

**MINUTES  
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORK SESSION  
March 8, 2011**

Technical Members Present: Mike Huber, City of Aztec  
Julie Baird, City of Bloomfield  
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington  
Nica J. Westerling, City of Farmington  
Dave Keck, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: None

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: Larry Hathaway, San Juan County  
Fran Fillerup, City of Farmington, Alternate

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Lopez called the work session to order at 10:03 a.m.

**2. FY2012-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Agenda Item**

<b>Subject:</b>	FY2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Martin Lucero, Associate MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	March 1, 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.
- District 5 will be holding a meeting on March 10, 2011 to discuss and compare project priorities within the MPOs and RPOs.

**CURRENT WORK**

- The MPO Technical Committee developed priority lists by funding type on February

- 24, 2011.
- Staff has made changes to the FY 2012-2017 TIP to reflect comments received by the member entities.

<b>ATTACHMENTS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft FY2012-2017 TIP Unfunded Priority Lists.</li> </ul>

<b>TIP SCHEDULE</b>	
<b>MONTH</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
January 2011-February 2011	Call for Projects was made & Project Identification Forms were issued
February - March 2011	Entities reviewed project information; development of an agreed to list of projects and TIP financial plan
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

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is recommended that the Technical Committee recommend approval of the prioritized lists for the FY 2012-2017 TIP.</li> </ul>

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori began the meeting by stating the purpose of the Work Session was to review and recommend approval of the prioritized TIP Unfunded Project Lists that were developed during the Technical Committee meeting on February 24, 2011.

Mr. Delmagori elaborated that he spoke with Mr. Dave Martinez regarding an invitation to attend a District 5 meeting set for March 10<sup>th</sup>. The meeting was originally described as an opportunity to prioritize projects from all MPOs and RPOs within the District. After further review, Mr. Martinez told Mr. Delmagori that the meeting would be focusing on RPO projects and their RTIPR process. The MPO representatives did not need to attend. Mr. Delmagori stated that once the MPO prioritized lists were approved they would be submitted to the NMDOT. Mr. Delmagori told Mr. Martinez that the prioritized lists included 3-5 projects per funding source and Mr. Martinez said that procedure should fit with what NMDOT is looking for. Mr. Delmagori will present the prioritized Unfunded Project Lists at the Policy Committee meeting on March 17, 2011 and ask for their approval. At their March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Technical Committee will recommend approval of the TIP document to the Policy Committee, and then the Policy Committee will finalize the process at their April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Mr. Lucero asked the Technical Committee members to review the Unfunded Project List to verify the changes made during the Technical Committee meeting on February 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Lucero stated that NMDOT has locked in funding for the years 2012 and 2013. Mr. Lucero recommended the need to review each project year, stating less expensive projects may still be considered for FY2012 and FY2013, but that entities may want to consider moving out their larger cost projects to future years.

Mr. Lucero directed Technical Committee members to Page 1 of 16, the prioritized Bridge section of the Unfunded Project List. Mr. Lucero noted that the projects are listed in priority order, but he intends to add priority numbers to each project on the list making the prioritization clearer for others viewing the list. Ms. Lopez asked if Staff could make the category names more visible. Mr. Lucero will look at different formatting options to make these titles stand out more.

Mr. Lucero noted that he removed \$10,000,000 from U-F10 - Pinon Hills Blvd Extension, which is the bridge portion for this project. The road portion is later shown on Page 6 of 16 under the Surface Transportation Program (STP) category. Ms. Westerling elaborated her concern that breaking the project out by category could result in receiving money for a bridge project but not the corresponding roadway.

Mr. Lucero said Staff understands the concern raised by Ms. Westerling because it raises the issue of the difficulties of funding new projects when there is limited funding for ongoing projects. Mr. Lucero added that the NMDOT has confirmed that they are going to continue to fund the remaining phases of US 64. The difficulty lies in the fact that other local projects have been identified through the MPO process and are already in design or engineering. The question becomes how do local priorities relate to NMDOT priorities.

Mr. Lucero suggested that the MPO might want to discuss various ideas with NMDOT on how near-term federal funds for this area might be programmed. With the understanding that approximately \$20,000,000 is allocated to each phase of US 64, is there a possibility the funding could instead be divided to other regional priorities identified by the local entities. Mr. Lucero further cautioned this might have an impact on phasing for US 64.

Ms. Westerling expressed her concern again that \$22,000,000 is needed to complete the East Pinon Hills project. Without all \$22,000,000, a new bridge may be constructed, but then there is no usable roadway to the bridge which makes the bridge unusable. Ms. Westerling added unfortunately the US 64 project has taken longer than planned, and the entities now have other critically important projects that need funding. Mr. Lucero stated that if we are able to fund the bridge it could help find funding for the road. This could be done through earmarks, bonds and other funding mechanisms. Funding would then become more manageable.

Ms. Westerling said that once work on US 64 is completed, the NMDOT's next priority will be NM 516. This means funding for other projects could be 20 years out. Mr. Delmagori said that even though we understand the priorities of NMDOT, as an MPO we need to find ways to illustrate to them how important Pinon Hills is as an arterial in comparison to US 64. Mr. Lucero added that the Policy Committee should be involved with any recommendations to NMDOT. Ms. Lopez suggested that the political voice is what we need to draw everyone together and have NMDOT consider our priorities. Mr. Lucero reiterated that a coordinated and cooperative effort with the NMDOT is needed so that there is an understanding that we have identified the most critical projects for our area.

Ms. Westerling asked if it was correct that NMDOT has set projects and budgets for FY2012 and 2013, but that FY2014 and 2015 are open. Mr. Lucero stated that was correct and that FY2014 and 2015 are completely open. Mr. Delmagori added that the Unfunded Project List shows quite a few projects for FY2012-2013, but he

recommended the Technical Committee keep the dates since it shows the importance and the priority placed on these projects. Mr. Lucero asked the Technical Committee to also review the Project Description for each project and to delete “plan” and “design” if the projects are ready for construction. The NMDOT will look at these project descriptions to evaluate if the project has been engineered and is ready to be built. Ms. Westerling commented that any archeological and environmental clearances be promptly completed as well.

The recommended MPO prioritized lists are as follows:

#### Bridge Priorities

PRIORITY	PROJECT
1	U-F5 - City of Farmington - East Pinon Hills Boulevard
2	U-SJ12 - San Juan County - Bridge #8105 on CR 7150
3	U-B10 - City of Bloomfield - US 550 to Saiz Lane - E. Blanco Blvd (Phase 1)
4	U-SJ7 - San Juan County - Bridge Crossing on CR 5500

#### Safety Priorities

PRIORITY	PROJECT
1	U-B9 - City of Bloomfield - US 64 to W. Blanco - Bergin Lane
2	U-A4 - City of Aztec - NM 516 to City Limits - Light Plant Rd.
3	San Juan County - CR 350/CR 390 intersection

#### Surface Transportation (STP) Priorities

PRIORITY	PROJECT
1	U-F5 - City of Farmington - East Main to CR 3900 - E. Pinon Hills Blvd.
2	U-SJ3 - San Juan County - CR 3000 to CR 3950 - CR 3900
3	U-A14 - City of Aztec - US 550 to NE approximately 0.75 mi - East Arterial Route (Phase 1B)
4	U-A15 - City of Aztec - East Arterial Route (Phase 2)
5	U-B9 - City of Bloomfield - US 64 to W. Blanco - Bergin Lane
6	U-B10 - City of Bloomfield - US 550 to Saiz Lane - E. Blanco (Phase 1)
7	U-F8 - City of Farmington - Butler to Dustin - Pinon Hills Blvd.

#### Transportation Enhancements (TPE) Priorities

PRIORITY	PROJECT
1	City of Aztec - Ruins Rd to N. Main Extension - Animas River Pedestrian Bridge
2	U-B9 - US 64 to W. Blanco - Bergin Lane
3	U-F4 - City of Farmington - Santiago to Main - 20 <sup>th</sup> Street
4	U-B4 - City of Bloomfield - US 550 to W. Blanco - 5 <sup>th</sup> Street
5	U-F9 - City of Farmington - Yarrow to Andrea - Wildflower Pkwy.

Mr. Lucero quickly reviewed the project details with the members to check for any final changes. Mr. Keck, Ms. Westerling, and Ms. Baird had small changes to funding for their bridge projects. For his Safety project on Lt. Plant Rd, Mr. Huber asked for changes to the description and would like the project phased at \$2,000,000 each for two years.

Mr. Keck outlined several small changes to his project on CR 3900. Ms Baird explained changes for Bergin Lane and East Blanco Blvd. Ms Westerling asked that the funding for Wildflower Pkwy be increased to \$2,400,000. Mr. Lucero noted that he will make the recommended changes. He also commented that the General Unfunded Project List is shown by entity and includes the remaining unfunded projects that have not been prioritized.

**ACTION:** Ms. Westerling motioned to recommend to the Policy Committee the approval of the prioritized lists for the FY2012-2017 TIP. Ms. Baird seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

**DISCUSSION:** There were no business items from the Chairman or Technical Committee members.

Mr. Delmagori reported that the Rail Plan Stakeholders' meeting was being planned for Wednesday, March 30<sup>th</sup> from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. at the Civic Center. The invitation is ready to be sent out to the current list of identified stakeholders and the meeting agenda will be prepared in the next few weeks.

Staff was seeking local approval of the Major Thoroughfare Plan from the Farmington City Council on March 1. Action was tabled, and Staff was directed to have a public meeting in the Northeast Farmington area to explain how the Northern Route would potentially connect with the City of Farmington. A tentative date for this evening meeting is Thursday, March 31<sup>st</sup>, at County Club Elementary School with more details to follow.

**4. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

**DISCUSSION:** There was no business from the floor.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Keck made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Westerling seconded the motion. Ms. Lopez adjourned the meeting at 10:42 a.m.

---

Cindy Lopez, Chair

---

June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide