

**MINUTES**  
**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**NOVEMBER 10, 2011**

Policy Members Present: Sherri Sipe, City of Aztec  
Pat Lucero, City of Bloomfield  
Dan Darnell, City of Farmington  
Gayla McCulloch, City of Farmington

Policy Members Absent: Dr. Jim Henderson, San Juan County

Staff Present: Mary L. Holton, MPO Officer  
Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner  
June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide

Staff Absent: None

Also Present: Miguel Gabaldon, District 5 Engineer  
David Martinez, Assistant District 5 Engineer  
Mike Huber, City of Aztec  
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Pat Lucero called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

**2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2011 POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Mr. Darnell made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 15, 2011 Policy Committee meeting. Ms. Sipe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. ADOPT PC RESOLUTION 2011-4**

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**Agenda Item**

<b>Subject:</b>	Annual Meeting Resolution
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	November 2, 2011

**BACKGROUND**

- The attached PC Resolution 2011-4 establishes the procedures to be followed and notice to be given pursuant to the provisions of the New Mexico Open Meetings Act, provides for the annual determination of reasonable notice of meetings, and establishes the meeting times, dates and locations for the Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meetings during calendar year 2012.

**CURRENT WORK**

- The Policy Committee will hold six regular meetings during 2012.
- Meetings will be held in January, March, April, June, September, and November.
- The attached PC Resolution 2011-4 will implement the following meeting schedule: meetings occur on the third Thursday at 1:30pm, except in November when it will occur on the second Thursday.
- Policy Committee meetings will rotate among the entities.
- The members have the opportunity to modify the meeting schedule as necessary prior to adopting the resolution.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee adopt PC Resolution 2011-4.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori stated that the proposed Resolution is developed each year to re-establish the MPO’s continuing agreement with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act and to establish the meeting calendar for the FMPO for the coming year.

The Resolution establishes the procedures to be followed and the required notice of meetings dates and times to be provided. The proposed scheduled for 2012 meetings is the same as for 2011; meetings held at 1:30 p.m. on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday in January, March, April, June, and September, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday in November; meeting location to rotate among the four MPO entities.

Mr. Darnell said he did not believe there had been any conflicts with the meeting days and time as proposed.

**ACTION:** Ms. Sipe made a motion to adopt PC Resolution 2011-4. Mr. Darnell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. APPROVE A LIST OF SAFETY PROJECTS FOR THE FARMINGTON MPO FOR THE FY2012 AND FY2013 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Agenda Item**

**Subject:** Safety Project Prioritization

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	November 2, 2011

#### **BACKGROUND**

- The NMDOT is requesting proposals for safety improvement projects for consideration for funding in FY2012 and FY2013.
- The final submittal deadline to NMDOT is January 6, 2012.
- Projects will be prioritized and submitted by the MPO.
- All projects received are in competition at the state level.

#### **CURRENT WORK**

- At the October 27 Technical Committee meeting, the committee members recommended approval of the Safety priority list from the FY2012-2017 TIP.
- The three recommended projects are: Bergin Lane in Bloomfield, Light Plant Rd Phase I in Aztec, and the CR 350/CR390 intersection in San Juan County.

#### **CRITERIA**

- The safety memo that describes the full details for applying was provided by the NMDOT Safety Bureau.
- Some key criteria for project selection include:
  - Cost should be \$2,000,000 or less.
  - Crash analysis showing a history of serious crashes or fatalities.
  - A safety study showing the project will reduce traffic hazards.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Extract from the FY2012-2017 TIP showing the three safety project priorities.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee approve a list of safety projects for the Farmington MPO for the FY2012 and FY2013 Highway Safety Improvement Program.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori reported that in the spring of 2011, NMDOT's Safety Bureau issued their annual call for safety projects and gave a submittal date of January 6, 2012. The project criteria have remained the same as previous years - projects of \$2,000,000 or less and those projects that address high crash intersections or corridors or improve the overall safety of a particular road section are more favorably considered. The projects are submitted state-wide and are competitive in nature. No specific amount of funding is given to any District or MPO. FMPO has been fortunate to typically get one or two safety projects approved on an annual basis.

The MPO identified three projects in March and those were included on the TIP Priority List. The Technical Committee reviewed the project list at their October meeting and

believed the list was still valid and recommended the Policy Committee approve the list. Ms. Sipe asked where the San Juan County project of CR 350/CR 390 was located. Mr. Delmagori said this was the intersection where Dino's Mart is located.

**ACTION:** Ms. Sipe made a motion to approve a list of safety projects for the Farmington MPO for the FY2012 and FY2013 Highway Safety Improvement Program. Mr. Darnell seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

**5. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON ROAD MAINTENANCE DONE BY NMDOT FOR STATE HIGHWAYS IN SAN JUAN COUNTY**

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Agenda Item**

<b>Subject:</b>	State Highway Maintenance
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	November 2, 2011

**BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK**

- At the May 26 Technical Committee meeting, District Engineer Miguel Gabaldon and Assistant District Engineer Dave Martinez discussed state highway maintenance issues with the members.
- A Joint Policy/Technical Committee meeting was then held on July 27 to discuss a maintenance partnership between District 5 and member entities.
- At that meeting, District 5 and the entities agreed to share maintenance resources and establish partnerships when projects are identified.
- District 5 agreed to gather information on road maintenance done in the past five to ten years.
- District 5 gave a brief report on recent road maintenance during the October 27 Technical Committee meeting.

**CURRENT WORK**

- Federal fiscal year closeout will provide funding for road maintenance projects on US 64 and NM 516.
- District 5 will provide information on maintenance done for state highways in the past five to ten years at the Policy Committee meeting on November 10.
- This information will help NMDOT and the entities to determine maintenance priorities in San Juan County.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee receive a presentation on road maintenance done for state highways in District 5.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori introduced Mr. Miguel Gabaldon, District Engineer and Mr. David Martinez, Assistant District Engineer for NMDOT's District 5 who attended to speak on road maintenance done for state highways in District 5.

Mr. Gabaldon provided the Policy Committee members with a spreadsheet which detailed historical maintenance expenditures (contract maintenance and chip seal) in San Juan County by NMDOT. Mr. Gabaldon said the information provided had been modified since the October Technical Committee meeting. He noted there were some years missing from the data (2005-2006 and 2006-2007) which could mean no contract maintenance was conducted during those time frames.

Mr. Gabaldon explained that the NMDOT budget has two sections: a. Operating which covers NMDOT normal operating costs at their facilities and personnel services (salaries, benefits), and; b. Road Betterment which is an allocated amount to maintain the highway infrastructure which includes pavement preservation, maintenance of ROWs, highway signs, and roadway bridges. Included under this section is Field Supplies Cost which is for purchased materials for projects completed either by NMDOT or by a contractor. These purchased supplies are used for winter snow removal and chip seal materials.

Mr. Gabaldon also reviewed NMDOT's contract maintenance and field supplies budgets for each of the fiscal years shown on the spreadsheet. Monies are pulled from the Contract Maintenance budget to provide the bridge division with funds for preservation and maintenance of bridges. Funds are also provided to the traffic section so that they can do guardrail repair and sign replacement. Additionally, funds are pulled from this category to fund NMDOT's use of inmate labor. Mr. Gabaldon clarified that the dollars shown on the spreadsheet in the District Contract Maintenance Funding column are the amounts available to the District to use toward roadway preservation or other contracted services besides bridge, traffic, or inmate labor services.

Mr. Gabaldon said that the Field Supplies Cost budget may also be used to cover the cost of materials that will be given to a contractor who will actually complete the maintenance project for NMDOT. This type of cooperative effort has been done in the past with San Juan County and the City of Farmington. The numbers in the Field Supplies Cost column are only for crack or chip seal costs. No expenses for winter operations, potholes, or patching are reflected in these numbers.

The spreadsheet provided by NMDOT also showed the percentage of contract maintenance funds spent in San Juan County. In the fiscal year, 2003-2004, over 30% of the District's budget was spent in San Juan County. The lowest percentage spent during was in 2008-2009 with 0.33% of the District 5 contract maintenance budget being spent in San Juan County. Although his spreadsheet shows no funds spent to date in San Juan County in fiscal year 2011-2012, Mr. Gabaldon pointed out that Federal closeout funds are scheduled to be spent on US 64 at the Hogback and Harper Hill and on NM 516 beginning early next year.

Mr. Gabaldon spoke on NMDOT efforts to maintain NM 173. In fiscal year 2002-2003, \$187,429.00 was spent on chip sealing NM 173. NMDOT strives to get a 5-6 year rotation on chip seal projects. NMDOT hopes that at the end of that time period, funds are available to do a resurfacing or re-construction project. If funds are not available, NMDOT will re-do the chip seal and work to maintain the roadway until construction

funds become available. NMDOT was unable to return to NM 173 until this year and a similar road section repair that cost \$190,000 in 2003 was \$380,000 in 2011. Mr. Gabaldon noted that the cost of inflation has been felt District-wide and state-wide.

Mr. Gabaldon stated that NMDOT was aware of the concerns of the entities as to the number of projects being completed and the funds being spent in San Juan County as opposed to other areas of the state. NMDOT has faced challenges in all six Districts and maintenance efforts are falling behind state-wide. Mr. Gabaldon stated that NMDOT has worked well with all the entities in San Juan County and appreciates the cooperative efforts throughout the County. He commented on working with the City of Farmington on a structure failure on US 64 and Murray Drive and struggling to get his procurement people on board with the repair process. Mr. Gabaldon added that this cooperative relationship is in effect with the other entities and he appreciates the partnerships.

Mr. Gabaldon re-stated that NMDOT had hoped to complete the work scheduled on US 64 west of Hogback and at Harper Hill and on NM 516 before the winter set in. Several other projects in San Juan County, but outside the MPO boundaries, will also see repairs in the spring. NMDOT has also identified several safety improvements projects on NM 516 and NM 574 near a school and at the crest of the intersection of NM 173 and NM 575 just west of Aztec.

Mr. Gabaldon still plans to meet with each entity to discuss their needs and determine a course of action. He stated that the winter season will govern how NMDOT proceeds in the spring. Ms. Sipe asked how many miles of NM 516 were going to be repaired. Mr. Gabaldon said this project had been expanded to include from the Farmington Lake intersection through Aztec to the junction of NM 173. Ms. Sipe also asked what might happen with the project if repair costs increase due to a severe winter and further road deterioration. Mr. Gabaldon said NMDOT will work to keep moisture out of the sub-grade throughout the winter and he is confident that they can keep the planned stretch of roadway repairs as established and, should there be a shortfall, identify other funding sources. NMDOT has materials contracts in place and will ensure potholes are filled and that the road is maintained throughout the winter.

Mr. Darnell questioned the numbers shown on the NMDOT spreadsheet for the fiscal year 2011-2012 which showed \$524,359 spent in San Juan County compared to over \$7,000,000 being spent in the rest of the district. He asked if NMDOT could provide the federal closeout funds to be used in San Juan County to give a more accurate and complete picture of expenditures here.

Mr. Darnell also asked how the MPO could facilitate and encourage the development of partnerships with NMDOT. He stated that since the local governments are closest to the people, the complaints are going to be made to the local entities. People want to know why road maintenance is not being done and they do not want to hear their local government say that the problem is a NMDOT issue. Being able to handle local roadway issues saves time and money and NMDOT does not have to bring in resources and crews from outside the area to make repairs. This makes maintenance more cost effective. Mr. Darnell asked what the roadblocks were and what is standing in the way of making progress and actually developing these partnerships with NMDOT.

Mr. Gabaldon stated that the partnerships are doable, but NMDOT must ensure they will have the necessary funds to reimburse an entity for work they might complete, that all

aspects of the project are spelled out and agreed to beforehand, and that all procurement rules are followed. He stated that NMDOT cannot enter into a contract with a local entity's contractor/vendor. Mr. Gabaldon agreed that agreement efforts should be expanded and increased because they offer flexibility and the opportunity to provide better customer service. However, in the end, NMDOT has to be able to reimburse the entities for any work completed and they can only do that if they have the budget available.

Mr. Darnell asked if there was something the MPO can do to help get these agreements/partnerships pushed through. Mr. Gabaldon said he believes the MPO and each entity's staff are of great assistance and asked for their continued support. Agreements with an entity can be established for up to a period of four years. Mr. Gabaldon reiterated that NMDOT cannot use an entity's contractor nor pay that contractor directly, but it is acceptable if the entity were to use its own people to complete the work.

Ms. Sipe also questioned the length of time it takes to secure these agreements with NMDOT. If both parties would benefit by having agreements in place, what can be done to speed up the process. Mr. Gabaldon explained some of the issues involved with the San Juan County agreement they are currently trying to finalize: can NMDOT provide the needed vehicles to San Juan County; are the funds available to reimburse the County employees for the jobs performed; San Juan County is still learning to use the striping equipment, and legal reviews. He added that persistence on getting this first agreement in place may make obtaining subsequent agreements much easier. Mr. Gabaldon said NMDOT is committed to this area and being 200 miles from Santa Fe does not make San Juan County less of a priority.

Mr. Gabaldon provided some figures for projects planned for San Juan County using federal closeout funds:

- US 64 at the Hogback - \$4,500,000
- US 64 at Harper Hill - \$1,100,000 (concrete repair)
- NM 516 and Light Plant Road - \$1,000,000
- NM 173 at NM 575 - \$1,000,000
- NM 516 (from Farmington to NM 173) - \$3,000,000-\$5,000,000

If additional funds are awarded by the state legislature, additional projects considered for the MPO area are:

- NM 371
- NM 173 (US 550 to recently constructed recreational facilities)

Mr. Darnell stated that the projects discussed above provided him with the information he was looking for. The addition of these projects using federal closeout funds changes the picture for San Juan County.

**ACTION:** The report was received.

## **6. RECEIVE A REPORT FROM NMDOT**

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Gabaldon reported that NMDOT is still focused on the US 64 project in Bloomfield. The southern half of the roadway is expected to be surfaced by

December. The work will then shift to the north side of the roadway. The construction engineer on the project reports that the north half of the project should go more quickly as a majority of the utility work, storm drains, and trunk lines have been completed. NMDOT will be in contact with the City of Bloomfield and San Juan Economic Development Services to discuss ongoing construction and business impacts.

Mr. Delmagori reported that Mr. Matthew unable to attend the meeting, but he had reported at the Technical Committee Meeting in October that the proposed lowering of air quality standards below the current 0.75 ppm has been postponed indefinitely.

Mr. Martinez reminded the group that any outstanding paperwork for ARRA projects needs to be closed out. The City of Aztec and the City of Bloomfield each have a project to close out.

## **7. REVIEW THE UPDATE TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN**

### **FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Agenda Item**

<b>Subject:</b>	Public Participation Plan Update
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	November 2, 2011

#### **BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK**

- The Public Participation Plan (PPP) guides the public involvement activities conducted by the MPO.
- The PPP describes how the MPO and the public communicate with each other and how information is distribution and provided.
- The PPP describes the procedures the MPO must follow with regards to public comment periods, adopting and amending documents, and complying with the Open Meetings Act.
- The PPP was adopted on January 17, 2007 and is required to be updated every five years.

#### **CURRENT WORK**

- The PPP update will be reviewed by the Technical Committee, Policy Committee, interested parties, and the public from October through January.
- The PPP update will include more descriptions on the MTP, TIP, public participation requirements related to transit, Title VI, and Environmental Justice.
- The Technical Committee reviewed the draft on October 27.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- The draft PPP is being provided under separate cover.

#### ANTICIPATED WORK

- Open the required 45-day public comment period in November.
- Post the draft PPP for public review.
- Finalize the draft PPP.
- Hold a public hearing at the December 15 Technical Committee meeting.
- Adopt the PPP update in January 2012.

#### RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee review the update to the Public Participation Plan.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori stated the Public Participation Plan (PPP) guides the MPO's public involvement activities and must be updated every five years. The current PPP was adopted in January 2007 and the MPO needs to adopt the updated Plan in January 2012. The PPP describes how the MPO communicates with the public, how information is distributed with regard to the different planning activities and documents, and how the public can provide input and feedback to the MPO. Mr. Delmagori stated the Technical Committee members reviewed the PPP in October and made some minor changes. Mr. Delmagori began a review of the PPP where significant proposed changes/updates are being recommended:

#### FTA Public Participation Requirements (new section)

This additional section came about following the Red Apple's three-year review with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). In their review, the FTA noted that the PPP needed to specifically spell out transit's public involvement requirements. The updated PPP will now include these seven requirements.

#### Environmental Justice and Title VI

This section is strengthened with goals and the basis of Environmental Justice and Title VI. The section strengthens the actions the MPO will take to provide information to various interested groups.

#### Social Media

This section is new and mentions in general terms that the MPO will investigate the usefulness of social media as a means of public involvement

#### Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

This section will be revised to further describe the MTP and include the main elements contained in 23 CFR 450.322. The section now includes the steps that the MPO takes to update the MTP.

#### Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

This section will include information to more fully describe this document and what the TIP entails. Detailed sections/elements of the TIP are described as well as a corresponding schedule which lists the MPO and entity activities.

#### Appendix A – Summary of PPP Procedures and Tools

This section references the various public involvement activities conducted by the MPO and the techniques and tools available for carrying out this process.

Appendix C: Inspection of Records

Rather than include the Inspection of Records document (14-2-1 NMSA 1978) in the PPP, it will simply note where it can be accessed. This document is on file and available for viewing at the MPO office.

Appendix E: State Transportation Improvement Plan Protocols

NMDOT has recently completed a significant update of this document and it is now 10-12 pages. The STIP Protocols will be made available upon request but not detailed in the actual PPP.

Mr. Delmagori stated that the 45-day public comment will be opened around November 20 and if any public comments are received from citizens or stakeholder groups, they will be recorded and made available for the final version. It is expected that the Technical Committee will recommend adoption of the PPP at their December meeting and it will be brought to the Policy Committee at their January 2012 committee meeting.

**ACTION:** The Public Participation Plan was reviewed.

**8. RECEIVE A STATUS REPORT ON RED APPLE TRANSIT MONTHLY RIDERSHIP**

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Agenda Item**

<p><b>Subject:</b> Red Apple Transit Monthly Ridership <b>Prepared by:</b> Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner <b>Date:</b> November 2, 2011</p>
---

**RED APPLE UPDATE**

- Overall ridership reached 12,352 passengers in August, an increase of 19% over the previous month.
- Ridership between January and August of 2011 is 6% higher than the same timeframe in 2010.
- Farmington ridership has maintained a healthy average each month.
- Bloomfield ridership decreased from April to July but rebounded in August
- Kirtland and Aztec routes have seen gradual increases for much of the year.
- The ridership report is attached.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- It is recommended that the Policy Committee receive a report on Red Apple Transit monthly ridership.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori reported that Red Apple ridership continues to increase. The numbers for the Farmington routes are well over 10,000 each month and show a

6% increase over 2010 through August. The Regional Routes are doing well and a dip in ridership in April-May on the Bloomfield Route is attributed to San Juan College being in their summer session.

Mr. Darnell stated there is some frustration in not being able to implement some of the recommendations from the Red Apple Transit Study. He asked if Staff had any estimates on how proposed route changes would impact ridership. Mr. Delmagori said the consultant's report did provide some estimate on ridership changes and he will have that information available at the next meeting.

Ms. McCulloch asked if Staff had received the request from the BLM asking for a stop to be added at their new building on College Boulevard. Mr. Delmagori said he had been given that information.

## **9. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Agenda Item**

<b>Subject:</b>	Information Items
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
<b>Date:</b>	November 2, 2011

#### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- a. MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan.** The MPO Major T-Plan, as amended by the Policy Committee on July 27, has been approved by San Juan County (September 20), Bloomfield (September 26), and Aztec (October 11). Farmington reviewed the amended MTP on October 25. Staff will provide a status report describing Farmington's recommended action.
- b. Transit Data Collection Activities.** Ridership data collection by the interns was completed in October. Staff will finalize analysis and determine a unique rider estimate in November. The information will be presented to Farmington City Council in December.
- c. Red Apple Transit Public Meetings.** The City of Farmington is hosting a series of public meetings to gather input on proposed route changes. MPO staff is assisting with these meetings.
- d. Other.**

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Delmagori said the MPO Major Thoroughfare Plan was approved by Aztec, Bloomfield, and San Juan County in September and October. The Farmington City Council, at their meeting on October 25, had some additional discussion on Glade Road and the revisions made by the MPO after the City of Farmington had approved the plan. Mr. Delmagori stated that the MPO is going to take a step back at this point and let

the City of Farmington's planning staff address the Glade Road at the local level. Once this has been addressed at the local level, the MPO will pick up the relevant conclusions and apply them to the regional thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Delmagori stated the transit data collection activities ended on October 30. All of the summer data has been tracked and organized and Staff is now working on the September and October data. Mr. Delmagori is scheduled to present this information to Farmington City Council on December 13 and a report will be available for the Policy Committee members at the January meeting.

Mr. Delmagori has been assisting Mr. Bob Campbell with several public transit meetings as the City looks to implement some variations of the recommendations in the transit study. There were two options presented at these meetings:

- simple modification to the existing loop routes to improve headway times;
- hybrid combination of line and loop routes: bi-directional routes running north/south and east/west through the City of Farmington and one Red and one Green route would be retained to assist in feeding outlying passengers to these new main line routes.

The hybrid combination is a step closer to the recommendations made in the transit study.

Mr. Delmagori reported that Mr. Martin Lucero has resigned and accepted a position in Phoenix, Arizona. Everyone wished him much success in his new endeavors.

Mr. Delmagori presented the Summary of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21). This is recent information about a new authorization bill that AMPO put together from a 600-page draft bill. The Summary describes this two-year plan, the core programs, possible new direction on transportation funding, and ways of streamlining the process. The summary includes a section on performance management and the measures that state DOTs and MPOs will be required to implement. Mr. Delmagori scanned through the 600-page bill to if there was information on the proposed tier system. The tier system is still being proposed in this draft bill although the requirements outlined to remain an MPO are things FMPO is already doing.

## **9. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Mr. Lucero asked if Bloomfield businesses will have input on the ongoing US 64 construction and if there is still an opportunity to suggest changes with regard to speed limits or to consider improvements specifically.

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

## **10. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

There was no additional business from the floor.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Sipe made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Darnell seconded the motion. Mr. Lucero adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

---

Mr. Pat Lucero, Vice Chairman

---

June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide