



Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

"Promoting Interconnected Transportation Options"



Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Monday January 25, 2016, 1:30 P.M.

City of Santa Fe Offices @ Market Station

500 Market Street, Suite 200, Santa Fe, NM

(Map: <http://tinyurl.com/l6kejeq>)

AGENDA

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 1/20/16 TIME 9:01a

SERVED BY Mark Tibbitts

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

- ◆ Call to Order
 - ◆ Roll Call
 - ◆ Approval of Agenda
 - ◆ Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 26, 2015 and November 16, 2015
1. **Communications from the Public**
 2. **Items for Discussion and Possible Action:**
 - a. Election of Officers – *MPO Staff*
 - b. Review and Recommendation for Revised SFMPO Bylaws – *MPO Staff*
 - c. Review and Release for Public Review of Amendment 2 to the FFY2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program – *MPO Staff*
 - d. Recommendation to Accept Public Transit Planning (Section 5304) Grant Award – *MPO Staff*
 - e. Discussion of the Project Development Process and Project Delivery Issues for T/LPA Projects – *MPO Staff*
 - f. Update on Transportation Improvement Program projects
 3. **Matters from the MPO Staff**
 4. **Matters from TCC Members**
 5. **Adjourn** - Next TCC Meeting: Monday February 22, 2016

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

SUMMARY OF ACTION
SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
 October 26, 2015

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER		1
ROLL CALL	QUORUM	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	APPROVED	1
APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES August 24, 2015	APPROVED	1-2
COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC	NONE	2
 <u>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION</u>		
REVIEW AND RELEASE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW OF AMENDMENT 1 TO THE FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	APPROVED	2
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE SANTA FE MPO 2016 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS	APPROVED	2-3
DISCUSSION OF A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FFY2015 AND FFY2016 UPWP	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	3
UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	3-4
MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	4
MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	4
ADJOURNMENT		5

SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Monday October 26, 2015, 1:30 pm

Market Station Conference Room

500 Market Street, Santa Fe, NM

1. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Chair John Romero at approximately 1:30 pm on Monday, October 26, 2015, at the Market Station Conference Room, Santa Fe, New Mexico,

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Romero, Chair, City of Santa Fe
Erik Aaboe, Santa Fe County
Desirae Lujan, City of Santa Fe
Richard McPherson, City of Santa Fe
Ray Matthew, Santa Fe County
Dave Quintana, NMDOT
Anthony Mortillaro, NCRTD

MEMBERS ABSENT

Vicki Lucero, Santa Fe County
Jon Bulthuis, Santa Fe Trails
Charles Dorame, Tesuque
Pueblo
Adam Leigland, Santa Fe County
Greg Smith, City of Santa Fe
Maria Lohmann, Santa Fe County

STAFF PRESENT

Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Keith Wilson, Senior MPO Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

Jessica Griffin, NMDOT
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Aaboe, seconded by Mr. McPherson, to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 24, 2015

Mr. Aaboe said the minutes refer to El Gaucho Way and it should be El Gancho Way.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Aaboe, seconded by Mr. McPherson, to approve the minutes as amended.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no communication from the public.

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

A. REVIEW AND RELEASE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW OF AMENDMENT 1 TO THE FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Mr. Wilson passed out a handout. The handout is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "1". Mr. Wilson reviewed the handout.

Mr. Quintana asked does it need to be deleted from the STIP database directly.

Mr. Wilson answered yes.

Mr. Wilson said we are looking for approval to send the Amendment out for Public Review.

Chair Romero asked for the Acequia Trail, is the \$470,000 intended to cover our over match.

Mr. Wilson said yes.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Mortillaro, seconded by Mr. Mathews, to approve the Amendment moving forward to Public Review.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE SANTA FE MPO 2016 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The proposed meeting schedule is included in the packet.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Quintana, seconded by Mr. McPherson, to

recommend the schedule of meetings to the Policy Board.

VOTE The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. DISCUSSION OF A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FFY2015 AND FFY2016 UPWP

Mr. Tibbetts reported that they are half way through a two year Unified Planning Work Program. We finished the Pedestrian Plan, Transit Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. We are moving into the implementation phase. We are looking at the special studies we have had in the past. We have five main tasks. Administration, TIP, data collection and management and planning. The 5th one was special studies. We never really got any hours assigned to those. We have taken those and put the heart of them into other planning activities. That will shuffle those tasks a bit. We hired an intern planner for the summer and that hire will continue through the end of this calendar year. The change adds hours to the original plan. Those changes trigger a formal amendment because it is more than a 20% change. We are in the process of preparing that Amendment. We will get the proposed Amendment out in a minimum of a week before for review and recommendation for your meeting of November 16th.

D. UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Mr. Wilson passed out a handout. The handout is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "2". Mr. Wilson reviewed the handout.

Chair Romero asked if the Guadalupe Bridge is just repair.

Mr. Quintana said yes, deck and rails and approach work reconstruction. Nothing major. We are hoping to get another ten years out of it.

Mr. Romero asked regarding Canyon Road 70, what happened with that.

Mr. Quintana said we are looking at option four. We will be ready by February to go, however, it needs funding. We will be lobbying the Legislature next year for funding for this item.

Mr. Wilson stated that a correction needs to be made to the draft Amendment 1 to the FFY2016-2021 TIP. Item 100340 needs to be added and changed to reflect moving the funding to Federal year 17.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Mortillaro, seconded by Mr. Matthew, to add this correction to their previous motion for approval

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF

Chair Romero asked if the Pedestrian Plan had been approved.

Mr. Tibbetts answered yes, it is on our website.

Mr. Wilson announced that this will be Ms. Lujan's last meeting.

Ms. Lujan said she had resigned from the City and is going to work for Los Alamos County.

8. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Aaboe said that Mr. Leigland should be replaced on the Committee by Michael Kelley, Public Works Director for the County of Santa Fe.

Mr. Wilson said we may want to look at the membership of the TCC to make sure we have the right people at the table. Mark can send out our current membership and you can look at it and advise us. We can have that on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Tibbetts said we will have it on the agenda. We need to have land use represented. We need that connection.

Mr. Quintana said he was asked to set up a tour of the DDI project. He can do that. He asked that anyone who is interested please let him know.

Chair Romero said the Local Government Road Fund Training is next week.

9. ADJOURN - NEXT TCC MEETING, MONDAY NOVEMBER 16, 2015

The meeting as adjourned at 2:20 pm.



Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

John Romero, Chair

**SUMMARY OF ACTION
SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Monday, November 16, 2015**

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER		1
ROLL CALL	NO QUORUM	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	NOT APPROVED	2
APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES October 26, 2015	NOT APPROVED	2
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	NONE	2
<u>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION</u>		
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	NOT APPROVED	2
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FFY2015 AND FFY2016 UPWP	NOT APPROVED	2
DISCUSSION ON REVISIONS TO TCC MEMBERSHIP	NOT DISCUSSED	2
UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS	NOT DISCUSSED	2
MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF	NONE	3
MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS	NONE	3
ADJOURNMENT	ADJOURNED	3

**SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
CITY OF SANTA FE OFFICES @ MARKET STATION
Monday, November 16, 2015**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Mark Tibbetts on Monday, November 16, 2015, at approximately 1:45 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rick Devine, Engineer Supervisor,
City of Santa Fe for John Romero, Chair
Richard MacPherson, City of Santa Fe
Anthony Mortillaro, NCRTD
Ray Matthews Santa Fe County

MEMBERS ABSENT

John Romero, Chair
Eric Aaboe
Dave Quintana, NMDOT
John Bulthuis, Santa Fe Trails
Charles Dorame, Tesuque
Pueblo
Greg Smith, City of Santa Fe
Maria Lohmann, Santa Fe County
Vicky Lucero, Santa Fe County

STAFF PRESENT

Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Keith Wilson, Senior MPO Planner
Erick Aune, MPO Transportation Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

Brad Fisher Local Government Coordinator NMDOT
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

Mr. Tibbetts said we do not have a quorum. If the committee is comfortable with this, we will adjourn. He can answer questions if there are any.

Mr. Matthews asked can the Policy Board approve these items without a recommendation from the TCC.

Mr. Tibbetts said this is an advisory Board to the Policy Board. If they choose to,

they can, however, typically they don't do it that way. These items are changes to the TIP money and shifting some things.

Mr. Wilson said nothing has changes on these items since we went out to public review. We did not have any public comments. This Board tentatively approved these items pending public review.

Mr. Matthews said so they could approve them.

Mr. Tibbetts said yes, we will explain to them that you recommended approval pending pubic comments.

Mr. Wilson said it is time sensitive.

Mr. Tibbetts said there will be no meeting in December.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
October 26, 2015**

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

**A) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF AMENDMENT TO
THE FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM**

**B) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PROPOSED
AMENDMENT TO THE FFY2015 AND FFY2016 UPWP**

C) DISCUSSION ON REVISIONS TO TCC MEMBERSHIP

**D) UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM PROJECTS**

7. MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF

8. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:22 pm.



Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

John Romero, Chair



Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

Bylaws and Operating Procedures

Approved by the Transportation Policy Board
August 13, 2009

Amended: June 25, 2012
November 19, 2013
June 26, 2014

Bylaws and Operating Procedures

The Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization (“SFMPPO”) is established by a Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”) between the City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Tesuque Pueblo, and the New Mexico Department of Transportation; approved by the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration, and by designation of the Governor of New Mexico. The purpose of the MPO is to carry out the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process as defined within the provisions of federal regulations contained in 23 CFR Section 450 and SAFETEA-LU Section 3005.

Federal regulations and the ~~SFMPPO~~-JPA establish a number of operational and procedural requirements for the SFMPPO. The purpose of these Bylaws is to establish guidance for issues pertaining specifically to the SFMPPO that are not otherwise addressed in other documents.

SFMPPO Transportation Policy Board

I. Authority:

The SFMPPO Transportation Policy Board (“TPB”) has authority granted under the ~~SFMPPO~~-JPA, applicable to contracts and State and Federal laws and regulations, including but not limited to 23 CFR Section 450.

II. Membership:

The TPB is comprised of eight (8) ~~appointed-elected~~ officials from the member governing bodies identified in the ~~SFMPPO Joint Powers Agreement~~JPA. The TPB Membership shall be comprised of the following appointed officials:

City of Santa Fe

Mayor or Mayor Pro-Tem
Two (2) City Councilors

Santa Fe County:

Three (3) County Commissioners

Tesuque Pueblo

Tesuque Pueblo Governor or designee

New Mexico Department of Transportation (“NMDOT”)

Cabinet Secretary or designee

TPB Members from each governing body can be selected or changed at any time. Notification of the selection of a TPB Member must be made in writing to the TPB Chair. A copy of this notification shall be kept on file at the MPO Office.

The following are non-voting, advisory agencies to the TPB:

New Mexico Department of Transportation, Planning and Safety Division

New Mexico Department of Transportation, Rail and Transit Division
New Mexico Department of Transportation District 5
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
North Central New Mexico Regional Transit District (NCRTD)

- A. Alternates - Each governing body can designate one alternate TPB Member. An alternate can only be seated in the absence of a Member from the corresponding governing body. Notification of the selection of an alternate TPB Member must be made in writing to the TPB Chair. A copy of this notification shall be kept on file at the MPO Office.
- B. Officers - The officers of the TPB shall consist of a Chair and Vice Chair:
1. Chair - The Chair shall be elected by simple majority at the first meeting of each year. The duties of the Chair shall be to preside at all meetings of the TPB and act as official signatory for SFMPO documents and letters either directly approved by the TPB or supporting policies previously approved by the TPB.
 2. Vice Chair - The Vice Chair shall be elected by simple majority at the first meeting of each year. The Vice Chair assumes the duties of the Chair as stated in II B (1) in the absence of the Chair.
 3. Secretary - The MPO ~~Officer/Director~~Officer shall be the Secretary of the TPB and shall have the responsibility for preparing agendas and packet materials, posting meeting notices, and maintaining accurate records of all TPB meetings
- C. Removal Procedure - Attendance is required at all TPB meetings. If a TPB Member is consistently absent or is unable to continue participation on the TPB, the acting TPB Chair can petition the absent Member's governing body for a new appointment to the TPB.
- D. Replacement Procedure - The corresponding governing body shall make any and all replacement appointments to the TPB. Notification of the selection of a replacement TPB Member must be made in writing to the TPB Chair. A copy of this notification shall be kept on file at the MPO Office.
- E. Change in Membership Composition – Any change to the above stated membership composition requires a unanimous vote of the TPB Members.

III. Meetings:

All TPB meetings shall be in compliance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act (NMSA 10-15-1 – 10-15-4). Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed. Distribution of agendas and supporting documentation shall be provided to the TPB Members with the following minimum advance notice:

Regular Meetings – seven (7) calendar days' notice
Special Meetings – three (3) calendar days' notice

- A. Regular TPB Meetings - TPB meetings shall be held at least quarterly in accordance with the Annual Meetings Schedule as approved by the TPB.

- B. Special TPB Meetings - Special meetings shall be held as needed. Special Meetings may be scheduled by the Chair or a majority of the TPB.
- C. Quorum – A quorum is formed by the presence of a simple majority of five (5) Members. No action shall be taken without a quorum of the TPB in attendance.
- D. Voting Procedure - Any action of the TPB (with the exception of Section II-E above) requires a simple majority vote of those Members in attendance to be approved. A motion fails on a tie vote. Each member of the TPB, including the Chair and Vice Chair, has one vote. Members must be present to vote. However, in the event of no quorum and at the discretion of the Chair, Voting-voting by proxy or telephone is may be not allowed.

IV. Oversight:

Technical Coordinating Committee

The TPB shall establish a Technical Coordinating Committee (“TCC”) which will be responsible for providing coordination, technical review and recommendations for all transportation plans, projects and studies within the Metropolitan Planning Area. The TCC shall provide recommendations and input to the TPB on issues directed to it by the TPB, its membership, or the MPO Officer/~~Director~~.

SFMPO Staff

SFMPO Staff shall be employees of the City of Santa Fe, which is the fiscal and administrative agent of the SFMPO. The SFMPO Staff reports to the TPB and is directed by TPB policies and approved documents.

~~At a minimum, the SFMPO~~ staff shall include the following positions.

- MPO Officer/~~Director~~
- MPO Senior Planner
- MPO Transportation Planner

Formatted: Left, Right: 2.69"
Formatted: Right: 3.51"

Task Forces and Study Groups

The TPB may designate a Task Force or Study Group to undertake special projects or review special topics. These Task Forces or Study Groups shall function as advisory bodies to the TCC and TPB.

SFMPO Technical Coordinating Committee

I. Authority & Responsibilities:

The SFMPO Technical Coordinating Committee (“TCC”) is established by the ~~SFMPO~~ TPB and shall be responsible for providing coordination, technical review and recommendations for all transportation plans, projects and studies within the Metropolitan Planning Area. The TCC provides recommendations and input to the SFMPO TPB on issues directed to it by the TPB, its membership, or the MPO ~~Officer/Director~~ Officer.

The MPO Officer/~~Director~~ and staff shall prepare and present a draft of all required documents and programs to the Technical Coordinating Committee for review and recommendation. The MPO Officer/~~Director~~ will submit all TCC recommendations to the TPB for discussion and final approval.

II. Membership:

The TCC is comprised of twelve (12) voting members including agency staff from the TPB governing bodies and representatives from regional transit providers within the SFMPO Metropolitan Planning Area ("MPA").

Voting TCC Members:

The TCC will be comprised of the following agency staff:

City of Santa Fe

Engineering Supervisor, Director, Roadways-Roads and Trails Engineering Drainage Division/Section, Public Works Department
Director, Traffic-Engineering Division, Public Works Department
Director, Long Range Planning Division
Director, Current Planning/Land Use Division

Santa Fe County

Land Use Department Administrator
Transportation Planner, Growth Management Department
Director, Public Works Department
Project Development Division Director

Tesuque Pueblo

Staff Designated by Tesuque Pueblo Governor

New Mexico Department of Transportation

District Engineer, District 5

Transit Operators

Executive Director, North Central Regional Transit District
Transit Division Director, Santa Fe Trails

The following are non-voting advisory agencies to the TCC:

Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration
Santa Fe Public Schools
New Mexico Department of Transportation Planning and Safety Division
New Mexico Department of Transportation Rail and Transit Division
Northern Pueblos Regional Planning Organization (NPRPO)
North Central New Mexico Economic Development District (NCNMEDD)

A. Alternates - If a TCC member is to be absent, only the designated alternate can represent that TCC member. Notification of the selection of an alternate must be made in writing to the MPO Officer/Director/Officer. A copy of this notification shall be kept on file at the MPO Office.

B. Officers

1. Chair - A member shall be elected as Chair by simple majority at the first meeting of each year. ~~The Chair shall be responsible for presiding at all meetings.~~

2. Vice Chair - A member shall be elected as Vice Chair by simple majority at the first meeting of each year. The Vice Chair shall be responsible for presiding at the meetings in the absence of the Chair.
3. Secretary - The ~~SFMPO Officer~~/~~Director~~ or MPO Senior Planner shall be the Secretary of the TCC and shall have the responsibility for preparing agendas and packet materials, posting meeting notices, and maintaining accurate records of all TCC meetings. The Secretary shall preside at meetings in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair.

C. Removal Procedure

1. Attendance is required at all TCC meetings. If a member or their alternate is consistently absent or is unable to continue participation on the TCC, the TCC Chair or MPO ~~Officer~~/~~Director~~ may petition the absent member's agency for a new appointment to the TCC.
2. The ~~SFMPO~~ TPB may remove any TCC member by a majority vote upon the grounds of malfeasance or nonfeasance of office.

- D. Replacement Procedure – The corresponding agencies shall make any and all replacement appointments to the TCC. Notification of the selection of a replacement must be made in writing to the MPO ~~Officer~~/~~Director~~. A copy of this notification shall be kept on file at the MPO Office.

III. Meetings:

All TCC meetings shall be in compliance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act (NMSA 10-15-1 – 10-15-4). Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed. Distribution of agendas and supporting documentation shall be provided to the TCC members with the following minimum advance notice:

Regular Meetings – seven (7) calendar days' notice
Special Meetings – three (3) calendar days' notice

- A. Regular TCC Meetings - Meetings shall be held each month in accordance with the Annual Meetings Schedule as approved by the TPB.
- B. Special Meetings - Special Meetings shall be held as needed and may be scheduled by the TCC Chair, a majority of the members of the TCC or the MPO ~~Officer~~/~~Director~~/~~Officer~~.
- C. Quorum – A quorum is formed by the presence of a simple majority of seven (7) members. No action shall be taken without a quorum of the TCC in attendance at that meeting.
- D. Voting Procedure - Any action of the TCC requires a majority vote of those members in attendance to be approved. A motion fails on a tie vote. Each member of the TCC, including the Chair, Vice Chair has one vote. Voting by proxy or telephone is not allowed.

SFMPO Staff

SFMPO Staff shall be employees of the City of Santa Fe, which is the fiscal and administrative agent of the SFMPO. ~~The SF~~MPO Staff reports to the TPB and is directed by TPB policies and approved documents including the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and the Public Participation Plan (PPP)

~~At a minimum, the SF~~MPO staff shall include the following positions:

- MPO Officer/~~Director~~
- MPO Senior Planner
- MPO Transportation Planner

The MPO Officer/~~Director shall be is~~ responsible for direction of all administrative and operational functions of the SFMPO, including supervision of the ~~SF~~MPO staff. Hiring additional staff or consultant assistance will be determined and managed by the MPO ~~Officer/Director/Officer~~ based on need and budget constraints.

The MPO Officer/~~Director shall be is~~ responsible for:

- preparing agendas and supporting documentation for meetings;
- providing information and technical support to TPB and TCC members; and
- transmitting notice of all official actions taken by the TPB to the public and to the NMDOT, the Federal Transit Administration, and the New Mexico Division of the Federal Highway Administration.

The MPO Senior Planner and Transportation Planner shall assist the MPO Officer/~~Director~~ in the day to day operation of the ~~SFMPO/SFMPO~~ and manages are responsible for the technical functions of the SFMPO as identified in the approved UPWP.

Bylaws Amendment Process & Renewal

I. Amending the Bylaws:

The formal procedure to amend the bylaws is described as follows:

- A. Amendments to the bylaws can be initiated by TPB members, TCC members or SFMPO Staff.
- B. Proposed amendments shall be prepared by SFMPO Staff
- C. The TCC shall review all proposed amendments and make recommendations to the TPB.
- D. The TPB shall review all proposed amendments.
- E. All amendments require approval by the TPB by a simple majority vote (with the exception of Section II-E of SFMPO Transportation Policy Board above)

Santa Fe Metropolitan Pre-Teen and Teen (10-17) Independent Transit and Mobility Plan

What?

- Determine after-school and weekend trips that pre-teens and teenagers make
- Determine the degree of independence in their travel
- Determine perceived and real safety measures associated with travel
- Map formal, informal paths and types of independent mobility movements (walk, skateboard, bicycle, scooter/moped, bus, other) {Independent mobility is defined as a pre-teen or teenager traveling through the community without assistance from an adult/parent and without an automobile.}
- Determine approximate age of when young people gain independence in their daily travels
- Demographic Mapping and Data Collection: # of youth age 10-17 in the Santa Fe Metropolitan Area and public/private school and residential locations.
- American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates (2008-2012) 11,021 youth age 10-17 or 9.2% of metro area

Why?

Public transit, multi-use trails and formal and informal paths enable a certain level of independent travel throughout the community. As pre-teens age they typically increase the diversity of after-school trips as extramural activities including sports, music, arts and employment opportunities increase. Generally in the United States, as teens attain driver's licenses their independent mobility option simply shifts to the single passenger automobile as well as their reliance on its use. However, recent trends indicated that youth primarily in urban centers are less attracted to automobile dependency for a variety of reasons. By analyzing current attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of youth in the Santa Fe Metropolitan Area in 2016 the Santa Fe MPO may achieve the following:

- Development of policies and programs that maximizes travel independence via transit and active transportation as youth move into adulthood.
- Provide parents and schools with resources and tools that encourage youth to safely travel within the community as using transit and active transportation as alternatives to the automobile.
- Increase employment access and opportunities for teens.
- Development of infrastructure gap analysis that supports current and latent demand for youth travel movements throughout the community.
- Develop new partnerships with SFP Schools, City Youth and Family Services, and Santa Fe Community Services.
- Encourage and increase transit ridership from all socio-demographic areas of youth and help to shift perceptions of walking, biking and transit from an un-cool negative stereotype to one of independence, freedom and safety.
- Develop metrics regarding ridership and origin/destination for local service providers.

Jurisdictional Scope:

Similar to the development of the Santa Fe Metropolitan Public Transit Plan, the Santa Fe MPO will work with all public transit service providers to better understand the breath of how youth move within and through the community via transit and alternatives to the automobile. Examples of Santa Fe Indian School, and the Santa Fe School of Art and Design are examples of know populations of students that are commuting beyond local neighborhoods. Additionally, regional schools including Pojoaque Valley Schools and Edgewood will be included in the initial analysis to help discover what percentage of students may be utilizing public transit services passing through the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Area.

Consultant Cost Estimates

Data Collection and Analysis: \$6000.00

Public Outreach: Surveys, Workshops, and Working Groups: \$10,000.00

Networking GIS Mapping based on public input and data: \$7000.00

Plan formatting and graphic design: \$5000.00

Misc: Taxes, Travel and other: \$2000.00

TOTAL Consultant Cost: \$30,000.00

Resources:

- Teenage Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Transit Use, NCRTR – Aug. 2005, State of Florida <http://www.worldtransitresearch.info/research/2581/>
- Teenager Transportation Planners – A New Form of Public Involvement, Saint Lucie County MPO, Jody Bonet 2005 http://www.transplex.org/conference_2005/presentations/11BonetJ.pdf
- Carmaker's next problem: Generation Y People in their teens and twenties are more interested in gadgets than cars, Allison Linn, MicroSoft News, 4 Nov 2010 <http://www.nbcnews.com/id/39970363/ns/business-autos>
- The Future Isn't What It Used to Be: Changing Trends and Their Implications for Transport Planning, 24 Aug, 2015 Todd Litman, VTP <http://www.vtpi.org/future.pdf>
- Youth Participation in Community Planning; APA – PAS 486, Mullahey, Susskind, and Checkoway, 1999 <https://www.planning.org/education/youth/pdf/pas486.pdf>
- County Steer Teens Toward Public Transit: The Washington Post, Jerry Markon Oct. 26, 2006 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/25/AR2006102500471.html>
- Understanding How to Motivate Communities to Support and Ride Public Transportation, TCRP 122, 2008 <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:l4bWhk2c0mqJ:www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/159756.aspx+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&qI=us>
- Teenage Mobility in the United States: Issues and Opportunities for Promoting Public Transit: TRB, No. 1971, 2014 <http://trrjournalonline.trb.org/doi/abs/10.3141/1971-19>
- \Transportation for Teenagers: A project to increase the mobility of high school students, Desmon, Downs, Hunter and Jain, April 20, 2010 http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/69163/Transportation_for_web.pdf/35ee1de4-9863-4df4-8f59-bdae998672d8
- Young Riders: Community and Public Transportation's Next Generation, Wilson <http://www.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/ct/summer04/summer-12-21.pdf>



NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

January 5, 2015

Mr. Mark Tibbetts
MPO Officer
Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 909
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0909

RE: Award Letter for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5304

Dear Mr. Tibbetts:

The Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization (SFMPO) has been awarded \$24,000 for the Pre-Teen and Teen (10-17) Independent Transit and Mobility Plan, this study requires a \$6,000 cash match.

A Memorandum of Agreement will be issued to the SFMPO outlining the scope of the study and the requirements set forth by the State and FTA.

Please contact Marcy Eppler at 505-827-5435 if you have questions on the Department's processes for FTA Section 5304 funding.

Sincerely,

David C. Harris, AICP
Transit Manager, Transit and Rail Division
New Mexico Department of Transportation

Copy: Keith Wilson, SFMPO
Erik Aune, SFMPO
Christine Sandoval, NMDOT
Marcy Eppler, NMDOT

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6



TO: Anthony Lujan, Deputy Secretary NMDOT

FR: Metropolitan Transportation Board via
Dave Pennella, Transportation Program Manager _____

Date: November 20, 2015

RE: **Project Delivery Issues Summary**

The Mid-Region Metropolitan Transportation Board (MTB) of MRMPO/MRCOG at their meeting of November 20, 2015 directed staff to transmit this memorandum and summary of concerns from local and tribal agencies regarding the project development process and project delivery. It is the MTB's intent to engage in dialogue with NMDOT to mutually understand the various project development processes of tribal/local planning agencies (T/LPAs) along with NMDOT's process, address concerns, and improve and expedite the delivery of projects.

Background

In the summer of Federal Fiscal Year 2015, the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) formed a TCC Working Group to gain insight into ongoing project delivery issues being experienced within the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Area (AMPA). The idea of a TCC Working Group investigating common project delivery issues was welcomed by the Metropolitan Transportation Board (MTB) at their following meeting. The group along with MRMPO staff convened in early August to begin compiling and reviewing issues from various agencies within the AMPA. Overwhelming responses from agencies and highly detailed issues called for MRMPO staff to reconvene the group for a second meeting in September 2015 to discuss a strategy for summarizing the info at hand. The group was able to narrow the issues into a suitable manner and was able to recommend a format for delivery which is attached to this summary for your review. The purpose and intent of this document is to:

1. Explain key issues Tribal/Local Planning Agencies (T/LPAs) are experiencing throughout project development and delivery processes as a result of recent NMDOT procedures implemented in FFYs 2014 and 2015,
2. Provide regional recommendations to implement the MAP-21 goal of reducing project delivery delays, and
3. Ensure that federal dollars are obligated and retained within the region and projects are constructed in a timely fashion to ensure that the mobility of people and goods is maintained within New Mexico's most populated and economically diverse metropolitan area of the state.

The document is structured in a manner that covers key topics and TCC Working Group concerns in the project development process. The key topics and concerns are as follows:

(Bold text denotes major areas of concern for the TCC Working Group.)

1. **Establishment of New Deadlines and Timeframes for Contracts and Agreements for T/LPA Projects**
2. Local Government Agreement Delays
3. **Design Project Development and Certification Issues (Right-Of-Way issues are an area of concern to the AMPA)**
4. Design Review, Plans Specifications & Estimates (PSE) Issues
5. Baseline projects vs. Obligated Projects: Misleading T/LPA Reports

6. Minor issues with forms and NMDOT Comments at Design Review

Additionally, each topic of concern is followed by examples of the issue, potential ramifications to the region and TCC Working Group recommendations to improve project delivery and development issues and encourage dialogue with the New Mexico Department of Transportation to address these issues.

Attachment

xc: Elias Archuleta, Chief Design Engineer, NMDOT
Ken Murphy, Acting District Engineer, NMDOT District 3
Dolores Gallegos, Project Oversight Division, NMDOT
Jessica Griffin, Interim MPO Liaison NMDOT Planning
Debbie O'Malley, MTB Chair
Isaac Benton, MTB Vice Chair
Dewey V. Cave, Executive Director MRCOG
Steven Montiel, Transportation Improvement Program Coordinator

Project Delivery Issues Report

The Mid Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MRMPO) staff along with a working group of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) convened to discuss project delivery issues currently taking place within the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area. The working group was comprised of transportation staff from various jurisdictions, including tribal, city and county entities. MRMPO staff, along with the working group, met in early August and September 2015 to discuss ongoing project delivery issues that have impacted numerous projects programmed in the *FFY 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* and have placed an immense strain on Tribal and Local Public Agencies (T/LPA) throughout the region.

The vast majority of project delivery issues stem from recent procedural changes implemented by the New Mexico Department of Transportation-Project Oversight Division (POD). These procedural changes have resulted in a convoluted and inconsistent process for project delivery across the metro area resulting in an increased risk of federal transportation dollars not being obligated and unnecessary delays for putting projects on the ground. Other issues have arisen such as staff turnover within the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), procedural inconsistencies, and ever-changing interpretation of federal regulations as they relate to transportation policy.

A key feature of the current and re-extended transportation bill, *MAP-21-Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century* is the establishment of performance goals for the federal-aid highway program. One of the seven goal areas is reduced project delivery delays. The national goal aspires to reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices. Furthermore, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has an on-going "*Every Day Counts*" initiative which could support innovations that shorten project delivery; however, current practice is not working toward achieving this initiative's full potential. With these federal efforts in mind, the purpose and intent of this document is to:

1. Explain key issues T/LPAs are experiencing throughout project development and delivery processes as a result of recent NMDOT procedures implemented in FFYs 2014 and 2015,
2. Provide regional recommendations to implement the MAP-21 goal of reducing project delivery delays, and
3. Ensure that federal dollars and projects are obligated and retained within the region and projects are constructed in a timely fashion to ensure that the mobility of people and goods is maintained within New Mexico's most populated and economically diverse metropolitan area of the state.

Following are the issues which are hindering the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area's ability to work toward attainment of the national goal of reducing project delivery delays.

Topic # 1

Establishment of New Deadlines and Timeframes for Contract and Agreements for T/LPA Projects

TCC Working Group Concern

MRMPO staff along with the TCC Working Group understand NMDOT's objective of working towards stabilizing the annual obligation process and distribution of federal funds through each quarter of the federal fiscal year. However, the establishment of new timeframes and deadlines for current and future fiscal years was established without discussion between the NMDOT, the MPOs and the T/LPAs in a transparent and cooperative manner so a coordinated process and viable solution toward attainment of NMDOT's objectives could be cooperatively developed. According to 23 CFR § 450.206 (a), each state shall carry out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive statewide transportation planning process. Also, according to 23 CFR § 450.208 (a) (1), in carrying out the statewide transportation planning process, each State shall, at a minimum: coordinate planning carried out under this subpart with metropolitan planning activities. MRMPO staff along with the TCC Working Group believe newly imposed deadlines for the project certification process and the obligation of federal funds were established without a clear and cohesive understanding of the MRMPO TIP management process, or the level of regional planning that went into developing the current TIP along with a lack of understanding of our T/LPAs intragovernmental processes and established procedures. The TCC Working Group also believes that the new deadlines of October 15th for Agreement Request Forms (ARF), March 15th for all certifications/signed agreements and June 15th for all obligation deadlines are problematic and have proven to result in negative impacts to the TIP amendment cycle.

Ramifications to the Region

The resulting process and newly imposed advanced deadlines have already endangered, and will continue to jeopardize, current and future TIPs developed for this metropolitan area if they are continued to be imposed without coordination of MPOs and T/LPAs. The estimated amount of total funding programmed in the current TIP for the next six years (2016-2021) is comprised of nearly \$850 million in transportation improvements for the region. This amount of funding is what a large part of our region depends on to preserve our existing transportation network and maintain mobility of people and goods for our economy. The amount of federal dollars coming into our region is already limited which is why it becomes increasingly important and prudent that we mitigate as many project delivery delays and regulatory burdens possible to ensure that projects are implemented and put on the ground.

Additionally, numerous entities in this region identify and program a substantial amount of local funding in order to be able to request authorization for federal funds. When federal-aid projects are impacted either by having to be "swapped" with another project among fiscal years and, in the unfortunate event that the federal funds cannot be authorized, these local monies are also impacted. Most local entities have performance measures stating how much funding, from all fund sources, will be expected to be expended in any given year. When projects are "swapped" with other projects or if federal funding is jeopardized, the local funds that would have been spent on those projects are moved out and that year's performance measure for capital expenditures is not met. At the end of the day, it is the taxpayers who are negatively impacted when transportation projects fail to move forward.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

The working group offers to work with NMDOT in a transparent and cooperative manner to review the deadlines and timeframes for project development. This could take place through a series of workshops and meetings at the MPO or NMDOT offices. Also, collaboratively addressing potential or future procedural changes by the NMDOT would be greatly appreciated and encouraged so that agencies can begin to prepare and restructure their internal processes to help NMDOT meet their future goals.

Current deadlines are continuing to place enormous and insurmountable burdens on T/LPAs and their staff which is why the region is having difficulty complying with advanced deadlines. The working group believes that the new deadlines and the *NMDOT T/LPA Guidebook* have been interpreted by T/LPAs solely as guides and not policy. Therefore, deadlines and dates are not established by federal regulations and should only be encouraged as best practice until full coordination on an agreed upon process has been considered and established cooperatively.

The working group is open to a gradual transition toward advanced deadlines for contract and agreement processes over the next several years to help NMDOT attain their goal of stabilizing the annual obligation process and distribution of federal funds. This transition towards earlier deadlines and timeframes for contracts and agreements should take place over the course of the next 3-4 years to accommodate the first four years of the current TIP (federally mandated TIP (2016-2019)) and allow for T/LPAs to reconfigure their internal processes to meet NMDOT goals. After FFY 2019, NMDOT should finalize its timeframes and agreement deadlines and expect all entities to meet the March 15th deadline.

Topic # 2

Local Government Agreement Delays

TCC Working Group Concern

The working group has also expressed concern about NMDOT providing agreements to the T/LPAs in a timely fashion or by the deadlines established by the NMDOT-POD. Over the last two Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs), T/LPAs have been promised that agreements would be created by NMDOT-POD in November and sent back to the region via the TLP/A Regional Coordinator by mid-December. Over the last two FFY's, a majority of the local entities' projects were delayed in executing agreements due to agreements not being reviewed and finalized by NMDOT's legal department and sent out to the T/LPAs by the promised dates of December 13th for FFY 2014 and December 15th for FFY 2015.

An additional issue is that until a project has completed its 90% engineer's estimate, a T/LPA has no idea whether or not local funding needs to be increased or decreased, which, depending on the amount of funding change, can result in the need for a TIP amendment. If the agreements are requested in October but not executed until March, then there is not enough time in the fiscal year if an amendment to the funding agreement is needed. While the region can work towards making progress to accelerate the design of projects, the NMDOT requirement to request funding agreements in October is not currently compatible with the project development schedule.

Ramifications to the Region

It takes the average entity 2 to 6 weeks to locally process an agreement from the time it is received from NMDOT. When there are delays in this process, the local entities cannot start on any reimbursable work on projects until the LGA is executed which authorizes the expenditure of funds. Overall, the added

delays from NMDOT are making the project delivery process more burdensome especially when coupled with advanced deadlines. This further places transportation projects in limbo and makes TIP management and fiscal constraint extremely difficult for MPO staff.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

The working group recommends that NMDOT hold an annual LGA Meeting at the MPO early in each federal fiscal year for all T/LPAs to complete their agreements. MRMPO and NMDOT have previously gone through this exercise and it has worked effectively in expediting the project delivery process.

For the sake of expediting the project delivery process, the working group also recommends that only project specific sections of an agreement be reviewed by NMDOT Legal since the “boilerplate” template has already been reviewed. The legal review of every T/LPA agreement processed by NMDOT is an onerous process which defeats the purpose of a “boilerplate” and creates unnecessary delay in getting agreements out to entities so they can begin acquiring certifications for their projects.

Topic # 3

Design, Project Development and Certification Issues

The following section will address the project development process and issues that are currently being experienced when T/LPAs are producing plans and specifications, preparing environmental and cultural documents, acquiring and certifying rights-of-way, acquiring rail certifications, coordinating and certifying utility relocations and coordinating all these activities with various NMDOT departments and the Regional T/LPA Coordinator.

TCC Working Group Concern

T/LPAs have no control over the turnaround time for the various NMDOT departments to issue certifications. There is also unpredictability on whether or not they will receive certifications in a timely manner. The level of unpredictability and the number of project delays that have evolved out of this process in the last couple of federal fiscal years are making it extremely difficult for agencies to meet the new March 15th deadline for certifications and signed agreements. When this issue occurs, T/LPAs are then being threatened to not have their projects obligated which translates into projects not being built and federal dollars lost to this region.

The next sections will elaborate on some more detailed issues and some positive areas of local government coordination and assistance. The next section still relates to Topic # 3 but focuses on the specific departmental areas of concern as they relate to the certification process of project development and delivery.

Environmental Certifications

Environmental Level of Effort Determinations and subsequent certifications are being processed in an efficient/timely manner and early in project development stages which ensures completion of the process. Overall, the environmental certification turnaround has significantly improved and NMDOT environmental staff have been helpful and responsive in the general process. The T/LPA's and MPO greatly appreciate the cooperative approach that Environmental Design Bureau provides.

Railroad Certification

Agencies have expressed that rail certifications are sometimes not processed or approved in a timely manner (if the project impacts a railroad). The TCC Working Group has come to the conclusion that there is no predictable turnaround for rail certifications which is a critical component in the process of preparing a project for construction bids. The certification is a prerequisite to FHWA authorizing project funding and should therefore be processed in a timely manner to guide T/LPAs through an efficient project development process. Also, T/LPAs have encountered issues with NMDOT Transit and Rail Division signing off on certifications and then making agencies resubmit certifications because NMDOT Transit and Rail Division staff inadvertently signed off on the certification before consulting with all operating railroads. (This incident actually occurred to a project within our region.) These type of turnaround inconsistencies are creating further delays in an already compressed process.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Certification

T/LPAs are not experiencing any issues obtaining ITS certifications at this time. NMDOT ITS staff is highly receptive, professional and the turnaround on ITS approvals are fairly quick and predictable. T/LPAs enjoy working with NMDOT ITS staff due to their willingness to help in the process. The level of assistance and dependability within the NMDOT ITS Bureau is noteworthy and should be emulated as best practice when assisting T/LPAs through the project development process.

Utility Certifications

T/LPAs have expressed that the utilities section of the NMDOT changed the process for how T/LPAs receive notification of utility clearances and have also been inconsistent with a formal process. Previously NMDOT accepted a form from the utility company stating clearance of utilities for a project. While some T/LPAs have been required to provide email messages from each utility company, others have been required to provide statements on utility company letterhead. This new process of providing utility owner statements on letterhead has become burdensome for the T/LPAs and the utility companies and creates undue delays which make it harder to meet the March 15th deadline. Also, the inconsistencies in the process generate confusion among utility companies and the formal letter requires higher ranking personnel to sign off on what was once a straightforward process resulting in more delays. T/LPAs need to be informed of a consistent process and prefer the email message process which previously worked well and resulted in quick turnaround from utility companies.

Right-of-Way Certification

The right-of-way certification process is by far the most inconsistent, confusing, and time consuming of all the certifications. It has been explained to the MPO and the T/LPA's that the revised process and recent enforcement of previously unenforced regulations is due to the oversight by FHWA. Regardless of the reason, the process is highly burdensome for the local entities.

The most recent example of the inconsistently applied federal regulations has to do with private encroachments within public rights-of-way. It is understood, and agreed, that unpermitted encroachments that would be impacted by a transportation project are not only ineligible for

federal participation, but would be required to be vacated by the property owner. This issue comes about relative to private encroachments within the public right-of-way that are not impacted by construction and can be documented to show that they do not impede the use of the public transportation facility.

While the federal regulation requires that the owner of an unpermitted private encroachment needs to be notified of the encroachment, the definition of “notice” appears to be the sticking point. Direction from NMDOT is that the property owner needs to sign an agreement stating that they agree with the encroachment and that they will remove it at their own expense whether or not the encroachment is impacted by the transportation improvement. Private property owners who are located in well established, older neighborhoods are not likely to respond well to this initiative and could easily jeopardize the acceptance of a project.

The NMDOT Right-of-Way process irrespective of the encroachment issue is very burdensome and time-consuming. There are numerous steps in that process that involve numerous staff at NMDOT and a T/LPA cannot move on to the next step until there is an official approval of the previous process. Title reports expire after 6 months, appraisals have a short life expectancy before they require updates, right-of-way mapping can take months to approve and these steps must be followed in a particular sequence. In addition, NMDOT requires local governments to utilize State forms for right-of-way activities which are often not appropriate for local entities.

There is also a new requirement to stake the right-of-way after right-of-way maps have been approved and have a field review of the area with NMDOT staff prior to receiving authorization to move forward with appraisals, which take up to 2 months to receive after they are requested.

The right-of-way process alone takes upwards of 2 to 3 years for local governments to obtain a certification if right-of-way is required. The encroachment issue has yet to be resolved.

Another issue experienced by T/LPA's is when a local government owns property that is in a certain department's name within that agency. It should be enough to say that the property is publicly owned if a local government does own the property regardless of which department is the owner. NMDOT is now requiring that a formal easement be granted within an agency in order to obtain a certification.

Lastly, there also appears to be an issue as to when rights-of-way are acquired. Most local governments already acquire rights-of-way in accordance with the Uniform Property Act. The direction from NMDOT now is that T/LPA's should always follow the NMDOT right-of-way process even if no federal funding is identified for a project, because the possibility exists that the property may someday be included in a federally-funded project. Again, undue burden and expense on already strained local budgets.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

In response to advanced deadlines and certification concerns, the TCC Working Group recommends the NMDOT develop a new method of streamlining the certifications for T/LPA projects which makes the entire process more predictable. The working group feels like most project delivery delays are generated in this phase of project development. In order for advanced deadlines to be met, NMDOT will need to consider reducing regulatory burdens and improving departmental work practices as suggested by MAP-21, which sometimes hinder a T/LPA's ability to meet new deadlines. MRMPO staff have recognized that this is not only an issue that T/LPA's are experiencing, but is also an area of concern for NMDOT district lead projects which are in jeopardy of not being obligated in FFY 2016. When projects

are in jeopardy of not being obligated, this creates unnecessary burdens for MRMPO staff who are forced to apply urgent TIP management practices to shuffle projects around in the TIP as a means of saving federal dollars for the region.

Topic # 4

Design Review and Plans, Specifications & Estimates (PSE) Issues

TCC Working Group Concern

As part of project development and design, T/LPAs are required to undergo a mandatory 30% design reviews, 60 % design reviews, 90 % design reviews and finally Plans Specifications & Estimates (PSE) for all project types. Each one of these stages requires rigorous activities, meetings and steps geared towards large scale NMDOT roadway projects. T/LPAs feel that this rigorous project development process is more applicable to NMDOT projects which tend to be larger in scale and effect regionally significant facilities such as interstates and interchanges. In evaluating issues within the design review and PS&E process of project development, many local transportation projects are very basic and could easily follow a less stringent NMDOT process.

Example of Issue

All bicycle and pedestrian trail projects are required to undergo project review meetings at 30% plan completion, 60% plan completion, 90% plan completion and PS&E. Another example of the process being overly rigorous for small projects is with a \$40,000 sign replacement project (replacing STOP sign, traffic signs, etc.) in which NMDOT requested a topo survey, stationing and offsets for the sign replacements. In some cases only the sign itself (not post) was being placed and therefore this burdensome exercise led to unnecessary delays. While the full review process makes sense for a larger scale projects, smaller projects like the ones mentioned above require very limited design effort so the differences between 30%, 60%, 90% and PS&E are minimal, yet a meeting is required at each stage. This type of adherence to large-scale project procedures delays small projects and imposes requirements which no agency would undergo to build a bicycle and pedestrian trail or simply replace signs in a community.

Ramifications to the Region

When basic and small-scale projects are being held to the same standards as large NMDOT projects, all project types (large/small & basic/complex) end up being delayed. These taxing procedures are being applied to project types which tend to be more basic and smaller in their nature, which takes away valuable time and attention needed to review larger and more complex projects thoroughly. The working group noted that the major impact from these standards is increased project costs along with increased delays. T/LPAs expressed concern that consultants are forced to factor in additional costs to their work estimates to account for extra staff time and additional work generated by NMDOT's design review process thus increasing design costs. It is important to note that reducing project costs is highly encouraged as a national goal within performance management under MAP-21.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

Possible recommendations would be to waive or reduce certain standards for basic project types which entail minimal design effort (i.e. bicycle and pedestrian trails or sign replacement projects) or make scalable requirements based on project type and size. Another option could be to make small projects

exempt from full 30, 60, and 90 percent plan review requirements. These recommendations would allow for NMDOT staff and the T/LPAs to process small-scale projects in a more streamlined and expeditious manner which would therefore lessen the number of projects to be reviewed when approaching the March 15th deadline. The following recommendation would also allow NMDOT and T/LPAs to dedicate more time and detail to large-scale projects where rigorous design review is necessary and more applicable. It is important to note that local government projects, for the most part, are different in nature, scale and complexity when compared to NMDOT projects. The working group believes not all T/LPA projects need to look or be treated like large scale NMDOT projects.

Topic # 5

Baseline Projects vs. Obligated Projects: Misleading T/LPA Reports

TCC Working Group Concern

NMDOT and FHWA NM Division monitor and report the amount of federal funds obligated. Under federal regulations all MPOs must also produce, at the end of each federal fiscal year, an Annual Project Listing of Federal Funds Obligated for all projects in that federal fiscal year. The MPO's report, by federal regulation, includes all obligated funds in the FFY; NMDOT's report for FHWA only compares what was obligated versus what was listed in the TIP/STIP as of October 1st, the first day of the FFY. This can lead to very different analytical conclusions.

Ramifications to the Region

NMDOT's/FHWA's comparison report does not consider any TIP/STIP revisions throughout the FFY which are permitted under federal regulations. As a result, the proportion of obligated federal funds reported in the NMDOT/FHWA report is much lower than the proportion of funds actually obligated at the end of the FFY. This gives the impression that T/LPAs are not obligating all federal funds available to them.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

In order to conduct a more reasonable comparison of final obligations to the list of projects early in the FFY, it is suggested that the baseline utilize the TIP/STIP as of December 31st allowing the first quarterly amendment cycle and first quarter administrative modifications to be completed and approved. This change would incorporate TIP/STIP changes resulting from various agencies' internal fiscal changes and previously unforeseen project development issues arising at the end of the last FFY and reflected in the first quarter's TIP revisions.

Topic # 6

Minor Issues with Forms and NMDOT Comments at Design Review

TCC Working Group Concerns

The working group has noted a few minor issues that are having a cumulative impact on the project delivery process. The TCC Working Group would like to highlight a few of the key issues or themes that are delaying or making the project development process complicated. The following are the key minor issues T/LPAs are currently experiencing:

1. Required PS&E production checklists and forms are often inconsistent and frequently being revised without advance notification or easy access on the NMDOT website,
2. Production checklists are also geared toward large-scale NMDOT projects and development processes (one size fits all project types),
3. Review of plans at all stages (30, 60, 90 & PSE) sometimes leads to changes and delays for very minor items (moving the north arrow on plan sets to NMDOTs desirable location)
4. NMDOT staff comments from design review meetings are very infrequently related to actual design in such a way that it improves the overall quality of the final product (most comments relate to editorial changes or format preferences to plan sets)

Ramifications to the Region

Although these issues are minor in their nature, they continue to place unnecessary delays on T/LPAs and place projects at risk of not meeting NMDOT deadlines. In short, this translates into federal dollars not being obligated, projects being jeopardized and federal dollars for transportation improvements lost to this region.

TCC Working Group Recommendations

As a recommendation, it would be beneficial for all stakeholders if checklists were easy to locate on the NMDOT website, notification of revised checklist and forms were disseminated to T/LPAs and MPOs, work started on prevision versions of checklists and forms prior to revisions were grandfathered in and project checklists were also scalable to project type, size and geographic location to expedite the process. Another recommendation would be for NMDOT to provide more meaningful comments and hold design review meetings which are geared more towards engineering and design of projects which benefit the actual project and not the aesthetics of plan sets.

Other General Comments and Recommendations

Certain sections of NMDOT are operating in a manner that is not cooperative and not consistent. There appears to be a distrust of T/LPAs and their work practices. The goals NMDOT has to stabilize the letting program and the disbursement of the road funds for reimbursement would best be achieved by conferring with the MPO and local agencies to establish practices that fit the needs of all parties. As a final recommendation, the TCC Working Group would like to encourage NMDOT to initiate a major coordinated effort between all transportation stakeholders to make progress toward achieving the MAP-21 goal of reducing project delivery delays. The working group believes that progression towards this national goal through coordinated efforts should improve transparency, efficiency, work practices and coordination between all stakeholders as well as the general well-being of our region and state. Continued delay in the delivery of transportation projects increases project costs, jeopardizes potential jobs, harms the economy, impedes the mobility of people and goods and is counterproductive to providing a means to the most efficient investment of federal transportation dollars.

In Summary, the TCC Working Group looks forward to working with NMDOT to improve the project delivery and development process for our region. The working group would be happy to participate in further conversation regarding any of the concerns, ramifications and recommendations stated above. If NMDOT staff have any questions or concerns, please contact MRMPO staff who can provide a response back to the TCC.