



A G E N D A

Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee Meeting

**Executive Conference Room
800 Municipal Dr.
Farmington, New Mexico.**

**April 28, 2011
10:00 a.m.**

AGENDA
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
April 28, 2011 10:00 A.M.

This meeting will be held at Executive Conference Room, Farmington City Hall, 800 Municipal Dr., Farmington, New Mexico.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call meeting to order	
2. Approve the minutes from the March 24, 2011 Technical Committee meeting.	1
3. Receive a report on Census 2010 data and the delineation of Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) and Traffic Analysis Districts (TADs) for the FMPO.	15
4. Receive a status report on Functional Classification change request forms.	17
5. Receive a report from NMDOT. a. District 5 (<i>David Martinez</i>) b. Planning Division (<i>Ray Matthew</i>)	
6. Receive a summary report on the NMDOT State Rail Plan Stakeholder and Public Meeting.	18
7. Information Items a. Actions at the April 21 Policy Committee Meeting b. FY2011 UPWP 3 rd Quarter Report c. Quarterly Newsletter d. MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan Update e. Safe Routes to School Activities f. Other	22
8. Business from: a. Chairman b. Members c. Staff	
9. Business from the floor	
10. Adjournment	

ATTENTION PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: If you are an individual with a disability who is in need of a reader, amplifier, qualified sign language interpreter, or any other form of auxiliary aid or service to attend or participate in the hearing or meeting, please contact the MPO Administrative Aide at the Downtown Center, 100 W Broadway, Farmington, New Mexico or at 505-599-1466 at least one week prior to the meeting or as soon as possible. Public documents, including the agenda and minutes, can be provided in various accessible formats. Please contact the MPO Administrative Aide if a summary or other type of accessible format is needed.

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
March 24, 2011

Technical Members Present: Mike Huber, City of Aztec
Julie Baird, City of Bloomfield
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
Chico Quintana, City of Farmington, Alternate
Dave Keck, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: Nica J. Westerling, City of Farmington

Staff Present: Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide

Staff Absent: Mary L. Holton, MPO Officer
Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner

Also Present: Dave Martinez, NMDOT
Dr. James Henderson, MPO Policy Committee

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Lopez called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

2. **APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 24, 2011 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

Mr. Huber made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2011 Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Quintana seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 8, 2011 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORK SESSION**

Mr. Huber made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 8, 2011 Technical Committee Work Session. Mr. Quintana seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **AMENDMENT #1 TO THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)**

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 15, 2011

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- The Red Apple Transit Study was completed in January 2011 and identified several recommendations to meet future transit needs.
- As an identified work product of the 2035 MTP, Amendment #1 will incorporate the short and long term recommendations identified in the transit study.
- The amendment will also add in maps to the 2035 MTP that illustrate a new route structure for the Red Apple Transit system.
- A formal 30-day public comment period was opened on March 6 and closes on April 8, 2011.

CURRENT WORK

- Revise the Transit Plan in the 2035 MTP based on the short and long term recommendations in the Red Apple Study.

Short-Term Budget Neutral Improvements	Long-Term Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Install more bus stops on local and regional routes ▪ Convert from loop routes to two-way linear routes ▪ Extend all-day service outward to Farmington City limits ▪ Kirtland Bronco Route to serve CR 6100 and San Juan College West ▪ Identify Transfer/hub locations on publicly owned property ▪ Marketing & Performance Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Invest in shelters at new bus stops ▪ Create an Aztec to Bloomfield route ▪ Improve frequencies of routes and provide evening service

BACKUP MATERIAL

- Public notice for Amendment #1 to the 2035 Farmington MPO MTP.
- Revised Transit Plan for the 2035 MTP provided under separate cover (also available on the MPO website).

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee:
 - a. Hold a public hearing on Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP.
 - b. Recommend approval of Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP.

DISCUSSION: Copies of the final draft of the Transit Plan chapter for the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan were distributed and Mr. Delmagori reviewed the amended transit chapter of the MTP with the Technical Committee members and others present.

Page 5-4 -- ridership data updated to include 2010; trends show continued increase;
 Page 5-6 -- new information from LSC study added for detailing greatest transit needs;
 Page 5-10 -- short and long-term recommended improvements;
 Pages 5-11 and 5-12 -- maps of proposed route system;
 Page 5-13 -- updated the section on transit expansion beyond 2020.

The report was received and there were no questions of Mr. Delmagori. Ms. Lopez opened the public hearing on Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP. There were no comments or questions from the public and the public hearing was closed.

ACTION: Mr. Quintana moved to approve Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP. Mr. Keck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. FY2012-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
 Agenda Item**

Subject:	FY2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	March 15, 2011

BACKGROUND

- The Technical Committee developed priority lists by funding source on February 24.
- The MPO Technical Committee held a Work Session on March 8 to review changes to the Unfunded Priority Lists.
- These priorities were submitted to District 5 as they prepare the update to the STIP.

CURRENT WORK

- Final revisions have been made to the TIP.
- A 30-day public comment period closes on April 11.
- A public hearing on the TIP will be held during the Technical Committee meeting on March 24.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Any potential public comments will be incorporated into the final TIP document.
- The STIP will be revised based on the MPO TIP.

ATTACHMENTS

- FY2012- 2017 TIP provided under separate cover (also available on the MPO website).

REMAINING TIP SCHEDULE	
MONTH	ACTION
March 24, 2011	Technical Committee holds public hearing on and recommends adoption of TIP
April 21, 2011	Policy Committee adopts the FY2012-2017 TIP

RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is recommended that the Technical Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Hold a public hearing on the FY 2012-2017 TIP. b. Recommend adoption of the FY 2012-2017 TIP.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori discussed the Regionally Significant and Non-Regionally Significant lists. These lists are the final documents and are a culmination of several months of discussion and editing. Mr. Delmagori asked the Technical Committee members to review the documents one final time. Mr. Martinez asked if the projects were listed by priority by entity. Mr. Delmagori stated they were alphabetized by entity only and that only the Unfunded Priority Lists have been prioritized.

There were no questions on either the Regionally Significant or Non-Regionally Significant List, so Mr. Delmagori proceeded to the Unfunded Project List. Mr. Delmagori then presented the Unfunded Project Lists and explained how each has been broken out by funding category and stated that this approach works for the NMDOT.

Mr. Delmagori stated that on March 8th the Technical Committee held a Work Session to review the Unfunded Project List and to review the priorities within the list. He added that the STIP update gives an opportunity to provide a list of projects that might be programmed into the FY2012-2015 STIP. The Technical Committee focused on developing local projects, understanding that the NMDOT would be focusing on the US 64 project. With US 64 progressing, the MPO began looking at the projects that had been identified in the long-range planning process. Through discussions, it became apparent that a priority list needed to be created based on both local and NMDOT needs. One of the lingering questions was how to find a balance between these local and NMDOT needs to create the MPO priority list. Mr. Delmagori noted that with funding limitations from the Federal level on down and the impact of the US 64 project on other projects identified by the MPO, these other needs will be pushed further back. Mr. Delmagori stated there needs to be discussion on what are the near-term priorities for this area. The MPO should consider the pros and cons if some of the US 64 funding be allocated differently throughout the MPO area. These questions and discussion items were brought to the Policy Committee meeting last month when the Unfunded Project Lists were discussed. The Policy Committee tabled any action until the Technical Committee could readdress these questions and concerns with NMDOT.

Mr. Martinez stated that the amount of funding given to a particular entity is not a fixed or guaranteed amount, and programmed or reprogrammed funds are not available on an annual basis. NMDOT's investment in the US 64 project is significant and that investment started back when the corridor study was conducted in the early 2000's. Initially Federal monies were used to develop the plan for the US 64 improvements. At one point that corridor was considered the most important corridor within the MPO region. The NMDOT supported that idea and still does. Mr. Martinez

continued that the investment in this project has to stay in place. There is a commitment within the District that once a corridor improvement project has begun, it must be completed. The FHWA does not allow for programmed funds to be diverted to other projects or for construction to be interrupted on a corridor project once it has started since it can lead to problems with FHWA. Mr. Martinez said these issues need to be kept in mind when developing the program for the next few years. Mr. Martinez said that NMDOT is currently in a position of having to phase projects and do dual-year funding to get a particular phase complete. What's been done in prior years and what is being done now with the US 64 project is to take \$10,000,000 in one year, followed by \$10,000,000 the next year, for a total project cost of \$20,000,000. Mr. Martinez stated this is a significant project and the NMDOT will no longer be able to do project phases of this magnitude. Using US 64 as an example, the STIP shows Phase 3 of this project being funded in three fiscal years:

\$500,000 for 2011 - ROW acquisition and finalization of design plans
\$5,500,000 for 2012 - Construction
\$2,500,000 for 2013 -Construction

Phase 3 has a project total of \$8,500,000 as opposed to the \$29,000,000 identified for Phase 2 (also phased over two years). Mr. Martinez added that funding sources are dwindling for the entire program, and because of this, approximately only two miles of roadway will be constructed (from mile marker 59 to 62).

Mr. Martinez added that NMDOT hopes to program another phase of US 64 in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. Mr. Martinez has spoken to Mr. Gallegos about possibly funding a single year instead of doing dual-year funding, and allowing any additional funding to be used elsewhere within the MPO. Mr. Gallegos' concern with this was that by limiting the funding, the phasing would be shortened and would result in many more phases being needed to complete a project. Mr. Martinez said the goal is to keep the project moving at two-mile increments, with completion of the US 64 corridor expected to be in 2019. He added that the NMDOT has a long-term investment and commitment in completing this corridor. There is room to do other projects within the MPO and that is why this priority list is so important. The smaller projects (\$2,000,000-\$3,000,000) have a greater chance of being funded than projects costing over \$10,000,000. Mr. Martinez stated large projects would be difficult to fund even if it was done as a dual year project, especially when considered in conjunction with the funds being spent on the US 64 project. He noted that the FMPO is in competition with the needs of the District as well as Santa Fe MPO and the other RPOs.

Mr. Martinez said he didn't yet know how or if the new commissioner from this area (Mr. Bruce Mathews) might affect how District 5 programs the STIP. Mr. Martinez stated he believes the FMPO has been very fortunate in the last five years by getting \$6,000,000-\$8,000,000 per year for the US 64 corridor and the other projects in the STIP.

NMDOT anticipates being able to program additional projects, but they will be projects of a smaller scale. Mr. Martinez said the District has received priority lists from the Santa Fe MPO and all the RPOs and is now waiting for the FMPO list. Once the FMPO list is received, the NMDOT can begin reviewing the entire District's needs and identify what the STIP should include. The District has identified their own project

needs of close to \$1,000,000,000. Their process of prioritizing these needs is to first develop a reasonable project scope. Mr. Martinez said that some of these projects are in the \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 category, but rarely higher. One of the District's priorities is pavement preservation on NM 516. He stated that there was, at one time, a corridor study where needed improvements were identified. The City of Aztec, at the time, did not support those results and the corridor study went away. It would be difficult to now resurrect a major project on NM 516. Mr. Martinez added it appears the major priority is the East Arterial and he believes there are some opportunities there since investments have been made by NMDOT for that project.

Mr. Martinez reiterated that NMDOT is committed to US 64 due to the corridor study investment and potential ramifications if funds are diverted from this project. District 5 expects to program Phase 4 into the STIP update.

Mr. Delmagori asked if NMDOT projects or NMDOT-lead projects were included in the prioritized lists from the other MPOs or were those separate from their local priorities. Mr. Martinez commented that the Santa Fe MPO has local priorities that happen to be state facilities such as I-25. Mr. Martinez stated that most of the RPO projects, however, are not NMDOT-led projects.

Mr. Delmagori stated that the MPO list was developed showing projects where money has been spent on design and engineering. At what point does work done by the entities fit in with work to be done by the NMDOT and, ultimately, how should the MPO establish this list. He asked if FMPO submits their list as is, without US 64, is this then compared to the lists submitted by the Santa Fe MPO, the RPOs, and the District. Mr. Martinez said yes it is.

Mr. Delmagori asked what type of criteria is used to select the projects. Mr. Martinez stated that the NMDOT is given targets and then they evaluate based on needs and urgency. It's not a formal process. They use a wish list and try to satisfy every planning agency. Mr. Martinez said they juggle things and look for smaller projects because then they can get more done with the available dollars. He added that he believed the FMPO has been fortunate to receive \$12,000,000 each year which is approximately 30% of the District's total funds. Mr. Martinez added that a NMDOT project benefits everyone in a particular area. He commented on a bridge replacement project the NMDOT is doing on NM170 as well as a project completed last year in Aztec on Light Plant Road. Mr. Martinez stated the District knows there are significant needs in this area and they try to push to receive more safety funds. When completion of a larger project is not possible, the District tries to allocate these safety funds to address smaller needs, such as the Apache St. intersection improvements in Farmington, the Light Plant Road/NM516 intersection improvement in Aztec, and the safety study for NM173. Mr. Martinez stated that these are ways in which the NMDOT tries to address needs that they learn about. He added that he anticipates there being more pavement preservation projects for this area. Mr. Martinez stated District representatives will be meeting with Mr. Matthews, this area's new Transportation Commissioner, on April 7, 2011 to introduce him to the District and what they do.

Ms. Lopez said that a question had been raised about the US 64 corridor study, how long ago it had been taking to complete, and would the study need to be updated with new information and data. Mr. Martinez said he thought the study was completed in

2006, and that once the corridor study and the environmental document are completed and construction has started there would not be a need to revisit the study or the environmental document as long as there is continued progress on the project. The commitment to the project was made at the time of the study, different alternatives were discussed at that time, and the consensus is what is now being built.

Ms. Lopez stated that dynamics in this area have changed, needs have shifted, and perhaps other priorities could help the traffic situation in other ways. Mr. Martinez said that recent traffic data shows traffic is increasing on US 64. The goal of the US 64 project is provide an improvement that will stimulate business and provide access for businesses to utilize available lands. The investment is there and he believes the benefits will also be there for a very long time. He believes this area will grow into the US 64 project and take advantage of what has been done.

Ms. Lopez asked what the Policy Committee is now expecting from the Technical Committee. Mr. Delmagori stated that the direction given to Staff from the Policy Committee was to have the District speak with Technical Committee members to hear their thoughts on how the MPO's list of identified projects related to what the District was looking for and then determine how to compile those together in a priority list that the Policy Committee can take action on.

Ms. Lopez asked if it was necessary to have the NMDOT projects on the MPO priority list. Mr. Martinez asked if Mr. Delmagori would review the lists so he knew what projects were being referred to as NMDOT projects. Mr. Delmagori stated that none of the US 64 phases are on the Unfunded Project List because this list focuses on local projects. Mr. Martinez asked if there were any NMDOT projects on the Unfunded Project List. Mr. Delmagori said no, and added that NMDOT projects that have been programmed are shown on the Regional Significant Project List. Mr. Martinez recommended the Technical Committee revisit the projects programmed for 2013. Mr. Delmagori stated that Phase 3 of US 64 is on page 9 of the Regional Significant Project List.

Mr. Martinez stated the group had discussed the significance of keeping the US 64 project on the list, but that where it is ranked is not of importance. The \$8,500,000 project cost shown for this project in 2012 would complete two more miles of the project. Mr. Delmagori said that beyond Phase 3 is where the MPO is struggling to see how that project fits into future plans. Mr. Keck said that at prior Technical Committee meetings, members had referred to the completed portions of US 64 as the "bookends" and, because of some of the other pressing needs of the county, wondered if once these "bookends" were fully completed, could we back off on construction of US 64 and take care of the other pavement preservation projects within the county. Mr. Keck added that there are roads in the area that are fixing to fall apart. Mr. Martinez stated that he and Mr. Miguel Gabaldon are aware of the problems and are trying to address the issues. Mr. Martinez said Phase 4 of US 64 is programmed for 2014 and 2015 with preliminary numbers of \$4,000,000 in 2014 and \$5,000,000 in 2015 that will complete another two-mile stretch of the roadway. Ms. Lopez asked how many miles needed to be completed. Mr. Martinez said he didn't know the number of miles, but believed there were nine total phases to the project and that was why the project was expected to take until 2019 to complete the corridor.

Dr. Henderson asked about a bill in the legislature for \$100,000,000 for highway maintenance. Mr. Martinez said that bill had been defeated, but could be brought up in a special session in September. Mr. Martinez said he thought there was going to be some funding for pavement preservation, but he would have to do some research on the subject. Dr. Henderson asked if the projected money was Federal money, and Mr. Martinez said that it was all Federal money. He added that currently there is no Federal funding bill. Mr. Martinez said that the President's office is recommending a substantial increase in the funding bill for transportation projects which could help everyone, but that Congress was not of the same opinion. A funding bill is expected to come about by September 2011 and the NMDOT assumes the same level of funding as previously. Dr. Henderson asked if there was any discussion about getting more funds from the State. Mr. Martinez stated that the NMDOT currently gets no funds from the State's general fund and, although there has been discussion, the Governor does not support raising taxes which would be the only way to get additional monies.

Mr. Martinez asked if this was the only project on the list that is a NMDOT project. Mr. Delmagori stated this is the only one he is aware of. The rest on the Unfunded Project List are local projects seeking funding. Mr. Martinez recommended the US 64 project remain on the list even if it is shown in the back as unfunded and is not prioritized. Mr. Martinez said that it could even be shown as a lower priority than other projects because the entities have explained why it has a lower priority. Ms. Lopez said that this would be Phases 4, 5, and 6 since the others have been funded. Mr. Martinez agreed and said that the others, including Phase 4, have been programmed.

The group discussed funding of the different phases of the project: Phase 3 is in the STIP and Phase 4 has been preliminarily identified for FY2014 and 2015. Ms. Lopez asked then if Phases 4-9 should be shown on our Unfunded List. Mr. Delmagori clarified that within the timeframe of the STIP only Phases 4 and 5 would be listed. Mr. Huber stated that we need to make clear on our list that these projects are weighted very differently than those proposed by the MPO. Mr. Delmagori agreed that this was part of the discussion and where did the Technical Committee want these to fall.

Mr. Delmagori will be summarizing this discussion for the Policy Committee and asked if the Technical Committee members had any additional recommendations. Mr. Martinez said that the purpose behind prioritizing is to assign a weight to all of the projects. He recommended we not emphasize any more or any less where US 64 falls as a result of its being a NMDOT project versus a local entity project as this will automatically be taken care of in the priority list. Ms. Lopez said this could be shown at the bottom of our list and Mr. Huber stated this had been his point.

Discussion continued on where the US 64 project should be shown and Mr. Delmagori stated it should be shown on the STP list which is for all road projects in general. The MPO list includes a wide range of projects and costs due to the fact that targets will change. Mr. Martinez said this prioritization of projects was the type of help the NMDOT needed from the entities. He added that at fiscal year closeout some projects may be added in at the last minute if they have all of the preliminary work done and are just waiting for construction funding. At the end of the fiscal year, the general office may call the District and say they have \$1,900,000 and ask if there are any projects that are ready to go. Mr. Martinez said that with the prioritized list, he knows his office cannot fund the \$2,600,000 project which is listed as the number two

priority project, but the third priority project which is \$1,800,000 can be funded. Mr. Martinez said his office would rather fund projects based on an established priority and not randomly select one. He added that there are opportunities to make this happen, but that having a project ready to go at fiscal year-end is extremely important.

Ms. Lopez asked how important it was then to have the US 64 unfunded phases in the priority list. Mr. Martinez said it was still important, but it could be shown as #1 or #10 because there is a commitment to get the project done and it is going to be funded.

Ms. Baird had asked about the new census data and if that information would be used to update data to see how closely the numbers for Bloomfield and Aztec would affect the traffic to Farmington. Mr. Delmagori stated these activities will most likely happen a year or so from now to allow the Census Bureau information to work its way down from the State and County levels to the more specific city data level. As the information becomes available, the MPO will update the traffic models and the tables of information and complete an entire validation calibration of the traffic model at that time.

Mr. Martinez stated that last year, their Transportation Commissioner was given close to \$1,000,000 to use where he deemed appropriate. If the new Transportation Commissioner for this area is given that opportunity, the MPO needs to be in a position to let him know that there is a project need, and the Commissioner will have the flexibility to make that monetary commitment. Mr. Martinez said this could happen almost every year and that the Commissioners are involved in MAP decisions and other local government funding issues. The new Transportation Commissioner from this area, Mr. Bruce Mathews, owns a local trucking company as well as other interests. Mr. Martinez stated when he meets with Mr. Mathews on April 7th he will encourage him to be in tune with the MPO and will give him a schedule of both Policy and Technical Committee meetings so he is aware of when those meetings take place. Mr. Martinez added that he had never seen a Transportation Commissioner at these meetings, but added if they don't participate how will they learn the MPO's needs and become involved in helping to formulate the plans and program the priorities. The NMDOT needs the local MPO and RPO information in order to develop their program and spend the \$27,000,000 each year (which was \$48,000,000 only five years ago).

Mr. Delmagori summarized the discussion. The Technical Committee needs to add Phases 4 and 5 of the US 64 project to the Unfunded Project List. They also need to determine where on the list to add this information so it can then be presented to the Policy Committee next month. As already discussed, this project can be added either to the general listing or to the STP section. Mr. Keck asked if it mattered which category it was added into. Mr. Martinez recommended it be added to the STP section since this is a smaller list and the project is currently active. Mr. Quintana asked about Mr. Martinez's comment about extra money available at the end of the year and looking for the most ready project on the list. Mr. Martinez stated that the other entities use project readiness as major criteria in their ranking process. Ms. Lopez stated that project readiness was discussed when the Technical Committee ranked the projects. Mr. Delmagori agreed that was why the list included projects with a range of dollar amounts because the year-end closeout monies are frequently only a few

million. Mr. Martinez said these funds could be as much as \$10,000,000, but that a large project like that is rarely sitting on the shelf ready to go.

Ms. Lopez asked if there were any other questions or comments, and then opened the Public Hearing and asked for comments. Mr. Martinez strongly recommended again that since the US 64 project is already in the STIP, it be shown on the MPO's STP listing rather than in the general listing. Ms. Lopez closed the Public Hearing. Mr. Delmagori stated that a motion does not need to be made on this agenda item, but rather asked the Technical Committee to give direction to Staff to bring to the Policy Committee.

Mr. Keck recommended that Phases 4 and 5 of the US 64 project be put into the TIP priority list; Ms. Baird added that it be put under the STP section as Items #8 and #9. Mr. Huber stated concerns that by adding this to the STP project list as items #8 and #9, they might align with the NMDOT's #1 and #2 priorities which is the US 64 project, so if put on the general list, our STP projects stand a better chance of being funded. Mr. Martinez added that the only reason US 64 is a high priority for the NMDOT is that it is currently an active project with a major commitment to be completed. He added that it doesn't matter where this project is added the MPO list because the NMDOT knows the commitment is to get the project done. As long as the project is on the list it doesn't matter where it aligns with our priorities because it has a commitment to be completed. Ms. Lopez asked that since the US 64 project is committed to be completed and that the MPO project list doesn't come into play with that particular project, that the US 64 project will move forward whatever the MPO priorities are. Mr. Martinez said yes, that was correct. Ms. Lopez then confirmed that it didn't really matter where the project was on our list.

Ms. Lopez restated the recommendation to put Phases 4 and 5 of the US 64 project under the STP section of the Unfunded Project List and asked for agreement from the Technical Committee members. The Technical Committee members agreed. Mr. Delmagori will make the necessary changes to add Phases 4 and 5 of the US 64 project as Projects #8 and #9 on the STP section of the Unfunded Project List. That recommendation will be brought to the Policy Committee meeting in a few weeks for discussion and their review.

Mr. Delmagori asked the Technical Committee members for a motion to recommend adoption of the FY2012-2017 TIP.

ACTION: Mr. Keck moved to recommend adoption of the FY2012-2017 TIP. Ms. Baird seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FY2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Agenda Item

Subject:	FY2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 15, 2011

BACKGROUND

- The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the fiscal year work plan for the MPO, covering work activities from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- Staff reviewed the draft UPWP with both the Technical and Policy Committees in February and March.
- The FY2012 UPWP budget has been developed based on estimates from NMDOT.

CURRENT and ANTICIPATED WORK

- Revisions to the draft list of activities, products, and timeframes have been made.
- FHWA PL funding is estimated to be about \$175,213 for FY2012.
- Staff anticipates \$23,000 in FTA 5303 funding for FY2012.
- Staff will review the final draft FY2012 UPWP with the Technical Committee on March 24.
- The MPO will seek approval of the annual work plan on April 21, 2011.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft FY2012 UPWP (provided under separate cover to committee members and entity staff; document also available on MPO website).

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee recommend approval of the FY2012 UPWP.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori reviewed the entire FY2012 UPWP document for the Technical Committee members. Mr. Martinez reminded everyone that SAFETEA-LU has expired and recommended changes be made to this section to note a brief history of the program. Mr. Delmagori said that could easily be done as a housekeeping item.

ACTION: Ms. Baird moved to recommend approval of the FY2012 Unified Planning Work Program with the discussed changes made to the SAFETEA-LU section of the UPWP. Mr. Huber seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. RECEIVE A REPORT FROM NMDOT

DISCUSSION: Mr. Martinez stated the Federal government has mandated that 50% of their ARRA Projects must be completed by September 2011. There are four projects in this area, all of which are close to being finished. Mr. Quintana asked if a project with

both MAP and ARRA funds could be closed out if all the ARRA funds were spent and accounted for. Mr. Martinez said that if a project has multiple funding sources, the entire project must be finished before it can be closed out. Ms. Lopez asked of the four projects in this area, were they all multi-funded. Mr. Martinez said that only two of the four were multi-funded: one for City of Bloomfield and one for the City of Farmington.

Mr. Martinez again mentioned the NMDOT meeting with the new Transportation Commissioner Bruce Mathews on April 7th at the NMDOT Bloomfield Project Office. Mr. Martinez recommended the Technical Committee invite him to their next meeting in April. Mr. Martinez will send Mr. Mathews e-mail address to Mr. Delmagori.

Mr. Quintana asked about the new requirements to get projects on the STIP list and an upcoming presentation that gives the specifics of those requirements. Mr. Martinez asked if Mr. Phil Gallegos had presented the PEL program. Mr. Delmagori said the presentation had been given last August and Mr. Quintana said that during the August meeting it was mentioned that a follow-up meeting would be presented. Mr. Martinez will check with Mr. Ray Matthew to see if there is to be another presentation scheduled. Mr. Martinez stated that the PEL Program will be the new standard for project development to provide better guidance to entities as far as getting projects written. He recommended adding phasing to our project listing (i.e.: the Bergin Lane Project) and asked if that project has been started. Ms. Baird said design had been started, but she only had 60% funding on the E. Blanco Bridge project design. It is good to know that additional funding to finish the design phase could be received which would make the project ready to go. Ms. Baird added that having a checklist related to the environmental would be helpful. Mr. Martinez will get more information to the Technical Committee about the PEL Program.

ACTION: The report was received.

8. RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS PUBLIC MEETING FOR THE STATE RAIL PLAN

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	NMDOT State Rail Plan
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 15, 2011

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- On October 28, 2010, Bill Craven from NMDOT's Transit and Rail Division presented the schedule and anticipated outcomes for the Statewide Rail Plan.
- NMDOT is in the data collection stage of the process.
- There was considerable local interest expressed by various stakeholders to participate in the process.

CURRENT WORK

- MPO staff is coordinating a kick-off meeting with local stakeholders and the public to be held on March 30, 2011.
- Staff has sent invitations to identified individuals, groups, and organizations for the kick-off meeting.
- The kick-off meeting is intended to develop rail strategies for San Juan County that can be incorporated into the Statewide Rail Plan.
- Input and recommendations collected at the meeting will be provided to NMDOT.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Hold the kick-off meeting.
- Develop local rail strategies.
- Provide information to NMDOT Rail.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee receive a report on the local stakeholders meeting for the State Rail Plan.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori reported that the kickoff stakeholder and public meeting on the NMDOT Statewide Rail Plan is scheduled for March 30, 2011 from 3:00-5:00 p.m. at the Farmington Civic Center. Staff sent out invitations to a wide range of local elected officials, economic groups, oil and gas industry representatives, and have a confirmed response from 20 individuals to date. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss what the Rail Plan is about, what the NMDOT is hoping to achieve, and to give San Juan County residents an opportunity to identify, needs, projects, and strategies for this area. Mr. William Craven of the NMDOT Transit & Rail Division is expected to attend.

ACTION: The report was received.

9. INFORMATION ITEMS

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	March 15, 2011

INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. **MPO Quarterly Meeting.** Staff attended the statewide MPO Quarterly meeting in Albuquerque on March 22.
- b. **Safe Routes to School Program Update.** Debra Mayeux has been hired as the new Safe Routes to School Champion for the Farmington Walk and Roll Program. A summary of the latest activities and events will be provided at the meeting.
- c. **Major Thoroughfare Plan Update.** The MPO is holding three public meetings (March 31, April 14, and April 28) to seek public input on proposed regional road connections to the Northeast Farmington area.
- d. **Other.**

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori clarified that Ms. Debra Mayeux is the new coordinator for the Safe Routes to School Program.

Mr. Delmagori reported that the Farmington City Council directed Staff to organize a series of public meetings to gather input from the residents and property owners in the Northeast Farmington area on the Major Thoroughfare Plan. These meetings will focus on the northern Farmington area and how it would interconnect with the proposed northern route identified by the MPO.

Staff will prepare a report on the available census data for presentation at the next Technical Committee meeting.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

DISCUSSION: Mr. Quintana offered to forward information to other Technical Committee members on a free LTAP training class on slope staking being hosted in Shiprock on April 7th. Mr. Martinez added that Mr. Ray Matthew can help to get names added to the contact list for these trainings.

11. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

DISCUSSION: There was no other business from the floor.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Lopez adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Cindy Lopez, Chair

June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	2010 Census and TAZ/TAD Delineation
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, Associate MPO Planner
Date:	April 20, 2011

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- State and local Census figures have been made available by the Census Bureau.
- As part of the 2010 Census and the American Community Survey the Farmington MPO has been asked to participate in the Census Bureau's 2010 Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) Program.
- The Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) Program is a specialized program used for delineating TAZs and Traffic Analysis Districts (TADs) in support of the Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP).
- TADs are a new, higher-level geographic entity for traffic analysis. TADs are built by aggregating TAZs.
- The TAZ Program is designed to allow MPOs and State DOTs to define zonal systems and geographic summary layers suitable to their planning.

CURRENT WORK

- MPO staff has downloaded the TAZ MAF/TIGER Partnership Software (MTPS) and all program documentation.
- MPO Staff is currently evaluating the proposed 2010 TAZ and TAD boundaries based on 2010 census tabulation blocks, block groups and tracts, to ensure that all the demographic requirements are met.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Staff will make adjustments to the proposed 2010 TAZs.
- Staff will create new TADs boundaries.
- Staff will provide information to the US Census Bureau within the three month timeframe.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee receive a report on the 2010 Census and the TAZ/TADs Delineation for the FMPO.

State and Local Census Figures - 2000 and 2010

Entity	2000 Population	2010 Population	Change in Pop.	% Change
New Mexico	1,819,046	2,059,179	240,133	13.20%
San Juan County	113,801	130,044	16,243	14.30%
Farmington	37,844	45,877	8,033	21.20%
Aztec	6,378	6,763	385	6.00%
Bloomfield	6,417	8,112	1,695	26.40%

TAZ and TAD Delineation

(source: information provided by CTPP and the Census Bureau)

What is the Purpose of TAZ/TAD Delineation?

In support of the Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP) the U.S. DOT and the U.S. Census Bureau will obtain census 2010 block equivalencies for Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) from Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and State Departments of Transportation in 2011. The 2010 TAZ geography will then be added to the Census Bureau's TIGER file and these equivalency files will be used by the ACSO for the CTPP 5-year tabulation (2006 through 2010 ACS records).

Right now, ACS 3-year tabulations are limited to geographic areas with 20,000 population or over. This results in a "swiss cheese" of data availability when examining counties and places. If there were a nationwide coverage of geographic units that met this population threshold, it could potentially be used as an ACS 3-year tabulation geography, either for ACS standard products, or for future CTPP.

What are the thresholds for the TAZs/TADs?

The recommendation for TAZs is to use 600 residents or workers as a guideline, but it is not a firm threshold. This is because the ACS sample size is about one-half the sample of the Census 2000 Long Form, even after 5 years of data collection. This means that for an area with 600 (weighted) people, only about 20 unweighted records are being tabulated.

For the TADs, the recommendation is 20,000 as a threshold for residence population, as the goal is to define a nationwide coverage for which future ACS 3-year tabulations could be possible.

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	Functional Classification Request Forms
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	April 20, 2011

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- On January 25, 2011 Staff met with NMDOT to discuss and review traffic counts and the MPO federally classified road network.
- Staff has provided NMDOT with a GIS layer indicating all of the federally classified road sections that were not in their geo-data base.
- Staff discussed the possibility of helping NMDOT update their thoroughfare plan for the MPO region and submitting requests for reclassification and/or adding roadways to the classification system.

CURRENT WORK

- MPO staff has reviewed the MPO Major T-Plan and has created templates to submit to NMDOT for roadways that meet classification criteria.
- The road classifications for existing roads have been placed into the reclassification templates for consideration by NMDOT.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Staff will meet with member entities to review templates and help to facilitate the reclassification requests.
- Staff will provide templates to member entities for completion.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee receive a status report on the functional classification change request forms.

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	NMDOT State Rail Plan
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	April 20, 2011

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- MPO staff coordinated a kick-off meeting with local stakeholders and the public on March 30, 2011.
- Presentations were given by NMDOT Rail Division and Margret McDaniel from SJDS.
- Staff facilitated a public question and answer session.

CURRENT WORK

- Staff collected input and recommendations at the public meeting and issued a meeting summary.
- Staff will consider input received from stakeholder groups and begin to develop rail strategies for San Juan County that can be incorporated into the Statewide Rail Plan.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- The MPO will coordinate additional stakeholder public meetings as development of State Rail Plan continues.
- Develop local rail strategies.
- Provide additional local input and information to NMDOT Rail.

ATTACHMENTS

- The summary of comments from the March 30 stakeholder meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee receive a summary report on the State Rail Plan Stakeholder and Public Meeting.

NMDOT State Rail Plan Stakeholder and Public Meeting Summary of Public Comments

March 30, 2011

3pm – 5pm

Farmington Civic Center

Overview

Joe Delmagori with the Farmington MPO opened the meeting with a brief explanation of the MPO and how the development of the State Rail Plan streamlines with the long range plan adopted by the MPO. He described the purpose of the meeting was to gather input on the County's needs for rail service. He concluded by stating the various stakeholders in the County have a great opportunity to provide comments to NMDOT on the ways rail could benefit many businesses and sectors here in San Juan County.

NMDOT State Rail Plan Presentation

Bill Craven with NMDOT Rail Bureau spoke about the purpose of the Rail Plan being to set forth policy on freight and passenger rail. The Plan will list priority projects identified from around the state and will present strategies for enhancing rail service. The Plan is a requirement of the Federal Railroad Administration and is the mechanism for investing federal funding for railroad projects.

Mr. Craven presented a map of rail lines throughout the state of New Mexico and highlighted the fact that no rail exists in San Juan County. He explained the process of developing the plan, which includes creating a vision statement, identifying rail projects and establishing priorities, determining strategies for service improvements and supporting economic growth, stakeholder outreach, and public input. A draft of the Plan is expected to be completed in the summer of 2011.

SJEDS Rail Initiatives

Margaret McDaniel with SJEDS briefly summarized previous work done by her organization to gauge interest in rail for San Juan County. SJEDS had distributed a survey to all types of area businesses asking how rail would be used for importing and exporting materials and if rail would provide new opportunities for the business. She mentioned that State Senator Bill Sharer wrote a report that gave a history of rail in the county and the services it offered to several industries.

Open Discussion – Public Comments

Mr. Delmagori then opened the meeting to general discussion and public comment. He stated that the participants should consider the following key topics during the discussion: Local interest and need for rail, goals for the Rail Plan, connections to economic development, and funding options.

- Is there an option to have shared rail for both passenger and freight? The focus needs to be on freight rail and not passenger. Freight rail would encourage economic development for the local communities, and the State as a whole could potentially see positive returns. Passenger rail is not a revenue driving source and is heavily subsidized.

- Although initial construction costs are huge (\$10,000,000 per mile), freight rail is an important form of freight transportation because of the minimal cost to maintain once the line is in place. It is also the most efficient way of moving commodities.
- NAPI tried to work a deal with BNSF to bring rail to them, but would have been required to provide a 100 car load (unit train). The unit train is the most efficient train load, however some operators have backed off of that requirement due to the recession. Could we combine local industry needs together to meet a 100-railcar requirement?
- Freight provides a better return on investment because it is more efficient.
 - Products brought in and products brought out of an area
- We need to know if service providers (BNSF & Union Pacific) are on board with having a rail line in San Juan County.
- Are there current instances where a freight train line would run passenger cars simultaneously?
 - NMDOT indicated that most freight lines no longer offer combined services. This doesn't, however, prohibit the use of the line by both freight and passenger trains
- The area needs to consider what will be hauled out of this area.
 - We import items such as new cars and building materials, yet what products do we need to create for export so that rail cars do not leave empty
 - Products to export allow for a more efficient and profitable system
- Trucks are tearing up US 550 and other state highways
 - If we get freight onto rail, it should reduce impact on highways, help extend the life of the roads, and reduce maintenance costs
- Are there limits to what rail cars can bring in?
 - Rail cars are dedicated to a product/commodity (i.e.: cannot haul coal in and milk back out)
- We need to think regionally beyond San Juan County.
 - Create a rail link between I-70 and I-40 by way of Shiprock
 - Rail should serve all major regional cities: Farmington, Aztec, Bloomfield, Shiprock, Durango and Cortez, Colorado, and communities in southeast Utah
 - The Farmington area should be a direct line and not just a spur line
- Does rail justify the industry or does industry justify rail?
- What type of economic development do we want for this area?
 - We haul in, but what are we going to haul out
- Right now, the cost of building is high because all freight has to be brought in by trucks.
 - Twizzler factory and auto re-manufacturer left area because it became too expensive to truck in supplies and truck out the finished product
- Most railroad companies own their own track.
- Have any studies been done where road and rail are planned at the same time?
 - This could simply rights-of-way and other access issues
- Is light rail less costly?
 - There is a significant difference between freight rail and light rail, which is a type of public transportation specific to urban and metropolitan areas
 - Light rail track cannot be used for freight
- Other than Surface Transportation Funds or other sources that directly affect roadway funds, has the State identified other funding sources.
 - The Rail Runner was built using GRIP funds that were a dedicated state bonding source. These funds were in direct competition to other surface transportation projects
 - GRIP bond service comes from three sources: (1) unobligated federal funds in the state road fund; (2) proceeds from taxes and fees into the state road fund that are not pledged to bond payments; and (3) taxes and fees pledged directly to the highway infrastructure fund (GRIP)

- The Federal government has some other low interest loan programs that can be used but they are not aware of any funds that would not be in direct competition with roadways
- Is cost sharing an option?
 - Many eastern states do, but the anti-donation clause in New Mexico prevents this option for the state
 - In order to avoid this problem, the State purchased the rail line for the Rail Runner entirely and leases out time to other rail lines
 - The State is prohibited from loaning money to the railroad companies
- We need to ask ourselves: what can we bear, a badly maintained highway system or a lack of rail?
- What options do we have in terms of right-of way (ROW)?
 - Pipeline ROWs have serious potential safety concerns and grade issues
 - There might be available ROW with NMDOT state roads
- Has the State looked at the old proposal to have a Lee Ranch extension come through Bloomfield?
 - That line was the first 40 miles of the Star Lake Line proposal that failed to be completed due to some ROW issues
- In conjunction with private industry, SJEDS has some initiatives pending.
- If rail can take freight transport off of NMDOT roads, would the state be willing to pay for rail?
 - Can maintenance cost of roads factor into this plan?
 - Potential savings in maintenance costs of roads would be a factor in conducting a cost-benefit analysis of a rail project
 - There should be a balance between cost of constructing rail and how much it would reduce the maintenance cost of roads because the weight of freight is being hauled in by rail instead
 - We need to look at the inter-connectivity of all transportation modes
- What is the state looking to achieve from this Plan?
 - The Plan will guide public investment in rail
 - The Plan will establish priorities and strategies for service improvements
- Can a local tax that sunsets after a certain amount of time be used to leverage federal funds?
- Will a list of priorities result from the Plan?
 - NMDOT's consultant team is doing basic cost/benefit analyses to help with priorities
 - San Juan County will be in the plan, but local stakeholders need to work with SJEDS and the MPO to ensure their priorities are made known
 - Does HUB Zone factor into the selection of priorities?

Conclusion

Mr. Delmagori thanked those in attendance for their input. He mentioned that once completed the meeting summary would be issued by MPO staff to those who signed in. He stated the possibility of calling another stakeholder public meeting as development of State Rail Plan continued.

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	April 20, 2011

INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. **Actions at the April 21 Policy Committee meeting.** Staff will discuss action taken by the FMPO Policy Committee on Amendment #1 to the 2035 MTP, the FY2012-2017 TIP, the FY 2012 UPWP, and the MPO Self Certification.
- b. **FY2011 UPWP 3rd Quarter Report.** The quarterly report for the 3rd quarter of FY2011 was prepared and submitted on April 20, 2011 to the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT). It is available on the MPO website.
- c. **Quarterly Newsletter.** The current newsletter is available on the MPO website.
- d. **MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan Update.** At the request of the Farmington City Council staff has held two of a series of three public meetings in the Northeast Farmington Area to discuss the impacts of the MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan to that area of the City of Farmington. The last is scheduled for April 28.
- e. **Safe Routes to School Program Activities.** Student arrival counts have been taken at the participating schools during April.
- f. **Other.**