

**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**

<b>Subject:</b>	FFY2016-2021 TIP Amendment #4
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	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.
- **20<sup>th</sup> 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.

20<sup>th</sup> 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

<b>Subject:</b>	2017 Annual Meeting Schedule
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

<b>Subject:</b>	Status of TIP Projects
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	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"> <li>▪ Local Agreement Status (ARF)</li> <li>▪ ROW Certification</li> <li>▪ Design Completion 30 - 60 - 90%</li> <li>▪ Environmental Certification</li> <li>▪ Utilities Certification</li> <li>▪ Railroad Certification</li> <li>▪ Archeology Certification</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ITS/Sys ENG Certification</li> <li>▪ Public Involvement Certification</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

#### CURRENT WORK

- Top Regional Priority Projects
  - 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

- 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**

<b>Subject:</b>	FFY2017-2018 UPWP Amendment #1
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 are attached separately.

#### ACTION ITEM

- 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

<b>Subject:</b>	Information Items
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	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