborhood and a representative of the business community.
- CAC's also vary in the frequency of meetings, but these typically match the frequency of other committees.
- The time of day of the meetings is also a factor to be considered. Some hold their meetings during the day and others in the evening.

Next Steps

Creation of a CAC within the Farmington MPO involves at least the following next steps:

- At the direction of the Policy Committee, Staff would prepare amendments of the Bylaws, UPWP, and PPP.
- The Bylaws would contain details about the responsibilities, procedures and membership of the CAC. The Policy Committee would decide the composition and means of forming the CAC, plus its procedures and other details.
- The UPWP would need to reflect the CAC in tasks relating to administration and public outreach, and note that certain projects would be reviewed by the CAC in addition to the other committees.
- The PPP would outline the CAC as a means for public involvement in the MPO's work.
- Based on the amendments to the above documents, Staff would handle the details for forming the CAC.
- The Farmington MPO has contact with and active participation from many representatives of stakeholder groups and individual citizens. For example, the MPO maintains a list of contacts with interested groups. Members could come from contacts made during the MTP outreach and from the Complete Streets Advisory Group. General advertisements could also be used to invite groups or individuals to join the CAC. Many MPO's have success finding participants through referrals and word-of-mouth.

INFORMATION ITEM

- This is an information item and discussion by Technical Committee will be forwarded to the Policy Committee. At the direction of the Policy Committee, more information or amendments to the Bylaws, UPWP and PPP will be presented in the future for recommendation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Fillerup said he would be referring to Pages 4 and 5 of the Agenda as well as to a handout on other MPO's Citizens (Civic) Advisory Committees (CAC). The development of a CAC was discussed with the Policy Committee in November 2015.

Mr. Fillerup reported that CACs are common in many areas throughout the country and some states require an MPO to have a CAC. The purpose of a CAC is to include stakeholder and citizens input in transportation planning work. They are a standing committee of a MPO that reviews the work of the MPO, receives reports and provides a recommendation to the Policy Committee or Board.

There are no CACs in the state of New Mexico. The Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG) has a public involvement committee that convenes on an as-needed basis and has no recommending responsibilities currently.

Mr. Fillerup commented on the information provided in the handout and said that the biggest difference between the different CACs was how their memberships were composed, along with the number and size of the committees. Additionally, some CACs have requirements for maintaining membership. The frequency of meetings is similar to that of other MPO committees.

This information is presented to the Technical Committee for their review and if members have experience with CACs in other MPOs, Staff would ask for their observations and recommendations.

Mr. Sypher said he was concerned with the possibility of stacking a committee. He would like to ensure that this type of action is safeguarded against when nominating the membership. Mr. Sypher agreed that a CAC can be set up in different ways - reporting directly to the Policy Committee, recommending action to the Policy Committee, or recommending action to the Technical Committee. Mr. Fillerup commented that this was likely why other CACs had made membership open with responsibilities for participation. Mr. Sypher thought it important to look at how the opportunity for participation was noticed.

ACTION: The report was received.

5. RECEIVE A RED APPLE TRANSIT UPDATE

Subject:	Red Apple Transit Update
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	February 2, 2016

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- Staff will need to collect transit data on an ongoing basis to comply with MAP-21 performance measurement requirements.
- New ridership collection methods have been in place since March 2015 using tablets which can also collect basic demographic data.

- Red Apple Transit recently released a Transit Trip Planner interface which can be accessed on the Red Apple Transit and MPO websites.

CURRENT WORK

- Several route changes were implemented in August 2015 as a way to: (1) remove non-revenue miles; (2) add service to concentrated areas; (3) get workers into the COF by 8 am; (4) get students to San Juan College by 8 am; and, (5) provide a link with Navajo Transit.
- 2015 Ridership volumes decreased by 4.54 percent compared to 2014 volumes. Revenue during the same period went up by 9.69 percent*
- Farmington routes decreased by -4.08 percent while the regional routes decreased by -7.55 percent.

INFORMATION ITEM

- This is an information report requesting feedback from Policy Committee members.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wakan reported that the MAP-21 performance measures require Staff to collect data on an ongoing basis. The MPO has been tracking Red Apple Transit ridership since 2003. From the reports provided by Ride Right the MPO creates graphics and compiles the data. Mr. Wakan reviewed several charts depicting the 2015 regional and Farmington ridership, total ridership and a ridership comparison from 2011 to 2015.

Mr. Montoya noted that Ride Right counts passengers differently than had been done by the previous contractor so although some numbers appear to show that ridership has decreased, ridership has actually increased. The previous contractor would count a rider when they boarded the bus and, while still on the same trip, they were counted again when they transferred. So the same passenger was actually counted twice. Ride Right counts the rider only once from the beginning to the end of their trip. Mr. Wakan said Staff would note the change in methodology and update the graphics.

Mr. Wakan stated that revenue has increased by 9.69% even though the rates have not been increased, which most likely related to the new ridership measurement methodologies.

Mr. Wakan demonstrated a new interactive map on the MPO website that will tell you how close your home is to a bus stop. The map will help highlight where the transit system has gaps and could be missing riders and how, if stops were adjusted slightly, ridership might be picked up.

There is also a RAT trip planner for riders to use to plan out their transit trip. The planner uses Google Maps and provides directions, how long the trip will be, and where the transfers are located. Mr. Wakan said Staff can provide the html language so this can be embedded on the local entity websites if desired.

Mr. Wakan reported that the transit hub study has been finalized with three final locations recommended. Two of the proposed sites are in the Metropolitan

Redevelopment Area (MRA) and the other site is on Scott Avenue between San Juan Boulevard and Main Street. More information on the final study is available on the MPO website.

Mr. Wakan stated that the TIP is now available in a mapping format on the MPO website. Clicking on a specific location will bring up all the information on that particular project. Ms. Holton added that beginning tomorrow with the new City of Farmington web page, this information will be viewable on smart phones.

Mr. Sypher left the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

6. NMDOT REPORTS

District 5 Update

No representative from District 5 was present at the meeting.

Planning Division Update

There was no update provided by the Planning Division representatives in attendance.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Fran Fillerup, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	February 2, 2016

INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. **Complete Streets Design Guidelines.** The Technical Committee will meet on Wednesday, February 24, 2016 to review and offer edits to the draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines. This meeting is scheduled for 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the MPO Office.
- b. **Fran Fillerup.** Staff would like to extend an appreciation to Fran Fillerup for his dedicated service and professionalism while working as the MPO Associate Planner. He has accepted a position with San Juan County.

DISCUSSION:

- a. **Complete Streets Design Guidelines.** The Technical Committee will meet in a special workshop session on February 24 to review and offer comments to the draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines document. The meeting will be advertised as a public meeting and the Complete Streets Advisory Group members invited to attend.
- b. Mary Holton extended Staff's appreciation to Fran Fillerup for his service and professionalism to the MPO. A reception is planned for February 11 at 2:00 p.m. at the

Community Development office and Ms. Holton invited all to attend. Mr. Fillerup has accepted a position with San Juan County. Mr. Wakan said that Mr. Fillerup was a great colleague and he will be missed at the MPO.

8. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Keck announced that he was very pleased to have hired Mr. Fillerup and have him joining his staff at the County. He said Mr. Fillerup would be taking over all of the County's federally funded projects and be involved in not only the planning of a project, but also managing the construction of a project, documenting the progress of a project and seeking project reimbursements. Mr. Keck also plans to have Mr. Fillerup become the County's representative to the MPO Technical Committee. Mr. Keck believes that the Mr. Fillerup will also help coordinate work, communication, and cooperation between the County and the other local entities.

Ms. Lopez said she had first hired Mr. Fillerup for the City of Farmington and has seen him grow over the last eight years. She stated she was proud of his accomplishments and pleased for his new job opportunity.

Mr. Fillerup thanked everyone for their support and good wishes. He is excited for the challenges and opportunities ahead.

9. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no additional business from the Floor.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Lopez moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brevik seconded the motion. Mr. Keck adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.



David Keck, Chair



June Markle, Administrative Aide