

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
August 9, 2017

Technical Members Present: Jason Thomas, City of Bloomfield
Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Paul Brasher, NMDOT District 5
Andrew Montoya, Red Apple Transit
Fran Fillerup, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: Bill Watson, City of Aztec

Staff Present: Mary Holton, MPO Officer
Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Assistant

Staff Absent: None

Others Present: Steven Saavedra, City of Aztec
Taylor Clem, City of Farmington
Rosa Kozub, NMDOT Govt. to Govt. Unit Supervisor
(via telephone)
Somie Chavez, Planning Liaison, NMDOT (via
telephone)
Nick Porell, San Juan County
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fillerup called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JULY 12, 2017 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. C. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the July 12, 2017 Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

3. BOARD TRAINING-OPEN MEETINGS ACT, GOVERNMENT CONDUCT ACT, AND IPRA

Subject:	Board Training - Open Meetings Act, Government Conduct Act, and IPRA
Prepared by:	Mary Holton, AICP, MPO Officer
Date:	August 9, 2017

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- The MPO has arranged for Board Training on the Open Meetings Act, Government Conduct Act, and the IPRA.
- The UPWP requires that Technical and Policy Committee trainings be conducted quarterly.

CURRENT WORK

- A presentation will be provided by the MPO's Legal Counsel, Jennifer Breakell, at the Technical and Policy Committee meetings in August 2017.

INFORMATION ITEM

- Information only.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Jennifer Breakell, City Attorney for the City of Farmington gave a presentation on the Open Meetings Act, Inspection of Public Records Act, and the Governmental Conduct Act. Outlined below are highlights from and a general overview of each section of Ms. Breakell's presentation:

Open Meetings Act - NMDS 1978 Section 10-15-1 to 10-15-4

- To provide transparency in governmental actions and allow citizens to participate in governmental meetings of the city, county, state in which they live;
- All meetings of a quorum of board/commission/council/state governmental meetings have published agenda (at least 72 hours prior to meeting) that lists specific items of business to be discussed or acted upon;
 - o Exception for emergency meetings;
 - Unforeseen circumstances that, if not addressed immediately, would likely result in injury or damage to persons or property or substantial financial loss to the city;
 - Cautioned by Attorney General's office to use sparingly
- Written minutes of all meetings to include: date, time, place of meeting, names of members in attendance/absent, substance of proposals considered, and a record of any decisions and votes taken;
 - o Draft minutes prepared within ten working days after the meeting;
 - o Minutes approved/amended/disapproved at the next meeting where quorum is present.
- Some exceptions to open meetings act:
 - o Issuance, supervision, renewal or revocation of a license;
 - o Limited personnel matters;
 - o Deliberations by a public body in connection with an administrative adjudication proceeding;
 - o Discussions of bargaining strategy preliminary to collective bargaining negotiations;
 - o Portion of meeting at which a decision concerning purchases in an amount exceeding \$2500 that can be made only from one source;
 - o Meetings subject to the attorney-client privilege pertaining to threatened or pending litigation;
 - o Meetings to discuss the purchase, acquisition or disposal of real property or water rights;
- Closure of a meeting must:

- General indication of what is to be discussed in the closed meeting needs to be indicated on agenda ;
- Motion made to close that portion of the meeting;
- Any vote or decision must be in the open meeting;
- Minutes need to indicate what happened.
- Be careful of having a committee quorum (rolling quorum) outside of regular meetings and do not discuss matters over the phone, in person, or by e-mail;

Inspection of Public Records - NMSA 14-2-1 - 12

- Every person has a right to inspect public records;
- Provide for transparency to see what government is doing;
- Exceptions:
 - Physical/mental examinations are exempt;
 - Letters of reference concerning employment, licensing or permits;
 - Letters of memorandums which are matters of opinion in personnel files;
 - Law enforcement records that reveal confidential sources, methods, or information;
 - As provided by the confidential materials act;
 - Trade secrets, attorney-client privileged information, long range or strategic business plans;
 - Protected personal identifier information must be redacted.
- City Clerk is the designated custodian;
- Can request records in person or in writing;
- Inspection should be permitted within 3 days but not more than 15 days;
 - Written explanation provided if not permitted within 3 days;
 - May charge for copying (not more than \$1.00 per printed page), the actual costs associated with downloading copies, or for transmitting copies by mail, e-mail or facsimile;
 - May require advance payment if request is expansive;
- Failure to comply can result in fines, an injunction or have damages levied.
- Do not have to create a record or compile information for the requester; information only need to be provided in the original format/form.

Governmental Conduct Act - NMSA 1978 Chapter 10, Article 16

- Purpose of the act is to prevent public officials from using their offices for financial or personal gain;
- Act now applies to municipal/county bodies and not just the state legislature;
- Prohibited political activities:
 - Directly or indirectly coercing or attempting to coerce another public officer to pay, lend, or contribute anything of value to a party for a political purpose;
 - Threatening an employee;
 - Violating the duty of officer or employee to not use property belonging to the state agency.
- Public officers/employees shall not take an official act for the primary purpose of directly enhancing the public officer/employee's financial interest or position;
 - Cannot work on developing an RFQP/contract criteria and then bid on that project (includes family members as well);
 - Don't sell things through employees you supervise

- Must exclude self from any vote where you or a family member may benefit financially;
- There must be a separation or break in service from when one is a public employee to when one lobbies or represents a business wishing to conduct business with the city/state;
- Felony or misdemeanor charges can be filed for violations, PERA benefits can be stripped and civil penalties levied as well.

4. TITLE VI PLAN

Subject:	Draft Title VI Plan
Prepared by:	Mary L Holton, AICP, MPO Officer
Date:	August 9, 2017

BACKGROUND

- The current Title VI was adopted on June 20, 2013. A copy will be sent with the meeting agenda.

CURRENT WORK

- The update is due in accordance with the NMDOT Policy & Procedures Manual (PPM).

ATTACHMENTS

- The proposed updated Title VI document is enclosed for your review. The 2013 MPO Plan, the 2016 COF Plan, and the boilerplate document for MPOs in the PPM were used as models for the development of the update. The proposed draft has been sent to Tom Swenk, Human Resources Director for his review, as he is currently the MPO's Title VI Coordinator.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Staff plans to seek approval of the Title VI Plan in September from the Technical Committee (9/13) and by the Policy Committee (9/28). NMDOT requested that the document be updated before the beginning of FFY18 (October 1, 2017).

ACTION ITEM

- The Technical Committee is only asked to provide input at this meeting on the proposed draft.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Holton stated several documents (models) along with the state's boilerplate that were used to develop the FMPO's plan were provided to the Technical Committee when the agenda was sent out. She asked that members provide her with any additional input. The draft will be presented to the Policy Committee later this month and then brought back for considered approval in September. Ms. Holton stated there were no significant changes to the 2013 document other than the addition of the limited English proficiency section. This draft has been provided to the City of Farmington's Human Resource Director, Tom Swenk who is the current administrator for the FMPO plan. Any comments/changes recommended by Mr. Swenk will be shared with the Technical Committee.

5. STATUS OF TIP PROJECTS

Subject:	Status of TIP Projects
Prepared by:	Derrick Garcia, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	August 1, 2017

BACKGROUND

- The STIP Protocols, finalized in early 2014, indicate that each MPO shall develop a process to monitor the progress and status of each project in the first two years of the TIP. These monthly reviews help correct inconsistencies in the TIP, STIP, the MPO's MTP, Agreement Request Forms (ARFs), etc.
- Changes to the FFY2018-2023 TIP will be considered by the Technical Committee on July 12 and adoption by the Policy Committee sought on July 19, 2017.

TRACKING INFORMATION (2016-2021 TIP)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Local Agreement Status (ARF)▪ ROW Certification▪ Design Completion 30 - 60 - 90%▪ Environmental Certification▪ Utilities Certification▪ Railroad Certification▪ Archeology Certification | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ ITS/Sys ENG Certification▪ Public Involvement Certification |
|--|--|

EXISTING PROJECTS IN FFY2016-2021 TIP

- East Arterial Route, Phase II (F100091)
- East Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase I (F100100)
- East Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase II (F100101)
- East Pinon Hills Boulevard Extension Phase III (F100021)
- US 64 Phase V (F100112)
- US 64 Phase VI (F100113)
- CR 350/390 Intersection (F100210)
- Kirtland Schools Walk Path System (F100270)
- 20th Street Phase III (F100132)
- Foothills Drive Enhancements Phase II (F10099)
- Downtown Complete Streets Project (F10040)
- Anesi Trail (F100221)
- Glade Run Recreation Area Trails (F100240)
- NM 173 (F100170)
- Red Apple Transit Capital/Operating (TF00001)

DISCUSSION ITEM

- This is a discussion item only. Committee members will have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding TIP project status and details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Garcia stated that no information has been received from NMDOT on when to expect adoption of the new FFY2018-2023 TIP and STIP although he expects

that to take place by October 1. Once this has taken place, pending project TIP amendments will be accepted.

East Pinon Hills - Phases I & II

Assuming the deal the City of Farmington struck with Secretary Anthony Lujan is good, Phase I should be on the STIP allowing for the environmental and right-of-way clearances to be received. Both of these projects are pending addition to the STIP.

East Pinon Hills - Phase III

The design phase will continue. A signification amount of the bond funding that was set aside for Phase III has now been reallocated by the County Commission to the bridge on CR 5500.

US 64 - Phase V & VI

Phases V and VI are being combined into a single project. The design work for Phase V is complete. Phase VI has some right-of-way matters and is still in the design process.

CR350/390

Construction began last week. This project is not in the new FFY2018-2023 TIP.

Kirtland Walk Path

The 60%-90% design review is scheduled for August 17.

20th Street - Phase III

This project is under design and should be in construction by next summer.

Foothills Drive Enhancements - Phase II

Final acquisition is underway and once finalized this project will be complete and ready for construction.

Downtown Complete Streets

The consultant is on board and they have completed most of the survey and research work. They are now in the design phase for Phase I. Public participation with the design should be scheduled in the next month or so.

Glade Run Recreation Area

This project was awarded RTP funding and the cooperative agreement with NMDOT will be entered into after the start of the new fiscal year.

NM 173

The anticipated HSIP funding for this project fell through. District 5 may have identified another alternative funding source, but it has been pushed back to 2021.

This agenda item was added to the meetings to ensure project coordination between NMDOT and the entities, when and if needed. It was recommended that, perhaps, the North Region Design Center should also be involved in these discussions.

There was no City of Aztec representative present but Mr. Brasher commented that the environmental clearance was received for the land transfer/landfill area. There remain some right-of-way issues with the BLM right-of-way maps for the land transfer.

There is also a private land holding that has yet to be appraised along with some state land that the City of Aztec is working to acquire. The deadline has been extended to September 15.

6. REPORTS FROM NMDOT

District 5 - Paul Brasher

Mr. Brasher had been asked previously by the Technical Committee to explain the funding available to local entities, the process for applying for this funding, how funding decisions are made by District 5, funding of local projects, clarification of issues faced by District 5, and maintenance issues on NMDOT facilities through the local cities.

In response to the questions and concerns posed by the Technical Committee, Mr. Brasher provided the following information:

- District 5 maintains 16-1/2% of the state's road network; serves over 18% of the state's population;
- Responsible for all transportation related issues: construction and maintenance of roadways and bridges, drainage, signage, plowing, litter pickup, fencing repair, clear rock falls and slides, and all administrative functions for these responsibilities: construction audits, staffing, personnel matters, district operations, financing, and vehicle and building maintenance;
- Funding comes through fuel tax and is supplemented by federal funding;
 - Federal gas and diesel taxes are 18.4 cents/gallon on gas and 24.4 cents/gallon on diesel;
 - State taxes are 17 cents/gallon on gas and 21 cents/gallon on diesel; weight and distance charges and license renewals;
- NMDOT is impacted when the economy suffers;
- NMDOT is fiscal agent for the federal government; Congressional Authorization Policy and the FAST Act authorize funding and define ceilings;
- New Mexico's funding is penalized for track record on DWI recidivism;
 - Reimbursement program and not a disbursement program;
 - Not all FHWA are apportioned - interstate maintenance are discretionary as are TIGER grants and scenic byways;
 - Competitive process to receive discretionary funds;
- Highway trust fund established in 1956 as a way to pay for highway and interstate systems;
 - In 1980, Congress decided some of that money should go to transit;
 - Some of the highway trust fund money is also skimmed off for leaking underground tanks;
- New Mexico's FAST Act apportionment averages \$340M per year to be used on the National Highway System (NHS);
 - NHS is network of 160,000 miles of highways important to nation's economy, defense, and mobility;
 - Use AASHTO standards for designing roadways so that there is continuity and consistency in roadways from state to state;
- Programs and set-asides: national highway freight program, CMAQ, NHPP, STP, HSIP (some taken for railway/highway crossings);

- The six Transportation Commissioners met every other month and review all transportation and rail matters, consider and adopt policies and determine where the focus should be;
 - Policy 44 (adopted 1/18/17 by Commission) relates to the local government road fund;
 - Approximately \$22M - \$23M statewide; \$3.8 to District 5 (this can include maintenance costs);
 - Funding then split among the six Districts based on need and past award history;

For the local government road fund, Mr. Sypher asked if the Transportation Commissioners actually developed or prioritized projects or was a proposed list presented to them by District 5 staff. Mr. Brasher stated that District 5 briefs the commissioners so they are not surprised.

Mr. Brasher explained further:

- Local government road fund is state revenue (capital improvement money) and is statutorily divided;
 - 42% to cooperative agreement program (33% to county agreements, 49% to municipality agreements, 14% to school districts and 4% to other entities (transit/flood control));
 - 16% to municipal arterial program (design, right-of-way, construction, material acquisition);
 - 16% to school bus routes;
 - 26% for county arterials (based on number of miles to be maintained in each county);
 - Up to \$1M can be set aside for counties that demonstrate they cannot afford their match (typically there are 10-12 entities each year);
- District Engineer has some input/authority into where construction/maintenance money is spent;
 - Infrastructure is aging and must work to keep it maintained: preserve the pavement before it deteriorates;
 - NMDOT is preparing a formal asset management plan;
 - Systematic process for operating and maintaining/improving the physical assets already in place;
 - Get the most mileage out of the existing roadway;
 - Use analytical process for determining needs to optimize limited funding.
- Statewide funding received in 2016: NHPP - \$215,000M; Surface Transportation Block Grant - \$108,000M; HSIP - \$22M; Rail/Highway Crossing Program - \$2.5M; CMAQ - \$11M; Metropolitan Planning - \$1.6M; Freight Program - \$10.7M; along with other miscellaneous amounts.

Mr. Fillerup thanked Mr. Brasher for providing some answers to questions on available funding and how the federal dollars are split. He said Mr. Brasher had mentioned performing maintenance using the NMDOT maintenance budget and asked the source of that budget. The source of this budget is the state road fuel tax which includes tax on both gas and diesel, vehicle/license registrations, and weight and distance fees on trucks. Each of these sources contributes an equal amount to the state road fuel tax.

Mr. Fillerup asked what other funding sources beyond the local government road fund could be spent on local lead projects:

- NHPP - not available for local lead projects because local entities are not responsible for maintaining or constructing NHS infrastructure;
- STP Block Program - yes;
- HSIP - yes, but through road safety audits (RSA) administered by NMDOT;
- Rail crossings - yes
- CMAQ - yes
- Freight - used for anything to do with trucks or rail

Mr. Sypher commented that the CMAQ-Flex funds have been discretionary by NMDOT. A City of Farmington request for CMAQ funds was denied by NMDOT saying they were keeping the funds for their own needs. It was noted that an application process for these funds is being developed by NMDOT.

Ms. Kozub reported that, with the assistance of UNM, the CMAQ program just completed a study to assess the best practices from around the country on how CMAQ funds (non-mandatory) are handled and disbursed. NMDOT is beginning to outline a process for entities to apply for these funds and expects to have an update on this for the MPO Quarterly in October with a written process within the year.

Ms. Kozub said NMDOT is also working on a written guide on how HSIP projects are selected and expect this guide to be available in the next year. Both the CMAQ and HSIP funds are at the discretion of NMDOT whether or not they are awarded to local agencies. The only federal aid program mandated to be for local entities is TAP. The Recreational Trails Program (RTP) can be awarded to local agencies, but NMDOT elects to keep this also open to Tribal/Local Public Agencies (T/LPA).

Mr. Fillerup said it is recognized that NMDOT has many maintenance needs in the MPO area that funds could be spent on. What has been frustrating for the Technical Committee members is how, in practice, funding decisions for STP or CMAQ funds are being determined. Mr. Fillerup asked if the money is available to the local agencies, how is it available and how do the agencies seek these funds and how are the local projects given consideration.

Mr. Brasher stated that the process begins with a letter/proposal that describes the needs of the project, the proposed schedule and costs. He noted that it is a matter of balancing all the needs within District 5.

Mr. Sypher commented that the process all goes back to asset management. While this has been used elsewhere in the country, New Mexico is just now getting started on formalizing the process. NMDOT and District 5 have said they look at needs, assess those needs and then make decisions on spending. The Technical Committee has been trying to make clear that they do not believe the local projects/priorities are being given consideration or due process and they want to have a professional dialog or open meeting with District 5 to provide them with the needed information to appropriately compare and prioritize projects. Mr. Sypher said the Technical Committee members understood the lack of funding versus the number of proposed projects. They want to provide the necessary data and participate in the dialog and asset management decisions.

Mr. Brasher responded that there has been dialog through the MPO. The District has obligations elsewhere and those areas cannot be ignored. He said District 5 does listen and understands the concerns of the FMPO. He said the local entities were being represented and were being heard and FMPO needs are talked about at each meeting. Mr. Fillerup agreed that there is representation, but the funding decisions are made at the NMDOT level. Mr. Brasher clarified that each entity is represented at the MPO and they can voice their opinion and wishes through the MPO process.

Mr. Fillerup added that the Transportation Commission meeting is an open meeting, but at that time, all the decisions have already been made and the meetings preceding this meeting the entities cannot gain access to and participate in. He asked how to gain access to this earlier process. He stated that San Juan County had submitted an application for the bridge on CR5500 last year and no response was ever received. Were the decision makers given the application material for this project? Mr. Brasher said that all the materials are provided to all and they work to assign priorities to fit within the available funding. He asked if Mr. Fillerup wanted to participate in this type of meeting where project needs were weighed and evaluated. Mr. Fillerup said that, yes, these were the meetings the Technical Committee members want to participate in.

Ms. C. Lopez stated that the Technical Committee members want to know how the projects are weighed and have access to how the projects are measured and compared in order to strengthen the local project applications. Good decisions cannot be made if there is no feedback provided. There was further discussion on how decisions are made within the entities, studies done, getting public input, and working together among the entities when there is a jurisdictional boundary. State highways go through the local entities of the MPO and those entities are affected by the NMDOT decisions made for those facilities, yet there is no dialog between NMDOT and the local agencies. Mr. Brasher asked what the members would propose.

Mr. Fillerup recommended a process for the entire area of District 5, listing the money available for each funding source, the meetings scheduled, the projects being presented to District 5 and being considered, and then ask for an apples-to-apples comparison. This type of meeting would provide the agencies with the information and understanding of, for example, that US 64 to the Arizona border is in really poor condition and needs to be reconstructed. The agencies would know what projects are being considered, how they are assessed, and why they are priorities for NMDOT. Mr. Brasher asked if this would be a regular meeting outside of the MPO held during the planning phases of District 5. Mr. Fillerup said that the Technical Committee learned at the last meeting that projects are already being identified and programmed for the planning years of the new TIP and STIP, years 2022 and 2023. Are local agency projects being considered and how can the Technical Committee provide input to these discussions. Mr. Fillerup asked if Mr. Brasher would be open to meetings that would encompass the entire District. Mr. Brasher said he was and would do what he could to bring the FMPO more into the District's planning process. Everyone thought that this was a great beginning to understanding the other's perspective.

Mr. Fillerup added that a separate discussion of maintenance issues was needed. He asked if existing maintenance agreements could be expanded upon. The County and NMDOT have an agreement through September 2018 for highway litter pickup and

blading on NM57. Mr. Fillerup asked if replacing state roadway signs could also be included in an agreement. Mr. Brasher recommended as a starting point for Mr. Fillerup to propose a draft amendment to the current agreement to include signage.

The Technical Committee asked that discussion of maintenance agreements be added to the September agenda as part of the Committee Member Discussion agenda item. Mr. Brasher said he would try to bring the District's maintenance engineer, Javier Martinez to aid in the discussion.

Planning Division - Rosa Kozub

Ms. Kozub introduced the new FMPO Liaison, Soamiya "Somie" Chavez.

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER DISCUSSION ITEMS

Subject:	Committee Member Discussion Items
Date:	August 1, 2017

DISCUSSION ITEMS

No discussion items were brought forward.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Subject:	Information Items
Prepared by:	Mary Holton, AICP, MPO Officer and Derrick Garcia, Associate Planner
Date:	August 1, 2017

INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. **Status Report.** Letter requested by Technical Committee on July 12.
- b. **MPO Fiscal Agent Transfer Update.** The Policy Committee met with Julie Baird, Assistant City Manager for Farmington, Jeff Kiely, Executive Director of the NWNMCOG, and representatives from the Planning Bureau of NMDOT at a special meeting on July 19. By consensus, the Policy Committee agreed to continue pursuing the transition of fiscal agency to the NWNMCOG, and approved a delay to January 1, 2018 for the proposed transition to take place. The Committee is continuing its review of the proposed JPA and Bylaws. The Technical Committee should continue coordinating their input with their entity's Policy Committee members. Staff is currently planning

for the proposals to be finalized in time for the Committees to consider them during the September cycle.

- c. **2018 NM Rail Plan Presentation on August 24.** David Nelson, Rail Planner for NMDOT will present the 2018 State Rail Plan process at the Policy Committee meeting in Farmington on August 24. The Technical Committee is invited to this presentation. Staff will notice that members of the Technical Committee may be in attendance.
- d. **MTP Chapters 4, 5, and 9 Update.** One-on-one meetings between MPO Staff and Technical Committee members are wrapping up. A presentation on proposed MTP Amendments will be made to the Technical Committee in September seeking recommendation to the Policy Committee for adoption.
- e. **NMDOT Travel Model Improvement Program (TMIP) Peer Review Session.** Staff will travel to Santa Fe on August 11 to participate in a peer review session for the update and development of the State's Travel Demand Model.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Holton asked if the update on the Aztec East Arterial (Agenda Item #5) could now be revisited with Mr. Saavedra, the City of Aztec's Technical Committee alternate. Mr. Saavedra said the project still has some hurdles but they are making progress. The City of Aztec was finally able to obtain the correct contact person at NMDOT for appraisals and that step is now moving forward. The City has also verified with the survey company that the East Arterial will be on city property.

- a. The letter requested by the Technical Committee on July 12 asking NMDOT to be active participants and included in the planning process of District 5 was authorized for signature by the Policy Committee on July 19. The letter was sent out last week and Ms. Holton shared a copy of the letter with the members.
- b. The Policy Committee met on July 19 and held a workshop on the JPA and Bylaws. The NWNMCOG in discussions with NMDOT requested to delay the fiscal agency transition until 1/1/18. The Policy Committee agreed with the delay. They are continuing to review the JPA and the Bylaws documents and proposals may be considered in September.
- c. David Nelson with the New Mexico Rail Division will make a presentation on the 2018 New Mexico State Rail Plan at the Policy Committee meeting on August 24. Technical Committee members are invited to attend this meeting to hear the presentation.
- d. Staff is completing their work with entity representatives on reviewing and updating chapters 4, 5, and 9 of the MTP. An update on the recommended changes is being prepared for the September committee meetings.
- e. Mr. Garcia will be attending a peer review session on the state's Travel Demand Model in Santa Fe on August 11.

Ms. Holton reported that due to a scheduled emergency management exercise along Municipal Drive on September 13, the Technical Committee meeting that day will be moved to Room 4 of the Farmington Civic Center.

The fall MPO traffic counts are scheduled to begin the week of August 21.

Mr. Garcia has completed his updated the MPO Overview (MPO 101) that is provided as part of the committee training manuals. This new overview of the MPO will be presented in September.

The new committee member training manuals are available.

A nominee, Toni Sitta, was awarded the partial MPO funding to attend the 19th Annual EPA Region 6 Stormwater Conference in September.

A new link has been added to the MPO website under "Maps" that will allow access to an interactive map with the statewide milepost and functional classification information.

9. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Saavedra asked who was Kim Anaya with NMDOT's Vegetation Management Division. Mr. Brasher said Ms. Anaya is responsible for ensuring NMDOT follows NMED state requirements when spraying herbicide. District 5 maintenance crews are actually responsible to applying the herbicide. An e-mail sent to Ms. Anaya was forwarded to District 5 earlier in August and Mr. Saavedra was following up on some sight issues along US 550 due to the growth of Chinese elms and other weeds. Mr. Brasher said the District 5 crews were currently dealing with rock and mud slides elsewhere in the state.

There was no additional business from the Chairman, Members and Staff.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was no public comment on any issues not on the agenda.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. C. Lopez moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Sypher seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously and Mr. Fillerup adjourned the meeting at 12:40 p.m.



Fran Fillerup, Chair



June Markle, Administrative Assistant