

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
October 12, 2016

Technical Members Present:

Bill Watson, City of Aztec
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Andrew Montoya, Red Apple Transit
Fran Fillerup, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent:

Jason Thomas, City of Bloomfield

Staff Present:

Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Assistant

Staff Absent:

Mary Holton, MPO Officer

Others Present:

Robin Elkin, Planning Liaison, NMDOT
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County
Steven Saavedra, City of Aztec

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fillerup called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2016 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the September 14, 2016 Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Watson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. TIP PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Garcia asked if the Technical Committee members had TIP project updates to present.

East Arterial Route

Mr. Watson reported that funding for the East Arterial Route project will need to be moved out a year and there will like be a new scope definition. The City of Aztec plans to advertise in late 2017 for construction in 2018. Mr. Watson said Mr. Paul Brasher with District 5 is on board with the new plan, but the issue is whether there is now sufficient funding for the project. There is enough money if NMDOT's average funding rates are used, but unfortunately projects in the Four Corners area are typically 30-40% higher

than elsewhere in the state. Mr. Watson said he hoped that the project would be big enough to attract Albuquerque contractors to bid on the project.

Mr. Watson also explained that the project is hung up on sheep fencing for the BLM property. In one section of the roadway, there is a sheep grazing allotment area and NMDOT wanted a cattle guard installed on the arterial. The City of Aztec said that this would not work and they are working with NMDOT on an alternate approach.

CR 350/390 Intersection

This project is out to bid now.

CR 3900 – Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase III

Mr. Fillerup reported that the right-of-way remapping has been sent to NMDOT. The County continues to work on the 404 permit.

Kirtland Walk Path

A new project scope has been agreed to by San Juan County and NMDOT. A TIP amendment will be forthcoming to change the scope of the project and to shorten the total length of the walk path.

Mr. Sypher noted that for the Pinon Hills Bridge project, NMDOT's right-of-way division had asked for a revised right-of-way map and it was approved and signed by the land division. Later on in the project this right-of-way map was not approved because it had not been signed by the right-of-way division. Mr. Sypher encouraged Mr. Fillerup to ensure the correct division had approved their right-of-way map. Mr. Fillerup stated that this had been done and both divisions had signed off on the map.

Mr. Wakan asked if the County intended to add a scope into a new TAP or RTP project. Mr. Fillerup said he would like to complete the rest of the scope in the 2018/2019 timeframe, but that will depend on how much the County feels it can get done because they are also applying for an RTP grant.

Mr. Wakan stated that the Project Feasibility Forms (PFF) are due to the MPO by October 30, 2016 so there is time to review the documents before forwarding them on to NMDOT in November.

Red Apple Transit

Mr. Montoya said that TAP funding for the Red Apple Transit's project for bus shelters, pullouts, and ADA ramps has been returned to NMDOT.

Mr. Sypher reported that the City of Farmington has two TAP projects that need to be added to the STIP. Those amendments will be executed in the next quarterly amendment process in November. Mr. Wakan said following local approval in November it is hoped that NMDOT would approve in December. These projects would then go to the statewide scoring committee that is scheduled to meet in February 2017.

The local scoring committee for STIP projects has not been formed yet, but Staff is following up on this.

4. REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED MEETING CALENDAR FOR 2017 AND RESOLUTION 2016-1

Mr. Wakan said that the proposed 2017 meeting schedule followed the same calendar as in 2016. The meetings will be held at 10:00 am on Wednesdays and noted that the "grayed" months on the calendar were months when the TIP amendment cycles are addressed.

Ms. Lopez said that the November 8 date on the calendar is labeled as the "1st Tuesday". This should say the 1st Wednesday and the date should be November 1 to be the actual first Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Fillerup asked if having the Technical Committee meetings on the 2nd Wednesday caused a conflict with attending the RTPPO meetings which he thought were held on the same day. The members considered changing the meeting date and noted that it had been originally changed from Thursdays in order to accommodate attendance by NMDOT District 5. The Technical Committee decided to retain the current meeting schedule of the 2nd Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Sypher introduced some recommended changes that he thought should be incorporated into the meeting resolution:

- Page 1, item #2 - Change seventy-two (72) hours to one week prior to the actual meeting (allowing for exceptions and/or emergencies);
- Include only those items on the agenda where the supporting information is prepared prior to the meeting date and is included as part of the agenda when it is sent to the Technical Committee;

If the supporting documentation for an agenda item is not ready the item should be removed from or not included on the agenda for that meeting. Mr. Sypher said the Technical Committee and Staff have tried too hard in the past to work through these agenda items and makes for longer meetings since the Technical Committee members have not had the opportunity to review the supporting documents prior to the meeting.

- Consider clarifying the procedure for establishing the meeting agenda items; possibly clear the topics through the Chair prior to distribution to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Sypher suggested that by allowing the committee members the ability to set the agenda items they could better direct what they want to accomplish at the meetings.

Mr. Fillerup reiterated the proposed recommendations and stated that he thought the intent of the resolution was simply to state the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Mr. Watson offered that the Technical Committee members still needed to agree with what Mr. Sypher had proposed before moving forward. Ms. Lopez commented that items on the agenda, such as Agenda Item #5 in today's agenda, "review the revisions to the Safety Plan scope of work" do need to be provided prior to meeting so the Technical Committee can review the document and be prepared to discuss it. She noted that not getting this information prior to the meeting causes the meetings to be longer than necessary as the members have had no time to review the information.

Ms. Lopez said that for the Metropolitan Redevelopment Area (MRA) meetings, city staff is asking the board members if they have anything they want to discuss. She thought affording the Technical Committee members the opportunity to add a regional issue to the agenda would be good.

Mr. Sypher noted that all public bodies have established ways of getting things on an agenda. He thought that the MPO Staff worked at the will of the Technical and Policy Committees. He said if this was the case, then he would like to clarify how the agendas are set.

Mr. Fillerup agreed that there are times when agenda items are lacking the supporting documentation and sometimes agenda items are, perhaps, issues that do not need to be discussed by the Technical Committee. Mr. Fillerup asked if the second two proposals would be more appropriately included in the Bylaws.

Mr. Fillerup made a recommendation that language to address the proposals be considered as additions to the Bylaws if language is not already there. Mr. Fillerup thought the 72-hour requirement for setting agendas was to abide by the requirements of the Open Meetings Act and adding the seven-day requirement eliminates flexibility on last minute issues or changes. Ms. Lopez agreed and added that the 72-hour requirement plays into emergency or special meetings and is a minimum amount of lead time.

Mr. Sypher said he had not proposed that each Technical Committee member have input on the agenda because he used the same philosophy as individual City Council members not being able to add items on the agenda. Having the items channeled through one person provides for better order. This would not preclude a Technical Committee member from speaking directly to the Chair about a particular agenda item.

It was emphasized that the resolution states clearly that it is, "ESTABLISHING THE PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED AND NOTICE TO BE GIVEN PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW MEXICO OPEN MEETINGS ACT"... It was recommended and Staff was directed to seek input from the Legal Department about Mr. Sypher's proposals and to get their recommendation on possible inclusion in the resolution or the Bylaws.

ACTION: Mr. Sypher moved to table discussion and approval on the 2017 Proposed Meeting Calendar and Resolution 2016-1 until clarification on the three proposed changes can be acquired from the City of Farmington's Legal Department. Ms. Lopez seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Elkin commented that earlier meeting notice is preferred by NMDOT to allow him and others time to prepare for any planned discussion and to make needed travel and per diem arrangements.

5. REVIEW THE REVISIONS TO THE SAFETY PLAN SCOPE OF WORK

Mr. Watson stated that this goes back to the earlier discussion on Agenda Item #4 and being provided discussion items prior to the meeting. He stated that discussion of this item should be put off until the next meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Watson moved to table discussion on Agenda Item #5 until the next meeting. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion.

Ms. Lopez commented that the agenda referred to a "review of the revisions" yet she was never provided a copy of the original document and, thus, had nothing to compare. She also stated that this information was not received prior to the meeting and gave her no time for review.

Mr. Wakan asked to comment on the agenda item:

- MPO needs to submit an RFQ soon;
- MPO must spend and FFY2016 funds by December 31
 - o Safety Plan work represents a large portion of those funds
- Recommend Technical Committee look at the budget tables provided in the handout;
 - o MPO budget is restricted and budget tables detail the cost of hiring a consultant to prepare the full safety plan or do sections of it in-house
- Consider the information distributed today as the final Safety Plan Scope of Work document

The motion to table discussion on Agenda Item #5 was approved unanimously.

6. UPDATE ON THE MPO QUARTERLY

Mr. Garcia reported that the MPO Quarterly was held in Santa Fe on October 2 & 3, 2016. Mr. Garcia reviewed the copy of NMDOT's Planning Bureau's handout provided that was provided to the MPOs at that meeting:

- The final planning rule on target setting/performance measures
 - o NMDOT target-setting deadline is April 15, 2017
 - o MPOs target-setting deadline is October 15, 2017
 - This is also the deadline to get the safety plan implemented

Ms. Lopez said that she understood that NMDOT sets their performance measures and the MPO can accept and help NMDOT write their plan or the MPO can write their own plan. She thought more information and a better understanding of this was needed before making a decision on going forward with the MPO's safety plan.

Mr. Elkin said that his understanding is that NMDOT's safety plan will involve the state facilities and highways. The MPO's safety plan will address local roads and the interface of those roads with the state highways. The State's plan will not address local roads.

Mr. Fillerup asked if NMDOT's safety plan will list the required safety targets; are the performance measure targets on safety to be a part of the State's plan or will they be issued separately; should the MPO safety related targets be in the MPO's safety plan or should they be adopted separately.

Ms. Lopez said that what was sent out was a simple fact sheet and did not provide her with enough information. She would like to know what other states and other communities are doing. Mr. Fillerup referred to the fact that when the MTP was adopted, the safety targets and measures had not been set by the state. He asked if these would now be issued separately or will they be included in the State's safety plan; and should these targets be included as part of the MPO's safety plan.

Mr. Wakan responded that the MPO must set safety performance measures to measure safety and to make improvements. He thought that without knowing what our current safety conditions and concerns might be, we cannot make a judicious decision on whether to adopt the state's safety plan or do our own. Additionally the local vision is likely much different than NMDOT's. Mr. Wakan said that every MPO is different and can make their own decision on what they want to do and how they want to develop their safety plan. He also noted that it was not known if the other MPOs would be incorporating the state's measures and targets or developing their own.

Mr. Sypher commented that each political "subdivision" has their priorities, their own list of safety improvements, and their own CIP. Would the City of Aztec want the MPO telling them how to rank a particular intersection safety project, how they will be measured, and when they have to complete the project. He said he thought NDMOT would be very broad and general in these types of decisions and the MPO will need to decide how general or specific they want to be, and when jurisdictions cross, what might the MPO require of the individual entities. Mr. Sypher said he wanted to know the philosophy the MPO wanted to embrace and this will determine the parameters of the scope. He thought that maybe a legal or authoritative response should be sought.

Mr. Elkin said this is a very large issue and NMDOT is just now setting the groundwork and getting things established. More information will be forthcoming in the next year as specific details are developed. Mr. Sypher wondered if the MPO was too far ahead of the curve since NMDOT is still working on developing the targets and measures.

Ms. Lopez said that it did not appear that our safety plan needed to be completed until the state's plan was completed. At that time, the MPO can accept the state's plan or they have 180 days in which to write their own. Mr. Fillerup asked if the safety targets needed to be incorporated into the safety plan. Mr. Elkin replied that, at this time, those types of questions were too specific since NMDOT is just beginning the development of a very complex plan. Mr. Fillerup restated that the MPO would get the state's targets related to safety measures in April 2017 and then in October, the MPO would need to have set their own. He added that by doing a safety plan by April would help us be ready with our targets and then decide if we like NMDOT's targets when they are published. Mr. Fillerup said he did not think it was necessary to sit on these decisions until October.

Discussion continued on this item:

- Preparing MPO safety plan before April 2017 will help us set targets when state's plan comes out and decide if we like the state's targets and might want to accept them;

- MTP has performance measures chapter where targets could be added;
- Could there be redundant work;
- State produces crash report that only references the City of Farmington; Aztec, Bloomfield, and county have no data;
- MPO collects crash data from state;
 - It is public information
 - MPO maps the data collected; has information for all the entities
 - State does not map data for any city
 - Having regional plan will help identify the local problem areas and begin to take logical countermeasures and involve the public;
- Could we temporarily adopt the State's plan when it comes out;
- Continue with our schedule so the MPO is prepared to go forward should that decision be made;
 - Support Staff on safety plan scope;
 - Provides for some introspection, know what questions to ask, and have a basic direction to move towards
 - Err on the side of being prepared
- Learn more about how this is working and the federal mandates; how is the state progressing and receive periodic updates on how their plan is being laid out
- While we work on our safety plan between now and April ask NMDOT for more information on how their plan is progressing to assist the MPO's process, where they are in setting their targets and measures, and to avoid duplication of work;
- Submit a request to have the state's safety plan consultant, the HSIP coordinator, or an FHWA representative to come and speak to the Technical Committee or set up a GoTo meeting on all the items of interest;
- Developing the safety plan and that timeline is part of the MPO's UPWP; any changes would require an amendment to the UPWP;
- NMDOT's process for the development of their plan has yet to be established; the Technical Committee asked to be a party to this process as it is developed;
- The state will be looking at state roads only and will not be considering the local roads; this should be part of the regional safety plan;
- Concern over how safety projects would be identified, how they would be justified and then how they might fit into an entity's overall CIP and budgets.

Mr. Garcia commented that this information from the MPO Quarterly was the first presentation that had been made by NMDOT on the performance-based planning and programming being developed by NMDOT. Mr. Garcia presented it today to the Technical Committee to keep them apprised of the new developments. More information is expected at the next MPO quarterly in December.

Mr. Garcia reported that NMDOT is hiring a consultant to conduct a best practices study to see how other state DOTs are distributing Congestion, Mitigation, and Air Quality Improvement Program-Flex (CMAQ-Flex) funds. The CMAQ funds are mandatory and are given out in non-attainment or maintenance areas for air quality. The CMAQ-Flex funds can be used in any area that is eligible for STP funds and the FMPO is one of those areas. Mr. Garcia said that CMAQ-Flex funds and a process to award those funds are expected in FFY2019.

Ms. Lopez asked if there were going to be changes in how non-attainment is measured. Mr. Wakan said there is a meeting on air quality scheduled for the first week in

December at San Juan College and non-attainment status will be discussed. San Juan County was right at the limit of attainment, but with power plant shutdowns the air quality numbers have been trending down.

Mr. Garcia added that the CMAQ-Flex funds are typically used for traffic signals, roundabouts, and intersection improvements that will assist in improving air quality. Ms. Lopez asked if the funds could be used for construction and to change intersections. Yes, the funds can be used for construction of projects that benefit air quality.

Mr. Wakan reported that the Albuquerque TMA (MRCOG) was the only non-attainment MPO in the state and had been awarded \$5,000,000 annually for air quality improvement and maintenance projects. They are now coming into compliance and attainment and that money previously awarded to them will become available in the CMAQ-Flex program. Mr. Wakan commented that NMDOT's TAP and HSIP funding programs are good models for the CMAQ-Flex program. Mr. Elkin said the FFY2018 funds would be at the discretion of NMDOT, but once the funding process is developed and completed in FFY2019, funds could be made available statewide based on a competitive process.

Mr. Sypher noted that these funds have not been programmed for FFY2018 and 2019 and some funds could still be available while NMDOT is developing the application process. He urged the MPO and the entities to continue applying for funds throughout this period so that no funding opportunities are missed. Mr. Sypher said he has been asking how these funds can be applied for and what the current process is for decision-making. Mr. Sypher asked if Staff can find out how to apply for and receive some of the funding that is still being distributed.

Mr. Fillerup reiterated the Technical Committee's desire to know what the process is for getting CMAQ-Flex funds while the competitive process is being developed. He asked Staff to make a similar presentation to the Policy Committee about CMAQ-Flex, explain the Technical Committee discussion, and ask them to request more information from NMDOT on what is happening with these funds between now and FFY2019.

7. RECEIVE A REPORT ON FORMAL TRAINING/DEVELOPMENT FOR TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Mr. Wakan reported that formal trainings for Technical Committee members can be on the overall process, member's roles, or items of technical interest/concern.

Mr. Wakan reported on a road diet workshop presented by FHWA and NMDOT. The workshop included a peer-to-peer exchange and other states presented their road diet efforts. Some of the key points from the workshop were:

- FHWA has a link on their website for road diets where interested parties can go to see the latest innovations and what is trending;
 - o How to evaluate potential locations;
 - o How to market and perform outreach for these types of projects;
 - o Design considerations;
 - o Performance measures (need before and after picture);

- State wants to fund a road diet plan and look at policies to be implemented across the state;
- Best practices of other states:
 - o Trial-based road diet program that tests an area for six months to gather information and feedback – Nebraska
 - o Development of a policy and design manual (draft available) for road diets with FHWA – New Mexico
 - o Implementation of the modern roundabout with a road diet – Oregon and Washington

Mr. Wakan said agencies were encouraged to educate their entities on why road diets could be important in certain regions.

- Be context sensitive;
- Safety features – crash areas, reducing conflicts at intersections, protected island for pedestrians;
- FHWA has a road diet guideline; NMDOT draft is available;
- New average daily traffic (ADT) number of 19,000 is being proposed.

Mr. Elkin commented that the presenter, Tom Walsh, had a 50-year career in engineering in Iowa. He was involved with 120 road diets and only two ever reverted back to the four-lane highway. Fewer accidents and overall improved safety were definite incentives. Mr. Wakan noted also that the presenter was a pioneer in the research that identified and showed that adding travel lanes was actually increasing crashes and that road diets improved safety. Mr. Wakan is intending to bring Mr. Walsh to Farmington in 2017 to speak on road diets to the Technical Committee and interested local planners and officials.

Ms. Lopez commented that the City of Farmington intends to do pre-evaluations on the downtown Main Street corridor as well as post-evaluations. This data is important to be able to show what is working or not, not only from the traffic side but also from the economic development viewpoint. When looking at street upgrades, it is important to collect data prior to the making the changes to determine if, once the upgrades are made, changes can be documented.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Along with the road diet workshop, Mr. Wakan attended the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO).

Mr. Garcia reported that he will be attending the AMPO National Conference in Fort Worth, Texas the week of 10/24-29/16. He plans to attend a session on performance measures and report back to the Technical Committee. Mr. Garcia also attended the APA-New Mexico Conference in Albuquerque at the end of September.

Mr. Wakan stated that there are three or four projects that need to be added to the TIP and STIP. They first need to be ranked and prioritized per the project prioritization plan outlined in the 2040 MTP. Because most of the projects are City of Farmington specific, Mr. Wakan suggested having a Technical and Policy Committee member from the other entities participate in the scoring and ranking to avoid any conflict of interest. Mr. Fillerup

noted that Mr. Sypher, who had stepped out of the meeting, had expressed interest in previous meetings about participating on this scoring committee. It was noted that because the projects to be considered were City of Farmington, it would remove any conflicts by having the other entities review and score the projects. Mr. Watson volunteered to participate as the Technical Committee representative and Mr. Wakan said he would invite one of the Bloomfield Policy Committee members to also participate.

9. REPORTS FROM NMDOT

NMDOT Planning Division – Robin Elkin

Mr. Elkin commented on the final planning rule and the items being mandated by FHWA. He noted that the purpose is to have the requirements that will guide the funding process. The better the MPO prepares or meets the necessary goals, the more likely they are to receive funding. Mr. Elkin encouraged the MPO to take the necessary and continue working on those programs that would put the MPO in a better position to get funding since the funding process takes such a long time.

Ms. Lopez asked what the other MPOs are planning to do about implementing a safety plan and had some safety plans already been completed. Mr. Elkin replied that he could not answer that question, but noted that a safety plan was a combination of many components and elements and many of those are still being defined by NMDOT.

Mr. Fillerup mentioned Senate Bill 8 which included the authorization of \$22,500,000 statewide of state road funds and asked what types of projects were typically funded out of the state road fund. Mr. Elkin said the Planning Division does not deal with the funding processes and he could provide no additional information on this topic. Mr. Fillerup said he would like to know more about the projects impacted by the state road fund. Mr. Wakan mentioned that an "inactive list" was mentioned and Mr. Fillerup added that the list did show those projects that had been deauthorized.

Mr. Fillerup asked Staff to follow-up with Mr. Paul Brasher on whether a meeting of the public works directors, outside of the MPO, to discuss maintenance agreements fell under the requirements open meetings act and necessitated the publishing of a legal notice.

Mr. Watson thought that Staff was going to provide some information on what other states used for their maintenance agreements. Mr. Wakan responded that information from Utah had been e-mailed several days after the September Technical Committee meeting. He is still waiting for information from Arizona and Colorado.

District 5 - Paul Brasher

Mr. Brasher was unable to attend the meeting.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Fillerup introduced Mr. Steven Saavedra, the new Economic Development Director for the City of Aztec as well as the new alternate to the Technical Committee for the Aztec.

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

Mr. Fillerup adjourned the meeting at 12:02 pm



Fran Fillerup, Chair



June Markle, Administrative Aide