M I N U T E S
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 17, 2011

Policy Members Present:	Lynne Raner, City of Bloomfield, Alternate Dan Darnell, City of Farmington Gayla McCulloch, City of Farmington Dr. Jim Henderson, San Juan County
Policy Members Absent:	Gene Current, City of Aztec Pat Lucero, City of Bloomfield
Technical Committee Members Present:	Julie Baird, City of Bloomfield
Staff Present:	Mary L. Holton, MPO Officer Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide
Staff Absent:	None
Also Present:	David Fuqua, Bloomfield City Manager Larry Hathaway, San Juan County

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Henderson called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 20, 2011 POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Darnell made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 20, 2011 Policy Committee meeting. Ms. Raner seconded the motion. Motion was passed unanimously.

3. FY2011-2016 TIP AMENDMENT #3

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	FY2011-2016 TIP Amendment #3
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	March 9, 2011

BACKGROUND
▪ On February 6, 2011 the Farmington MPO advertised Amendment #3 to the FY2011-FY2016 Transportation Improvement Program. ▪ The amendment modifies funding to Phase II of the US 64 Farmington to Bloomfield project. ▪ A public hearing on Amendment #3 was held during the February 24, 2011 Technical Committee meeting. ▪ No comments were received during the public comment period.

CURRENT WORK
▪ Phase II funding for US 64 is being amended to reflect FY2010 closeout and a lower than anticipated bid for the project.

ANTICIPATED WORK
▪ Update the FY2011-2016 TIP to reflect the amendment.

ATTACHMENTS
▪ Public Notice describing the funding changes in Amendment #3.

RECOMMENDATION
▪ It is recommended that the Policy Committee approve Amendment #3 to the FY2011-2016 TIP.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Lucero stated that Amendment #3 to the FY2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) reflects changes to Phase II of the US 64 Project. Funding for Phase II was adjusted due to awarding a lower than expected bid. Due to the federal fiscal year closeout in September, changes to the STIP have already been completed reflecting the bid savings. Mr. Lucero stated that the $2,000,000 savings was reallocated within the district. Ms. Raner asked if those funds were reallocated away from San Juan County. Mr. Lucero stated they were reprogrammed elsewhere and that Staff did not know where in the District the funds were sent. Ms. Holton added that Staff has posed the question to NMDOT, but they have not responded. Mr. Darnell asked if there was flexibility in our plans that if we have a project that comes in below budget and have an extra $2,000,000, can we continue that plan without reverting that money elsewhere. Mr. Lucero stated that Staff had asked NMDOT why the $2,000,000 was not used on the underfunded Phase 3 portion of the US 64 project since engineering on that Phase is already complete. Mr. Darnell asked if there was policy on reprogramming extra funds. Mr. Lucero responded that we can ask that question of David Martinez with NMDOT if he is able to attend today's meeting.

Mr. Lucero stated that Staff will review the regulations that govern the Federal Fiscal Year-End Closeout and the proposed changes to the STIP protocols to ensure both sides accurately understand the protocols and recent changes. Mr. Lucero commented that NMDOT has conducted an initial review of proposed changes, but the Planning division of NMDOT and the Districts are still working out some issues. Mr. Darnell asked

where we stood with this issue and Mr. Delmagori said Staff had discussions with both the Planning Division and District 5 and asked why the money had not been redistributed in this area. The NMDOT said they had already identified a project elsewhere within the District that the funds would be used for, but did not offer any additional information. Mr. Lucero added that the Technical Committee members have been working on ways to better prioritize our projects to try to keep this from happening in the future.

Mr. Lucero stated that Staff was not notified of the changes to the STIP but happened to notice the changes when completing the federally mandated obligated project list as part of the end of year requirements. After reviewing the revised STIP, Staff was required to make the TIP Amendment to reflect these changes in the STIP and bring our TIP back in line with the STIP.

Ms. Raner asked if all Policy Committee members were aware of the public hearing period as noted in the Public Notice since most do not usually read the legal notices. Mr. Delmagori said this information was also posted on the MPO website and that a brief summary of the Amendment and comment period was made at the last Policy Committee meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Darnell moved to approve Amendment #3 to the FY2011-2016 TIP. Ms. Raner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. DRAFT FY2012-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	FY2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 9, 2011

BACKGROUND
▪ The TIP is a short-term program of projects expected to be completed in the next six years. ▪ The MPO updates the TIP on an annual basis. ▪ The TIP update process includes revising existing project information, adding new projects, and developing a TIP Financial Plan. ▪ Staff met individually with each member entity, NMDOT, and Red Apple Transit to review project information.

CURRENT WORK
▪ Staff has made all needed adjustments to the TIP to reflect additions, deletions, and corrections to the TIP. ▪ With the STIP update this year, the MPO reviewed its priority list with the

Technical Committee. ▪ Priority lists based on funding sources were developed with the Technical Committee on February 24 and March 8. ▪ District 5 is taking the priority lists from the MPOs and RPOs to program the STIP update.

ATTACHMENTS
▪ The recommended priority lists for approval. ▪ Draft FY2012-2017 TIP will be provided at the March 17 Policy Committee meeting.

REMAINING TIP SCHEDULE	
MONTH	**ACTION**
Early March – early April 2011	30-day Public Comment period is advertised and opened
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
▪ It is recommended that the Policy Committee review the draft FY2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program and approve lists of prioritized projects for the MPO.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Lucero presented the FY2012-2017 TIP and explained that each year the MPO updates the TIP which provides the opportunity to verify funding years, amounts, and categories to ensure projects are viable and that priorities have not changed. The Technical Committee has reviewed the various funding categories and tried to fine tune each to clearly identify this region's priorities.

Mr. Lucero began discussion on the Regionally Significant Project List which shows projects that are programmed to receive funding. He commented that the projects are listed by local entity and NMDOT and include projects such as US 64, West Main & Apache, Pinon Hills, and Light Plant Road. Also shown on the list is the transit funding for the Red Apple Transit.

Mr. Lucero then discussed the Non-Regionally Significant Project List. Mr. Lucero stated that projects on this list are projects that have funding but are not regionally significant, or are not currently federally classified. Mr. Darnell asked if these projects were prioritized. Mr. Lucero stated these have not been prioritized.

Ms. McCulloch asked if these projects have been funded. Mr. Lucero stated these projects are currently on each entity's CIP and are likely to be funded in the fiscal year shown. Ms. McCulloch questioned the $290,000 Cliffside Drive project and Mr. Lucero replied that the project has been verified with the City of Farmington and remains on their CIP and so it has been placed on the MPO's TIP.

Mr. Lucero stated the Non-Regionally Significant Project List is given for informational purposes as an appendix and is used mainly by the MPO to develop its priority lists. Mr. Lucero added that the NMDOT focuses on the Regionally Significant Projects and if funding becomes available, then the NMDOT refers to the Unfunded Project List.

Mr. Darnell asked about the Herrera project and if this was located East of Main Street. He said that many years ago this project was first identified as a way to connect Herrera to Railroad and then Railroad out to a bridge that would connect Farmington to Crouch Mesa. He added that this was meant to be the relief route. He noted that in recent years, housing subdivisions have been constructed and it will now be a major battle to build this as a relief route. Asked if this is the intent of this project, Mr. Lucero stated that this project is to be a collector in the area and would help move traffic to the arterial which is Main Street. This project is not a high priority project for the City of Farmington and has been moved out on their CIP and so the MPO has moved the project to same corresponding years in the TIP.

Mr. Lucero directed the conversation to the Unfunded Project List which shows the biggest needs for this area and will help funnel funds to the most critical projects for this area. The biggest obstacle is balancing the NMDOT-identified projects with the local projects. Mr. Lucero explained that during the last several Technical Committee meetings there has been discussion on how to balance the needs of this area with the needs of the NMDOT. With NMDOT focus on US 64 and then possibly NM 516, funds could be tied up for the next 20 years. With the extended time it has taken for the US 64 project and the creation of the MPO, local entities have since identified other high priority projects that have come about due to changes in the region. The MPO has grown from a population of 50,000 to approximately 100,000 and this doubling in size has created some growing pains. Mr. Lucero continued to add that the MPO is working with the entities and the NMDOT to facilitate a coordinated and cooperative effort.

The Unfunded Project List is prioritized by funding category. Mr. Lucero began with the Bridge category listing and said that all this information has been thoroughly reviewed with the Technical Committee members. Mr. Lucero commented that funds for the East Pinon Hills and East Blanco Blvd. Bridge projects were split to reflect the portion of estimated construction funds needed to construct the bridge in the Bridge category and estimated roadway construction funding in the STP section.

Mr. Lucero reviewed the Safety section of the Unfunded Project List and commented that they tried to prioritize projects with funding needs no more than $2,000,000 as this is the project size preferred by the NMDOT for Safety projects.

Mr. Darnell asked why Pinon Hills & 30th Street had not been considered by the Technical Committee. Mr. Lucero stated that this project has been identified as a Surface Transportation Program (STP) Priority and is shown on that listing.

Mr. Lucero stated that under the Surface Transportation Program List, the NMDOT has requested a priority listing for US 64. Mr. Lucero added that Phase 3 of US 64 appears to have been under-programmed and will need to be divided into another phase, plus there still remains Phases 4, 5, and 6. The Technical Committee has identified other priorities such as the Pinon Hills Extension at $10,000,000 to plan, design, and construct a new four-lane arterial to the bridge over the Animas River. Also part of this project is the County Road 3900 portion which would connect the roadway to the bridge. The

Technical Committee has worked to break these projects into smaller pieces in order to obtain appropriate funding. Mr. Lucero stated that even without US 64, the Technical Committee has identified seven high priority projects for the MPO region.

Mr. Lucero continued saying the Technical Committee has discussed the possibility of using near-term funding programmed to US 64 for other projects now that the "bookends" are being completed. An idea was discussed that a simple overlay or maintenance repairs could be done to the remaining sections of US 64 in the near term. In this way, some other high priority regional projects could possibly be funded. This could potentially allow for the District to evaluate and then come back and complete the US 64 project at a later date. The Technical Committee believes some of these other projects could help relieve traffic along US 64, and believes having this discussion with NMDOT to develop a coordinated prioritized list of projects would be beneficial.

Mr. Delmagori stated that it is understood that the NMDOT wants to continue with the US 64 project. He added that there also needs to be a balance between local priorities and NMDOT priorities due to the limited funding expected over the next four or so years. Mr. Delmagori added that District 5 targets are approximately $27,000,000 which not only goes to this region, but also to Santa Fe, Taos, and others within the District. If $20,000,000 of those funds are going to the US 64 project, that leaves $7,000,000 for all other projects in the District. How this $20,000,000 could be programmed for near-term use to meet the greatest needs of this area has been the topic of much discussion.

Mr. Darnell added that it is not just the US 64 project, but it's the US 64 project that is then followed by the NM 516 project, so that local projects never get addressed. He asked if anyone has ever looked at the impact of the Pinon Hills Bridge to Crouch Mesa in terms of relieving pressure on NM 516. He further asked if this were to be fully explained to the District, would they understand our concerns and see the funding issues in a different way. Mr. Delmagori stated this particular option had been addressed during the long-range planning process. The traffic model showed that there was a significant impact on the west half of US 64 from County Road 350 back into Farmington. Mr. Lucero added that the model of the Pinon Hills project, in correlation to other projects like East Arterial or the Highline Road or even US 64, showed a significant improvement to traffic flow from the Crouch Mesa area which has become the heart of growth in the area.

Mr. Delmagori stated that the nice thing about the Pinon Hills Bridge and potentially the Highline project is that another arterial system is created. With this project, traffic is not funneled to US 64 or NM 516 and the opportunity is there to disperse the traffic and might even decrease the need to widen US 64. Mr. Delmagori added that we are not saying US 64 does not need to happen, but the questions are about the timing. The US 64 project has been on the project list for ten years. It was to have been completed by now, but with funding issues and other conditions this has not happened. The region now has a backlog of projects that need funding, however the US 64 project remains the priority for the NMDOT.

Mr. Delmagori said NMDOT District 5 contacted Staff and has asked where the US 64 project stands on our priority list and Staff informed them that our focus has been on local projects. The Technical and Policy Committees need to determine how everything ties together. Mr. Lucero stated that the MPO strives to provide the most accurate

information to the Policy Committee to allow them to make the most informed decisions and to precisely speak as the voice of this area to the NMDOT.

Mr. Darnell asked if Staff knew the cost of the remaining section of the US 64 project. Mr. Delmagori stated the cost is calculated at $10,000,000 per mile and there are approximately seven miles yet to be completed. Mr. Darnell questioned that with that $70,000,000 do we want to complete the remaining portions of US 64, and do we believe it has a higher priority than other local projects that might actually move traffic more efficiently around the county. Mr. Delmagori said the decision is whether we want the focus to be on US 64 or do we want to explore these other projects. Mr. Darnell asked how it would be received by the NMDOT if we asked them to stop working on US 64 and put the funds earmarked for the remaining portion of that project toward other local priorities. He added that we do want to continue to partner with NMDOT. Mr. Delmagori said he had hoped Mr. David Martinez with the NMDOT would have been in attendance to answer these questions, but added that this is definitely where we need to work together.

Mr. Lucero added that prior to the creation of this MPONMDOT would get a project list from the Northwest RPO and would then select from that list the projects they believed were appropriate for the area. Now with an established MPO, we provide a priority list and then work together with NMDOT to get projects completed. Mr. Darnell stated that we appreciate our relationship with NMDOT and that before we set policy and determine a direction, we need NMDOT input. Mr. Darnell added that there does need to be a give and take process. For example, if the US 64 project is their priority and we agree with them on that, then maybe we can ask for some give on the NM 516 project. Perhaps in this way the next round of funding allocations could be used to address some of our local projects. Mr. Darnell reiterated that we need to be able to discuss these issues and ask questions of the NMDOT. Mr. Lucero stated that given no District attendance today, perhaps we could set up a special meeting where they could attend and answer some of our questions. Mr. Delmagori said that perhaps the District could send a representative to either the Technical Committee meeting on March 24 or even the next Policy Committee meeting scheduled for April 21. If the NMDOT could attend the Technical Meeting we could iron out our questions at that meeting and be able to get recommendations back to the Policy Committee for the April meeting. The District is pressing us to wrap up our Unfunded Project List because of their upcoming STIP update schedule.

Based on the discussion, Mr. Delmagori stated that there are three options for action:

- Approve the prioritized lists as presented;
- Make changes to the Unfunded List to add the US 64 project;
- Table any action until there is opportunity to speak with the NMDOT.

Ms. Raner asked if the funding being discussed was for new roadways or could it be used for maintenance and repair of existing roadways. Mr. Delmagori stated that maintenance funding is a separate category and the District NMDOT office has that schedule.

Ms. McCulloch asked when a representative from NMDOT could be here. Mr. Lucero said that the next Technical Committee meeting is March 24th so that might be the first opportunity. He noted that members of the Policy Committee are welcome to attend the Technical Committee meeting to listen to the discussion and voice opinions and

concerns. Ms. McCulloch noted that no action could be taken until the next Policy Committee on April 21st. Dr. Henderson agreed that further action would need to be tabled until a later meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Darnell made a motion to table the Policy Committee's discussion on the prioritized project lists until a discussion with the NMDOT was held. Ms. McCulloch seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. REVIEW THE DRAFT 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 9, 2011

BACKGROUND
▪ The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the fiscal year work plan for the MPO. ▪ The FY2012 UPWP describes planning activities and work products to be completed from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. ▪ Staff met with the entities individually to discuss new activities for FY2012.

CURRENT WORK
▪ Staff has developed a list of activities that are expected to be included in the FY2012 UPWP. ▪ The draft FY2012 UPWP Budget has been developed based on funding estimates from NMDOT. ▪ Staff will review the UPWP with the Policy Committee on March 17.

ATTACHMENTS
▪ Draft FY2012 UPWP by program area and draft FY2012 budget are provided under separate cover to the Policy Committee members.

UPWP SCHEDULE	
MONTH	**ACTION**
January-February 2011	Issued the Call for Projects
February - March 2011	Develop UPWP program areas
March 24, 2011	Technical Committee recommends approval of UPWP
April 21, 2011	Policy Committee approves the FY2012 UPWP

RECOMMENDATION
▪ It is recommended that the Policy Committee review the draft FY2012 UPWP and FY2012 UPWP Budget.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori reviewed the FY2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) document which outlines the projects and explains the activities of the MPO for the next fiscal year. The heart of the document begins on Page 7 with the Administration and Operation of the MPO. New information in the document is underlined.

On Page 13 under General Development and Comprehensive Planning, Mr. Delmagori noted that as a result of the transit study, the MPO has been directed to conduct an on-board transit survey to track ridership on the Red Apple Transit and track travel patterns to better understand the efficiency of the routes in preparation of the recommended changes that came out of the Red Apple Transit Study. Also included is the Highline Road alignment study from CR 350 to US 550. The City of Aztec has asked for alternatives to the NM 516 corridor for the portion that runs through the City.

Starting on Page 16 is the Long Range Transportation Planning section. Mr. Delmagori stated that the MPO will be completing a calibration/validation process to update the base and forecast years based on the new 2010 Census data.

Dr. Henderson asked if the MPO will be evaluating the dangerous situations along NM 516 particularly at the intersection with CR350. He understands that NM 516 is scheduled to be six-laned, but is there some special funding or provision for making changes/improvements to NM 516 now before it is scheduled to be improved? Dr. Henderson added that it seems that much of the State's discussion is on spending big dollars on a rail system and it seems the simple necessity of maintaining the roadways in our area is being ignored. Dr. Henderson recommended we make a note of safety factors and try to address them in the interim and not wait for a final project that may never happen.

Mr. Delmagori reviewed the MPO Budget spreadsheet on Page 25. In summary, $208,893 in Federal dollars are scheduled to be spent. With the local entities providing $37,428 in local match. If all Federal money and required match is spent, there is a local overmatch of $53,349; resulting in a grand total of $299,670 for the total programmed MPO budget.

Mr. Delmagori asked the Policy Committee members if they had any questions on this document. This document will be reviewed by the Technical Committee on March 24th, and if they recommend approval, it will be brought to the Policy Committee for their approval on April 21.

Ms. McCulloch asked how this proposed budget compares to the 2010 actual budget. Mr. Delmagori said that the Federal portion on the PL side will be slightly less because there was carryover from 2010 into 2011. He stated that any carryover from 2011 will not be known until September and should there be any carryover, the MPO will seek an amendment to the budget at that time.

ACTION: The report was reviewed.

6. RECEIVE A REPORT FROM NMDOT

DISCUSSION: No representatives from the NMDOT were in attendance.

7. <u>RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS MEETING FOR THE STATE RAIL PLAN</u>

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	NMDOT State Rail Plan
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 9, 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. ▪ 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 Policy Committee receive a report on the local stakeholders meeting for the State Rail Plan.

DISCUSSION: Dr. Henderson commented that when discussions first began on the State Rail Plan, it was made known that this region wanted to be included in the State's planning process, and he was pleased to see that the MPO had organized a meeting for local stakeholders. Mr. Delmagori explained that the process began when the DOT's

Rail Division attended the Technical Committee in October 2010. They presented an overview of the State Rail Plan which identified rail projects and needs state-wide which would then be compiled into their long-range planning document. Their presentation in October drew many interested individuals, and as a result of the local interest, the MPO has organized a stakeholder and public meeting to be held on March 30th at the Farmington Civic Center. This meeting will give local constituents the opportunity to express their ideas on what rail options they'd like to see in this area. Mr. Delmagori added that this area is one of the few counties in the State with no rail and that fact has considerable economic implications. This meeting will provide the opportunity to make some recommendations to the State Rail Plan. Dr. Henderson asked what other type of rail might be considered as he actually sees a greater impact for this area with a freight railroad rather than a "RailRunner" type of project. Dr. Henderson asked that we try to get this question answered at the meeting.

Staff and the Policy Committee discussed who had been invited to the meeting as well as other potential stakeholders to consider inviting. Mr. Delmagori said that to date staff have contacted the oil and gas companies, NAPI, the local Chambers of Commerce, legislators, and others. Mr. Delmagori added that if there are other companies or individuals to be included in the invitation to please send that information to the MPO. There will be an opportunity for attendees to speak following a brief introduction and overview of the Rail Plan. Mr. Lucero said that Staff would like those planning to attend to RSVP so that we reserve the appropriate facilities and that if the stakeholder response is substantial, representatives of the NMDOT Rail Division would be willing to participate. Mr. Lucero added that with a large, diverse stakeholder group, we can send the message that this is an economic driving force for the region. Mr. Henderson stated this was very important for the area and asked that we encourage participation by the representatives of the Rail Division as we need them to hear this discussion.

Mr. Lucero recommended members invite all others they thought might have an interest in the discussion. He also recommended them to speak to the new District 5 Commissioner, Butch Matthews to see if he would be able to attend. Mr. Delmagori said Staff will follow up on the members' recommendations.

ACTION: The report was received.

8. RECEIVE A REPORT ON A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE NEED FOR MAINTENANCE FUNDING FOR STATE FACILITIES

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	Maintenance Needs Resolution
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	March 9, 2011

BACKGROUND
▪ The local entities would like to bring to the attention of the NMDOT Cabinet Secretary and State Legislators the maintenance needs for state facilities in this area. ▪ The local entities are developing letters and resolutions that will stress the critical need for maintenance funding for state facilities within the MPO. ▪ The MPO is supportive of these efforts and is seeking to pass its own resolution. ▪ Maintenance funding is an important step in extending the life of these critical regional roadways.

ATTACHMENTS
▪ The local entities anticipate having their councils and commissions take action on the resolutions in early April. ▪ The resolution from the MPO will be provided to the Policy Committee based on the availability of information from the local entities.

RECOMMENDATION
▪ It is recommended that the Policy Committee receive a report on a resolution supporting the needs for maintenance funding for state facilities.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Delmagori stated that at a recent Technical Committee meeting, there was discussion on the safety issues along NM 173, the road from Aztec to Navajo Dam, and whether local entities should improve the roadway conditions or request action by the NMDOT. There was a separate meeting with representatives of Aztec and San Juan County to discuss this issue and the consensus was that it was a NMDOT road and they should be responsible for its maintenance and repair. Mr. Delmagori stated that this concept was then expanded to include all the State facilities in this area. The discussion was that the local entities would develop memos/resolutions to bring to their respective councils and commissions with wording and language to highlight the need for maintenance improvements in this area. The plan was to have this information work its way from the Councils and Commissions up to the Legislature. Mr. Delmagori said this initiative was originally driven by Aztec and San Juan County, but the respective City Managers from Farmington and Bloomfield were then alerted as well. Mr. Delmagori added that the MPO would like to support the entities efforts through resolution, but since no information has been forthcoming from the entities, this is only an informational item at this time. Once the information is provided it will be given to NMDOT and corresponding legislators to highlight the poor conditions of the state facilities in this area and ask what they propose be done to maintain the roads and keep them from falling apart even further.

Mr. Darnell said this discussion should have taken place prior to the 60-day session of the Legislature. He asked if we want them to adjust their budget or do something in the 60-day session. Mr. Delmagori stated that both San Juan County and the City of Aztec wanted to get something done during the 60-day session, but during the Technical Committee Work Session it was learned that no information had been forthcoming from the local entities. Mr. Delmagori stated that he was bringing up these previous discussions to keep the Policy Committee aware of recent concerns and issues

discussed at Technical Committee meetings. Mr. Lucero said that there needs to be discussion with NMDOT District 5 about available maintenance funds. Mr. Lucero added that this year the District is trying to keep programmed maintenance funds intact; however, being short-handed in this region they have been unable to keep up with needed maintenance. The Technical Committee wants them to understand that we understand their being short-handed, but maintenance is truly needed in this area.

Mr. Darnell stated that he believed the Policy Committee had addressed this issue about a year ago. The issue was of NMDOT having the maintenance funds, but not having the staff to perform the actual work, and could a local entity perform the work on behalf of NMDOT and then be reimbursed for that work. Mr. Lucero believed a JPA is being formulated to work with San Juan County and the City of Aztec. Staff would like to see if the JPA could be extended to all the entities. By allowing this, the entities could maintain the facilities in their area and be reimbursed by NMDOT for either using their own product/supplies or labor. Mr. Darnell added that he believed working to get reimbursement from NMDOT for work done by a local entity makes more sense that trying to get resolutions from all the local entities saying that maintenance funding is a problem. Mr. Darnell said the roadway issues are obvious to everyone who drives the roads and this issue has previously been discussed with Mr. Martinez. Mr. Darnell would like to see the entities push the JPA idea forward. He added that it seems like a great idea if NMDOT has the money but no manpower and the local entities have the manpower but no money. Mr. Delmagori said Staff would bring it to the attention of the Technical Committee and the entities and see if the Policy Committee's suggestions impact how the Technical Committee wants to proceed.

ACTION: The report was received.

9. RECEIVE A REPORT ON THE 2010 CENSUS DATE

ARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	2010 Census Data
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	March 9, 2011

BACKGROUND
▪ State and County level Data for the 2010 Census has begun to be released. ▪ 27 States or State Equivalents have been released. ▪ The 2010 Census only administered the short form. ▪ The American Community Survey (ACS) administered the traditional long form and will continue to administer the form for our area every three years. ▪ New Mexico can expect to have its State and County level data released between March 21st and April 1st.
CURRENT WORK
▪ Staff attended a workshop in Albuquerque on January 26, 2011 on new Census tools and the American Community Survey (ACS).

▪ Staff has participated in webinars on the 2010 Census, the new ACS long form, and the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP).

ANTICIPATED WORK
▪ Staff will define Traffic Analysis Districts (TADs) for the CTPP. ▪ Staff will update the traffic model to reflect new population figures from the 2010 Census.

RECOMMENDATION
▪ It is recommended that the Policy Committee receive a report on the 2010 US Census Data.

DISCUSSION: The 2010 census data has just been released and Mr. Lucero stated he will be getting that information downloaded. He said expectations are that San Juan County would be one of the highest growth counties and, although not the fastest growing, would be at the top of the state. It is anticipated that both our aging and younger populations would explode. Dr. Henderson added how important having accurate census data will be to the growth and political future of San Juan County.

Mr. Lucero will review the census data and have a report for the Policy Committee at the April meeting.

ACTION: The report was received.

10. <u>INFORMATION ITEMS</u>

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Martin Lucero, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	March 9, 2011

INFORMATION ITEMS

a. **Red Apple Transit Study and 2035 MTP Amendment.** The Transit Study Final Report has been provided to the MPO by LSC. With the completion of the Transit Study, the recommendations and new route maps will be added into the 2035 MTP. A 30-day public comment period closes on April 8 and staff will seek approval by the Policy Committee on April 21.

b. **MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan.** The MPO is holding a public meeting to receive input on Amendment #1 to the MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan.

c. **Other.**

DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henderson asked if there would be an amendment to the 2035 MTP. Mr. Delmagori said he would have that information at next month's Policy Committee meeting. This amendment will amend the actual transit chapter of the long-range plan. The public comment period closes on April 8th. The information will be brought to the Technical Committee at the March 24th meeting, and then finalized with the Policy Committee on April 21st.

Mr. Delmagori stated that there had been some changes to the Major Thoroughfare Plan. Staff had met with the Farmington City Council to seek approval of the Major Thoroughfare Plan and particularly the alternatives that had been identified for how future proposed roadways would connect with the NE Farmington area. The City Council tabled the request for approval so that Staff would have the opportunity to speak with residents of the NE Farmington area. The MPO is coordinating three public meetings on March 31, April 14, and April 28, 2011 to get more input from the residents and see if there are additional ideas that have not been considered.

Mr. Delmagori introduced June Markle, the new Administrative Aide for the MPO.

11. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

DISCUSSION: There was no business from the Chairman, Members or Staff.

12. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

DISCUSSION: There was no other business from the floor.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Darnell made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. McCulloch seconded the motion. Dr. Henderson adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

_____ _____

Dr. James C. Henderson, Chair June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide