MINUTES OF THE

SANTA FE MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer in the absence of Jon Bulthuis, Chair, on this date at approximately 1:40 p.m. in the Santa Fe City Councilors Conference Room at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:
Johnny Baca-Santa Fe County Public Works
Jon Bulthuis, City of Santa Fe
Reed Liming, - City of Santa Fe
Josette Lucero-NCRTD
Chris Ortega-City of Santa Fe
John Romero- City of Santa Fe
Andrew Yandotchek, Growth Management

Members Absent:
Mary Helen Followingstad, Vice Chair, RPA Dir.
Larry Samuel- Tesuque Pueblo

Staff Present:
Mark Tibbetts-MPO Officer
Ivan Guillen, RTD
Mr. Fred Pearson

Others Present:
Claude Morelli, NMDOT
David Harris, NMDOT
Lucas Cruse
John Maloney
Charmaine Clair, Stenographer

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Liming moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Baca seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 24, 2008

Mr. Liming requested that Mr. Yandotchek be listed as a *member, excused* on the minutes of November 24, 2008.

Mr. Liming said on page 4 B, he wanted to clarify a study appropriated $1 million not $1.8 million and it should be clear that the city received *$200,000* for the TOD study.

Mr. Liming moved to approve the minutes of November 24, 2008 as amended. Mr. Ortega seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Mr. Tibbetts asked for nominations for the position of Chair and Vice Chair.

Mr. Liming recommended Ms. Follingstad for Chairperson since she held the Vice Chair position.

Ms. Lucero nominated Mr. Ortega as Chair and Mr. Liming seconded the motion.

Mr. Ortega asked if the term was for a year and asked if the committee should postpone the vote for a month.

Mr. Tibbetts said the term was for one year and the bylaws had changed some and would be discussed in the next meeting.

Mr. Ortega moved the election be postponed because there might be other nominations from members who were not present. Mr. Liming removed his second on the nomination and seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM:

1. Approval of Revised FY 2008-2009-UPWP

Mr. Tibbits said for clarification the revised UPWP was necessary because funding amounts and tasks had changed. He said the MPO was funded through the FHWA and FTA and there was an additional amount of $22,000 with a required local match of $5,000 with a caveat that the additional funds be expended first before the end of the fiscal year.

He said the MPO had funded the cost of the advertising, design and printing of the brochure (*exhibit 1*) for $10,000 and the project was to integrate or coordinate public transit service with the Rail Runner. He said the brochures would continue to be produced by MPO and as new stations and information occurred changes would be made.

Mr. Tibbetts said the general coordination of the state services down to the city local services was a topic for discussion.

Mr. Liming suggested the committee go through the changes.

Mr. Tibbits said changes had been highlighted and would be under 2009.04 and the highlighted portions were the only things that had changed; changes specified the brochure production and the budget summary that showed the increase from $32,000 to $55,000. He said the fiscal year 2009 would be based on fiscal year 2008 and there might be additional revisions. Staff had recommended the approval of the revised UPWP for that fiscal year be passed on to the policy board.

Mr. Liming moved to approve the revised UPWP. Mr. Ortega seconded the motion.

Mr. Ortega asked if that would be the time to make additional changes or clarification.

Mr. Tibbetts said yes and the next meeting would focus on 2010 UPWP and other changes might be needed to the 2009. He said the 2010 UPWP would need to be approved by the policy board by the April 9 meeting and he brought it up for discussion to have a draft ready.

Mr. Ortega said on page 3, various study groups were described and the purpose of the group and their focus. He thought focus could mean a variety of things and was too vague and suggested, using the bicycle study group as an example, that it state "the study group developed recommendations for consideration by the TCC," because of the confusion about bicycle planning and the relationship to BTAC.

Mr. Tibbits said it could be more specific and the intention of that group was to make recommendations to the MPO committee.

Mr. Ortega suggested the wording "to make advisory information and recommendations."

Mr. Tibbetts said the intent had been that the MPO not spend a lot of time and would focus on the outcomes of the study groups and the next step would be to have a defined recommendation.

Mr. Liming said if the words "*advisory information and recommendation are passed on to the TCC*" were added it would make it clearer.

Ms. Lucero asked if the groups had been established, what were the names and how the members were appointed.

Mr. Tibbits said the Bicycle Pedestrian Study Group had been established about three years ago as a task force and the first task for a bicycle pathways routing map had been completed. The group looked at bicycle/pedestrian/bicycle safety issues and anything related to routes, bicycle use or needs related to transit.

Ms. Lucero said she would like to get a list of meetings.

Mr. Tibbetts said the next group that would have to be created was a strategy group for the MTP and would easily be accommodated by a public transportation study group that would include the Rail Runner, RDT, Santa Fe Trails and any shuttle services. He said they would be formed to inform and make recommendations to MPO and flush out the MTP and would make it part of their scope of work.

Mr. Ortega said on page 5, NMDOT planning liaison, had items that defined the person's duties and the second duty said "*to provide technical assistance for the development and implementation of the TPP.*" He

recommended "to provide technical assistance and state and federal funding targets for the development and implementation of the TPP." He said there had been many discussions regarding the challenges the group faced when it was time to update the TPP without knowledge of what to ask for.

Mr. Jon Bulthuis entered at this time.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was a good point and asked Mr. Morelli to look into it and said the committee should know how much they would receive.

Mr. Liming suggested: "to provide technical assistance, including the identification of federal and state funding targets" and Mr. Ortega said that would work.

Mr. Romero said on page 4, MPO staff summarized staff's responsibilities and asked if traffic counts would be included.

Mr. Tibbits said there was a section where traffic counts were mentioned and showed that MPO performed traffic counts but he wasn't sure they were required. He said this was a defined scope of work that would be passed on to the state for approval.

Mr. Romero asked if it meant that MPO wouldn't acquire the counts if the counts were not under the bullet.

Mr. Tibbits said there was a task section that had traffic counts.

Mr. Liming said it was on page 11, Proposed Programs, second paragraph.

Mr. Tibbits read in 2009.02, on the traffic count program, transportation data collection, "MPO will collect or have conducted, annual traffic volumes and classifications."

Mr. Romero said on page 4, under staff it listed "maintain the MPO intelligent transportation system" and it was a proposed program, and thought they should all be listed or none should be listed.

Mr. Tibbits said those listed were federal requirements and the other sections contained what MPO *intended*.

Mr. Ortega suggested it could say, "Included but not limited to."

Mr. Bulthuis asked if the state required that annual counts be submitted.

Mr. Tibbits said that contract had expired. He said counts were still done but not universally and it had been a problem that was spread out over three years and now looked for the revision to be more consistent and conform to a given year. He said the data would still be shared with the state, but it would change the process and the intent would be to gather data on significant roads and not get into the city streets.

Mr. Romero asked when counting streets required by the previous agreement would be stopped.

Mr. Tibbits said a senior planner who was a civil engineer with experience in traffic counts and modeling was being hired, and before a revised process was implemented he should be on board. He said locations

had been identified and the details were being worked on.

Mr. Liming said the number of counts would need to be negotiated with DOT in a new contract.

Mr. Romero asked if a new contract would be pursued that was not as involved.

Mr. Tibbits said it would have to be discussed with the city, state and county and there were a lot of issues.

Mr. Ortega said on page 5, MPO Director, "*additional staff members anticipated for FY09*" and he asked if that referred to federal FY09.

Mr. Tibbits said it would be this year if there was funding and MPO used the reference as the city and state fiscal year so the quarters would end in June.

Mr. Ortega said on page 17-19, in the top third, *MPO Staffing Needs,* include "*creation and coordination of a reasonable traffic count program.*" He asked if it would be more accurate to use *enhancement, work continuation of, expansion of,* instead of "creation of."

Mr. Tibbits said there was a new region proposed and the word *expansion* could be used.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if they went forward with a larger boundary would the plan be updated because it didn't show as a specific task.

Mr. Tibbits said it had been specified in the Joint Powers Agreement, similar to the language on the traffic count and would be in coordination with the other transit. He said Santa Fe County's concern had been to have more coordination of public transit services in areas like the town of Cerrillos and El Dorado.

Mr. Liming said the intention had been it would be a new boundary in the Joint Powers Agreement and the MTP would reflect that.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if there would be an effort to revise the MTP other than the five-year cycle. He said he had received pressure regarding the connections and things that were not currently included in the MTP.

Mr. Tibbetts said they would be addressed and the Community College District Plan would be looked at and work would be done with the county with developments south of El Dorado and developments that were protected that would need to be defined more clearly and go through the MPO process.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if the intent had been to gather work on those areas and if there was a schedule.

Mr. Tibbits said yes, there was a timeline and after March 1 when the senior planner came on, it would move forward and by the middle of March discussions and public meetings would be held. He said technically the MTP deadline was the end of June 2010, but he wanted to finish it by next spring to coincide with the quarter studies. He said the first public meeting would begin at 4 pm on Wednesday.

Mr. Romero said on page 13, the title of Santa Fe MPO Staff- he asked if the title should be Santa Fe Studies and Mr. Tibbets agreed.

He said returning to *counts*, if the plan asked for counts for the current MPO boundary would that happen because the model would be revised. He said the program map generated by the last count had shown within the city boundaries and there wasn't anything for the county.

Mr. Tibbits said the model had been built on the tazes (transportation analysis zones) and mirrored the boundary. The issues to conform to the tazes had been the reason the boundary was changed and in terms of counts, a sample was needed for validation.

Mr. Romero said the counts were used to validate and calibrate the model and asked if the county wouldn't need that.

Mr. Tibbits said some counts had been taken on 14 but the county was comfortable with the counts that existed.

Mr. Romero said there was six months to get the other counts that hadn't been established and it read data collection "for regionally significant roads within the MPO boundary" and he wasn't sure that had been done.

Mr. Tibbits said there would be a discussion with the county and the city as to the significant roads to be counted and there wouldn't be many changes for 2010 and it would be ongoing; it was not meant to be finished.

Ms. Lucero said on page 5 on the RPO, in the last sentence said the MPO and RPO would have direct communication, and asked if the communication worked well and if MPO had worked closely with RPO in the past.

Mr. Tibbits said RPO had a new planner that he had invited to the meeting and was on his contact list and he expected they would be more coordinated for transit issues and long range plans. He said they exchanged notices of meetings and there would be common issues on transit parking etc.

Ms. Lucero asked Mr. Harris if, from a planning perspective, there was any requirement of the state to have activities together.

Mr. Harris said he didn't know of any.

Mr. Tibbits said quarterly meetings for MPO and RPO had been suggested but the issues were so different there was no value in them meeting without a common issue.

Mr. Harris said for clarification, on a continuing basis there was no requirement but the Public Transit Human Services Coordination Plan had been coordinated to make the Santa Fe MPO and RPO area eligible for the various funding. He said there was a plan for the MPO and RPO area on the website with full appendices.

Mr. Tibbett said a serious issue in the RPO had been expansion of the MPO boundary and there was the need for more direct communication on the issue. He said the portion to the south and Tesuque Pueblo chose to join the MPO although they might still be with the RPO.

With no other comments, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Approval of the Revised and Restated Joint Powers Agreement

Mr. Tibbits said work would be presented to the policy board in the February meeting and there were the following changes:

- Tesuque Pueblo would keep their sovereignty on the governing law in (section 8, page 7)
- The names of the people to sign the document changed. He said the purpose had been to officially change and update the JPA to show Mr. Mike Anaya as the chair, Mark Mitchell, as the Governor of Tesuque, and Earl Samuels, as Lieutenant Governor.
- Membership of the MPO policy board would include the NMDOT and the Tesuque Pueblo with the county and the city.

Mr. Liming said there had been some previous discussion on boundary changes and had been reviewed by the county.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if there were public notice requirements related to the boundary change.

Mr. Tibbits said it wouldn't have to go to the governing bodies and would go to the TPB to be signed by the Board of County Commissioners and the mayor and if it were deemed a significant change, would have to be approved by the Governor of New Mexico.

He thought the biggest change of the boundary would be the inclusion of El Dorado and the un-incorporated areas under the Land Use and Planning ordinances and should remain consistent and not become enmeshed in land grants.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if they knew if the extent of the change required it go to the governor.

Mr. Tibbett's said he had been told it would not have to go to the governor's office; it would go to the Department of Finance Administration, the secretary's office of the DOT and to the mayor and the Board of County Commissioners. He said this would be a JPA between the various jurisdictions.

Mr. Bulthuis asked Mr. Tibbett's if the process would be to get the approval of City Council and BCC once it left the committee.

Mr. Tibbits said he would go to the policy board first.

Mr. Yandotchek suggested there be a written legal description to clarify the extent of the boundary and it should include the Santa Fe Southern Rail Line within the MPO boundary.

Mr. Liming said he would also add the PLSS lines on the legend.

Mr. Bulthuis said Mr. Tibbits had mentioned it would be appropriate to bring before RPO for discussion and asked if that was planned.

Mr. Tibbett's said it would be taken simultaneously to the RPO and the boundaries would be approved by the governing bodies of the jurisdictions and would be an *advisory*.

Mr. Liming said a presentation had been made.

Mr. Bulthuis said that was important to prevent anyone who might be taken off guard by official actions.

Mr. Liming moved to approve the revised JPA. Mr. Ortega seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

a. Update on Continuation Of Santa Fe Studies (I-25, NM599 and St. Francis Dr.) 1/28/09

Mr. Tibbits said the meetings on all three corridors would start with a public meeting held on Wednesday, February 28 at 4 pm and presentations would be given at 4:30 and 6:00 pm at the Genoveva Chavez Community Center.

Mr. Morelli said there would be a total of seven stations and an open house format with two presentations.

Mr. Tibbits said the MPO table would have the most recent version of the long range future transportation network and would be an opportunity for input from the public and to answer questions and piggyback information.

b. Update on Economic Stimulus Package-NMDOT, FHWA

Mr. Morelli said a list had been compiled by DOT of the proposals of the local agencies. He said Santa Fe had a total of four projects: Airport Road Safety Enhancements, Cerrillos Road Reconstruction, Siler Road Extension Bridge and two downtown river bridges.

He said that Cerrillos Road Reconstruction was in the STIP (statewide transportation improvement program) and there had been confusion if the dollar amounts proposed were an addition in the STIP or was part of the funds that could be used for local match.

Mr. Morelli said they were not sure who the contact person was, but he would need to know the level of work that had been done on each project. He said the government wouldn't issue contracts until all of the certifications were in place, environmental clearances, certifications, right of ways, acquisitions, SHIPO clearance and said if the money couldn't be spent it would be taken away. He said a table would be prepared on every project in the state for information and if they were "shovel ready."

Mr. Ortega asked the contact at the DOT because he sent various pieces of the information Mr. Morelli requested and had received an email that said it should be sent to someone else.

Mr. Morelli said the spreadsheet was being prepared by Pat Alvarid and she had asked for the information.

Mr. Harris said Mr. Morelli had referred specifically to the highway side and on the transit side it would be

done by formula. He said there was a house version of the bill and a senate outline with less money for transit. He said that "highways" was in the ball park and would be decided by formula and a certain amount would go to urban programs. He said the City of Santa Fe and Albuquerque would receive money by formula for the 5311 type projects and a list of the current transit providers throughout the state was being constructed; he wanted to use the money for the purchase of vehicles and price agreements that were in place. He said people and facilities would have to follow the same criteria and on the transit side, 50% of the allocation had to be awarded for construction within 120 days.

Ms. Lucero told Mr. Harris she hadn't received a list of the projects on the RTD.

Mr. Harris said RTD was not included because it was a different batch of money. He said a list was being prepared in the Transit Rail Division Office and information was still being collected. He said RTD would be on the list and it would depend on how ready to go it was.

Ms. Lucero they had been working on shovel ready.

Mr. Harris said it came down to the final bill language and the amount of money available.

Mr. Tibbett's said some of the projects for 5311 were rural transportation and asked if the MPO changed the boundary to look at urbanized areas and if the newer areas, like Cerrillos and outlining areas, would be considered rural and eligible for 5311 or lose that status. He said it had been written urban and areas 20 years out that might become urbanized.

Mr. Bulthuis said the urban areas related to the formula funding were numbers from the census definition of urban.

Mr. Tibbetts said that would be fair because funding had been based on the census.

Mr. Liming said the Santa Fe urbanized area was smaller than what was proposed as the new MPO boundary.

Mr. Harris said there was a gray area but the money had been given based on the TMA and would need clarification.

Ms. Lucero said she had received many requests that she had no information about and asked when she might see the list from Mr. Harris's office.

Mr. Harris said the list was being developed and would be shared but would probably not be completed until the following week.

Mr. Bulthuis said the airport also had a lot of requests in the pipeline.

Mr. Morelli said similar to the transit, it was in aviation and he would have to look at the spreadsheet and would follow up.

Mr. Bulthuis said the projects would need to be identified as a priority for the state for the local entity to have a chance at the money.

Mr. Tibbits said it should have been more clearly identified when the transportation commission met, that it was only district sponsored projects and not *projects from the district* meaning DOT sponsored projects.

Mr. Morelli said according to Ms. Alvarid the commission would have to visit the issue in February and approve a list and said what had been done was not approved.

Mr. Harris said per the house draft last week STIP would get $10 million; the senate version had been different.

c. Update on in NM Rail Runner Express service and coordination with NMDOT Park-And-Ride, NCRTD, Santa Fe Trails, and City of Santa Fe.

Mr. Tibbits said he would keep the brochures for people who arrived at the AltaVista station with the DOT defined connections to the Park-and-Ride shuttle, to the city shuttle, the North Central RTD and Santa Fe Trails services. He said he was not aware of any further announcements other than the station at 599 would break ground that day.

Mr. Bulthuis said that the weekend service had been a big press item and there was a push to extend service to Sunday but hadn't heard anything further.

He said the interface had gone well and had just left a meeting about interaction at the Rail Yard and signage to provide clearer direction on how to get downtown. He said the design planned by the Rail Yard for a plaza welcome area around the depot would relate to the archive building.

Mr. Tibbits added a testimonial; he had taken his family to the depot and everything went smoothly. He said there were only a few cars in the free parking lot but the platform was full of people and he heard positive comments a lot of surprise that the ride went faster than people assumed.

He said regarding the signage, people were crowded next to the track and there were no painted lines and there should be an alert for people to stay back.

Mr. John Maloney said the times he had ridden the train had gone smoothly and had been very easy and he said many times it was standing room only. He thought the use of the Rail Runner had been underestimated.

Mr. Ivan Guillen with the RTD said they were beginning to see people from Taos and Questa take advantage of the Rail Runner.

Mr. Bulthuis said in terms of interface, the connections were very accommodating with the local service providers RTD, Santa Fe Trails, Park-And-Ride, and worked well.

Mr. Harris said the shelters were installed last week, the lights would be installed within the next few weeks and there would be an information kiosk in the same style as the Rail Runner stations.

Mr. Tibbits said they tried to color code everything and suggested the kiosk if possible be painted to

correspond with the colors of the stations.

Ms. Lucero requested the next version of the brochure change her color from red to blue for the buses.

d. Discussion: Clarification and coordination of public transportation service and planning roles within the MPO Planning Area.

Mr. Tibbits said the role MPO would play should be looked at and whether there were issues on the planning coordination, points on routes and coordination. He said some of the planning coordination would need to be clarified with RPA who had taken on a stronger transportation component in their scope of work. He said the Transportation Policy Board Policy was made up of many of the same people as on the RPA and MPO and gross receipts tax wouldn't be determined but a forum for the coordination for discussion of various services and help in the facilitation would be created.

He said he wasn't sure to what extent the RPA had intended MPO be involved and whether would be only to split up the gross receipts tax or involvement in service routes.

Mr. Ortega asked had the bullet been put on the agenda by the RPA.

Mr. Tibbits said he had discussed it with a variety of people and thought it would be a discussion point for clarification.

Mr. Ortega asked if there was concern of ambiguity; the UPWP had a rail transit study group that talked about regional transit, district planning and Park-and-Ride.

Mr. Tibbits said the venue for discussion on the issue of coordination of services would be in a study group.

Mr. Ortega said in another area it made reference to Santa Fe Trails Transit Division MPO and said they would *provide planning and computer modeling assistance; Santa Fe trails is necessary to facilitate coordination of local and regional transit commuter rail service.*

Mr. Tibbits said that had been in the model and would also ensure they had the latest designated train stops.

Mr. Bulthuis said the role being sought would be between the RPA and MPO and would be important. He said he would be deep in the RPA process along with Mr. Yandotchek and both could bring information back to the committee. He said with regional transit issues he served on the board for the district and Ms. Lucero was a member of the regional board and would be able help fill in the regional gaps.

He said the process was clear and there should be no ambiguity on how things would move forward with the policy bodies. He said the RPA had been tasked with prioritizing the revenues from the GRT for new services related to the Rail Runner and how the work elements would be broken up in terms of who would provide the services. He said they had clearly taken charge and were moving forward and had gathered information from staff on how the public thought the money should be spent. He said they would go through the prioritization process by the end of June, when the collection of funds would start under the new tax.

Ms. Lucero asked Mr. Bulthuis if he would be interested in a discussion held on the 6th to describe the RPA process to the board. She said the board had questions and Councilor Romero had mentioned she wanted a presentation for the RTD.

Mr. Bulthuis said he thought that would be a great idea and a presentation should be given by Mary Hollingstad, as the Director of the RPA.

Mr. Bulthuis asked Ms. Lucero to call Ms. Hollingstad and said he would also mention it. He said Ms. Hollingstad would be responsive to the board and would move forward with a public involvement plan. He thought there wouldn't be a lot of new things, in terms of service corridors, El Dorado, New Mexico 14, Santa Fe Community College, and something to the pueblos north of Santa Fe had been lifted out of the RTD service plan and he had recommended they move forward with them. He said there might be some connections within the city that didn't currently exist; potentially La Cinega.

MPO OFFICER UPDATES

Staffing; FY 2009-10 UPWP; and FY2010-2013 TIP

Mr. Tibbits said there had been three candidates and all had been interviewed for the senior planner position. He said two of them had specific MPO experience in traffic demand modeling and traffic count program development. He said he hoped to make an offer the next day and would be announced by e-mail when it happened.

He said he had handed over TIP to Phil Gallegos to ensure it corresponded to the current STIP and the meeting in March would be to finalize any TIP additions and he would have a draft for the 2010-2013 for the next meeting.

Mr.Bulthuis asked if the items related to the stimulus package that Mr. Harris had mentioned and would it be on the TIP log as well.

Mr. Tibbits said it would with any projects mentioned by Mr. Morelli. He said technically they were supposed to be fiscally constrained and all the projects had been sitting in the wings. He said there was a better idea of funding this time around and they would be in the TIP even if they had to be limited or phased.

Mr. Harris said this would be money in addition to money they would normally receive.

Mr. Tibbits said in their TIP the money would show up as regular economic stimulus package money regardless of whether it was for transit.

TCC MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Romero requested an agenda item for the status of the revisions to the schedule and asked for an outline for the MTP.

Mr. Tibbets said it wasn't at that level but if possible he would put the schedule in. He said it wouldn't have

a lot of detail.

Mr. Romero said it had been discussed two years ago and there was only a year and five months left and he wouldn't want to be in a position of making decisions without being able to give it thought. He said the TPP's first responsibility was to do the MTP and would need focus.

Mr. Tibbits said MPO was not at the level to have a fiscal constraint to the MTP.

Mr. Bulthuis said it would be helpful to him to see how they would get the work done over the next nine months. He said the task involved a lot of public-relations and road extensions and corridors that didn't happen overnight and it would have to be plotted on how they would get an approved document that TBB would feel comfortable with and that had all the components.

Mr. Tibbets said a lot of it would be tied to the study.

Mr. Romero suggested he not wait for the studies. He said if some of the information/discussion items had to be removed from the agenda it would be best.

Mr. Pearson said he wanted to echo Mr. Romero's comment that the time was short and there would be two main activities processed over the next two years: the updated MPT and the resumption of the corridor studies. He said it would be a disaster if they proceeded independently until the last month of the year with no opportunity to integrate them.

Mr. Tibbits said he and Mr. Romero were on the studies team and Mr. Romero would ensure coordination on the technical issues. He said he used any opportunity in the public meeting for comments and concerns and had already made notations from the comments on the Siler Road Project.

Mr. Morelli said he should mention the link of the MTP in his presentation.

Mr. Bulthuis said he understood the next meeting would have a basic outline of the milestones.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
There were no Public Comments.

ADJOURN- Next TCC meeting: *Monday February 23, 2009*

Mr. Romero moved to adjourn. Mr. Ortega seconded the motion in the past by unanimous voice vote.

Approved by:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Chair

Submitted by:

Charmaine Clair

Charmaine Clair, Stenographer