



Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

"Promoting Interconnected Transportation Options"



Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Monday, February 27, 2012, 1:30 P.M.

*City Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, NM*

AGENDA

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 2-22-12 TIME 12:07pm

SERVED BY Keith Wilster

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Roll Call
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 23rd, 2012

1. Communications from the Public

2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action:

- a. Review and Release for Public Review proposed amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program – *MPO Staff*
- b. TIP Project Updates
 1. Presentation of the I-25/Canoncito Interchange Draft Phase A/B Report – *NMDOT Staff*
 2. Presentation of the I-25/Cerrillos Rd Interchange Draft Phase A/B Report – *NMDOT Staff*
 3. Other Project Updates – *Lead Agency Staff*
- c. Review and Release for Public Review the Draft Metropolitan Bicycle Master Plan – *MPO Staff*
- d. Review and discussion of the proposed Tasks for the 2012-2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – *MPO Staff*
- e. Update on the status of the Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization – *MPO Staff*

3 MPO Officer Report

4. Communications from TCC Members

5. Adjourn - Next TCC Meeting: Monday March 26th, 2012

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 INDEX
SFMPO-TCC MEETING**

February 27, 2012

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE(S)
CALL to ORDER		
ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES January 23, 2012	Approved	2-3
1. Communication from the Public	None	3
2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action		
a. Public Review proposed amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 TIP – <i>MPO Staff</i>	Discussed	3-4
b. TIP Project Updates		
1. I-25/Cañoncito Draft Phase A/B Report	Discussed	4-6
2. I-25/Cerrillos Rd Draft Phase A/B Report	Discussed	6-7
3. Other Project Updates – <i>Lead Agency Staff</i>	Discussed	7
c. Public Review Draft Metro Bicycle Master Plan	Discussed	8-9
d. Proposed Tasks 2012-2014 UPW Program (UPWP)	Discussed	9-11
e. Update- Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization	Discussed	11
3. MPO Officer Report	Discussed	11
4. Communications from TCC Members	Discussed	12
5. Adjourn - Next Meeting: March 26, 2012	Adjourned at 5:35 p.m.	12

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FÉ MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

February 27, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Santa Fé MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order on the above date by Board Chair John Romero at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Fé City Council Conference Room, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Romero, Chair - City of Santa Fé
David Quintana for Phil Gallegos, District five DOT
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fé County
Richard Macpherson for Reed Liming
Eric Martínez – City of Santa Fé
Tamara Baer for City of Santa Fé Greg Smith – City of Santa Fé

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Tony Mortillaro, NCRTD
Shelley Cobau- Santa Fé County
Robert Martínez – Santa Fé County
Ryan Swazo-Hinds, Tesuque Pueblo

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Mr. Keith Wilson, MPO Planner
Mike Kelly, NMDOT
Ricardo Roybal, NMDOT

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. E. Martinez moved to approve the Agenda as presented. Ms. Baer seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES- January 23, 2012

Page 5, 9th paragraph- for clarification: "Mr. Martinez said ..." should be Phase B and C.

Ms. Baer moved to approve the Minutes of January 23, 2012 as amended. Mr. E. Martinez seconded the motion and the motion passed by majority voice vote.

1. Communications from the Public

There was none.

2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action:

- a. Review and Release for Public Review proposed amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program – *MPO Staff (Exhibit 1)*

Mr. Wilson said the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) amendment process would be accelerated about a month to allow District five to get funding and bid. The amendment would go to the Policy Board in April and the March STIP amendment would be approved with the Policy Board's amendment.

Mr. Wilson said the amendment; the NM 475/ Washington Ave. Intersection Reconstruction Project needs an additional million dollars of federal funding. State and City match will contribute \$230,000 for additional work and the original \$1.5 million entered in the TIP will increase to \$2.73 million.

The Caja del Rio road improvements are mandated by the federal government to be in the TIP because it is regionally significant and the \$3 million cost estimate will be amended to \$4.7million.

A resurface of Cerrillos Road to St. Francis Drive is a new project that would be upgraded to meet ADA facilities for sidewalks. The State Maintenance funds of \$500,000 would complete the work. The project will also be in the TIP.

Las Soleras project will also be included in the TIP. The project is moving forward with road construction connecting Beckner Road from Cerrillos Road to Richards Avenue and a portion of the crossing at Chamiso.

The State identified highway rail grade improvements to improve the Santa Fe Southern Rail crossing at Rabbit Road for gates, lighting upgrade and pavement improvement. Federal funds of \$264,000 is allocated for the project that would be done this summer

Mr. Wilson said projects on page 21 and 22 still need confirmation if they should be in the TIP. He said Santa Fe Trails wants a portion of the \$131,000 for Small Transit Intensive Cities reporting and the Santa Fe Place Transit is still being clarified.

Mr. Wilson said projects would be removed if they don't need to be included in the TIP. The amendments would be released for a 30 day public review if the Committee makes a recommendation at the March meeting. The amendments would then go to the Policy Board meeting on April 12 for approval and approval within the STIP.

Ms. Baer asked who would pay for the Santa Fe Place Transit Center.

Mr. Wilson said about \$588,000 was FTA (Federal Transit Administration) funds with \$147,000 in local match.

Ms. Baer said questions came up on the Santa Fe Place project in the review of a City planning project. There were questions about the location and orientation of the transit center in relation to the mall and the main entrance and who would make that decision.

Mr. Kelly said Santa Fe Trails leased the area at the Santa Fe Place Mall for several years. He said there was a discussion about expansion of the mall that evolved into a 50 year easement being granted and a purchase of property. He said the existing real estate being used has a conceptual layout plan. That plan was redeveloped and the mall owners would sell the City a piece of the property.

Ms. Baer said they were also talking to the new owners and the plan was to put a tenant into the old Mervyns space and there was discussion on the amount of parking needed for the mall. She said it was uncoordinated and she would appreciate coordinating that with Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Kelly said the transit exemption: to exempt the maximum/minimum spaces for parking in retail outlets in exchange for transit use, was received through City Council, Land Use and Zoning and there is some leeway.

Ms. Baer said it wasn't about losing parking but more the location of the Transit Center in relation to the layout of the mall and the main entrance.

Ms. Baer moved to release the amended TIP for public review. Mr. E. Martinez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. TIP Project Updates

1. Presentation of the I-25/Cañyoncito Interchange Draft Phase A/B Report –
NMDOT Staff

A slide show was presented on the I-25 Cañyoncito Exit 294 Interchange Project. A copy of the presentation (**Exhibit 2**) was passed out to members.

The project is identified in the FY 2012-2015 STIP and is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Fe MPO. The purpose of the project is to address infrastructure, geometric and drainage deficiencies of the I-25 Cañyoncito Exit 294 Interchange.

The existing underpass is insufficient with insufficient clearances vertically and horizontally. The project addresses drainage issues and provides improvement to the interstate ramps that are currently too short for AASHTO design standards. The existing underpass is deteriorating; two structures (bridge #6063 and bridge #6064) are within the project limits.

The original speed in the area was 60 mph and the current posted speed limit is 75 mph. The road meets criteria for a 60 mile an hour design speed with the exception of the ramps. The southbound off/on ramps and the northbound on ramp are too short. The southbound off ramp has limited site due to the growth of Siberian elms and three of the four ramps do not meet AASHTO length criteria.

There are 18 culverts that cross under I-25 and the remaining drainage is small pipes; a number of the structures are partially salted or have erosion at the outlet.

Two properties are listed in the National Register of Historic Places; the Glorietta Pass Battlefield and the Nuestra Señora de la Luz Church and the archaeological site of Johnson's Ranch is included. The Santa Fe National Historic Trail and the historic AT&SF Railroad are adjacent to the project area.

A total of 10 alternatives were developed and screened to the three alternatives currently being evaluated. The major issues that affect the alternative selection are the four historic resources, limited funding and meeting the needs of the residents.

Alternative 2 would relocate the interchange 600 feet to the south with an underpass configuration and a diamond interchange. The alignment of Sleeping Dog Road on both sides would be required and the existing box culvert would be taken out of service.

Alternative 3 would relocate the interchange 4,000 feet to the south with a conventional diamond interchange with two options; 1) rebuild and replace the existing underpass and 2) provide a frontage road to Sleeping Dog Road on the East side of I-25 and take the underpass out of service.

Alternative 10 meets AASHTO design standards by providing increased lanes at the southwest on and off ramps and northbound on ramp and would closely mirror a diamond interchange while maintaining the original location. Retaining walls would be used at the north end ramps and east and west ends of the CBC (concrete box culvert.)

Beth Mills, Santa Fe County said she works on a larger concept in the Galisteo Basin. She asked if the alternative designs were considered for the wildlife crossing.

Jim ? said animal crashes have been looked at back to 1995 and there wasn't a high incidence. He said the Apache Creek Triple Box Culvert was considered for the area and they were working with the New Mexico Game and Fish.

Mr. Quintana added that data beyond the crashes was looked at as well.

Ms. Baer said that Ms. Cobau had raised an issue when this was last discussed that the project is a \$7 million project and whether it is necessary. Ms. Baer said she knew that the underpass is structurally deteriorating and unsafe and is the biggest reason. She asked for a brief update on the State Safety Access Manual.

Mr. Quintana said the need to replace the CBC is driving the project and the focal point is bridge funding. He said it made sense to address the ramp deficiencies at the same time.

Ms. Baer asked if there is an alternative to abandoning the underpass so it could be used for a bicycle or trail connection, etc.

Mr. Quintana said that was possible but that decision would be made when the alternative is identified. He said the design team would make the decision and is a collaborative with the consultant, the district, the MPO Santa Fe County, FHWA and the National Park Services.

Ms. Baer asked what concerns the resident's had.

Mr. Quintana said some concern was about moving the interchange south and the additional vehicular traffic onto Old Las Vegas Highway. He said also the caretakers of the church were concerned with construction activities and access and the protection of the church during construction. He said most people were favorable toward the project and the safety concerns that would be addressed.

Ms. Baer asked if it was anticipated that traffic would increase by improving the interchange.

Mr. Quintana said there is no planned growth in the area but his opinion was the Parks Service might better utilize the area for tourism and increased traffic would be a result.

Mr. Wilson said what could be achieved at the current site and extending the ramps would be discussed on Wednesday. He said \$7 million was approved in the TIP.

Mr. E. Martinez asked the costs on the three alternatives.

Mr. Quintana said the first two were between \$12-13 million and keeping the current location is about \$7.1 million.

2. Presentation of the I-25/Cerrillos Rd Interchange Draft Phase A/B Report

Ricardo Roybal said he was a civil engineer and is now with the DOT. The Phase A/B Report study area included Beckner Road to Rancho Viejo. He said the FHA guidelines required a look at the adjacent interchange at St. Francis Drive and further south.

He said the interchange at Richards Avenue and the underpass impact hasn't been studied but would be for the chosen alternative. He said several alternatives are being looked at: 1) the diamond interchange 2) roundabouts-not insignificant to the diamond interchange on the opposite side. The difference would be the new diamond interchange would have signalization and 3) a diverging diamond that crosses under the interchange.

Mr. Roybal said the traffic analysis for all three alternatives is within 5% of each other in level of service, efficiency, etc. and the costs were from \$12-\$13 million.

Mr. Roybal said there would be a meeting at District 5 to review comments from the design team based on the A/B Report. The draft has gone through a public hearing and possibly would have another.

He said several bicycle issues are being looked at and a multi use path for bicycles, pedestrians, horses, etc. is considered for all three alternatives. He said he is aware that a diverging diamond could have some uncomfortable points for cyclists and might be confusing.

Mr. Roybal said roundabouts minimize conflicts and generally reduce conflict points and accidents by about 47 percent. The area is residential and would turn to heavy commercial because it was zoned industrial. Residential land wouldn't be impacted to the east and southeast.

Mr. Roybal said 2008 through 2010 crash data shows mostly rear end collisions and side swipes, same side caused by driver inattention or excessive speed and the traffic would increase.

Mr. Kelly said his concern is that the speed limit on Cerrillos Road is currently 55 mph until it slows to 45 mph at Beckner Road. He asked what the traffic calming speed limit projections would be.

Mr. Roybal said currently there is none. The FHA has indicated they want to study the impact and the lights (signal) beyond Beckner into the City of Santa Fe on Cerrillos. He said a study showed that reducing the speed would reduce the accidents.

Mr. Quintana asked if true that the addition of the roundabouts or diamonds would decrease the speed through the interchange. He said all of the options would pull the southbound to northbound

movement closer to the interchange and increase the weaving distance to Beckner Road. The data has shown many of the crashes were because people tried to make the left onto the frontage road.

Mr. Kelly said the demographics have changed in the last couple of years and people want to get off a bus and cross the intersection at Beckner and NM14. He said it would increase the liability with a stop on that side of the road because it would be in an unsafe location.

Mr. Roybal said he anticipated the speed limit would be reduced to 45 mph if the intersection is signalized.

Mr. Wilson said it is important to emphasize that the use of the diamond was because of the two bridges with the northbound off ramp under them that needs to be replaced.

Mr. Roybal said A and B are study phases and phase C would look at environmental. There is little concern about archaeological sites and the biological has been looked at. Sabrina Pratt from the Arts Commission would attend the meeting on the twelfth. He said a gateway was discussed and those things would be considered.

Mr. Wilson said the City has a scenic by-way application to install scenic Route 66 artwork on both ends of the alignment into the City and it made sense to look for a potential location for a gateway.

Tim Rogers said both of the interchanges would likely be part of the bike Route 66. He was happy to see the trail included. He said it was important to realize it could be less significant as an alternative to NM14 than a way to get north to south and could tie the County trail system to the City trail system.

3. Other Project Updates – *Lead Agency Staff*

Mr. Quintana gave project update information. A summary follows:

St. Francis/ I-25- netting is being installed to prevent nesting; construction should start mid April.

Jaguar 599- the plan is a 60% design review in March. A draft MOU is being readied to finalize the three-party MOU (memorandum of understanding.) Construction could start in the summer but possibly not until the next construction season. Jaguar has been graded.

County RD 62 and 599-the project is about a month behind St. Francis Drive and construction should begin the end of May and would be coordinated with Caja del Rio construction for traffic control.

Mr. E. Martinez said the trail underpass at Zia and St. Francis Drive should start the beginning of March and could affect traffic control at St. Francis.

Mr. Quintana said traffic control would be easier if that started in April but either way should be coordinated. The traffic on St. Francis Drive would be reduced and the northbound would be closed for 2 months between April and June. They would get the word out on clear channel stations with daily spots.

c. Review and Release for Public Review the Draft Metropolitan Bicycle Master Plan– MPO Staff

Mr. Wilson said the draft needed final editing before a formal release; a preliminary draft was released in September of last year. Input meetings have been conducted with Staff, COLTPAC (County Open Space Land Trail and Path Access Commission) and the Planning Commission and the ADA Commission and the final product is about a week away.

Mr. Wilson asked approval to release the Draft Bicycle Master Plan in a week for a formal 30 day public review. Copies could be provided for the Committee to review and they could also do a formal release for public review at the next TCC meeting.

Ms. Baer said a main concern on behalf of the Planning Commission is that the plan had no cost figures. She said the Commission was impressed with the work and lauded the effort but felt it was unrealistic to support the plan without knowing the costs.

Mr. Rogers said the Planning Commission's comment was actually that there was a lack of data. He said the implementation plan has the cost estimates of the projects proposed. He said survey data was included from American Community Survey to address the concerns.

Mr. Wilson said one member's concern was that the \$30 million cost estimate over 25 years couldn't support spending money on bicycle facilities without data that said bicycling would be increased. He said another issue about maintenance costs had been added in the implementation plan on what is needed to maintain over the life of the plan.

Ms. Baer asked who would be responsible and where the funds would come from.

Mr. Wilson said transportation legislation is going through a reauthorization process and funding might be available. The BTAC (Bicycle Trails Advisory Committee) adopted Phase A plan recommendations and that was used as part of the bond for \$4 million for trails. He said that was probably where the majority of funds would come from.

Mr. Tibbetts asked if the Planning Commission felt that \$30 million was sufficient. He said over 25 years \$30 million is not that much.

Ms. Baer said it wasn't that the Commission thought the project wasn't worthy but that they recognized that it was a large number that was not supported from data or analysis. They also questioned how it would be maintained.

Mr. Wilson said other cities like Portland were looked at and that was included.

Mr. Rogers added that American Survey data showed an increase in Portland and is up to 8%; Santa Fe is at point 5 percent.

Mr. Wilson said the Committee still has an opportunity to review the plan and discuss aspects if the plan is moved forward to public review. The revisions from the September draft added the data from Portland and the two recommendations related to bicycle parking and connectivity and planning.

Mr. Rogers said major changes were touched on and an example was the implementation plan for maintenance which included one of the costlier items to repave older asphalt trails.

Chair Romero said another maintenance aspect is the general upkeep; to remove overgrowth and shrubs etc. He said Fabian Chavez expressed the strain to keep up with the new trails with a lack of Staff.

Mr. Rogers said recommendations could be made for soft surface trails and there could be a lot done along the paths like an “adopt a multi-use trail.”

Chair Romero suggested the information be included in Phase A so the City/County and City Council would be aware of what is needed.

Mr. Wilson said Mr. Chavez has talked about training volunteer staff to take on minor maintenance and he could touch base with Mr. Chávez. He said if the Committee released the plan, at the end of the review period the comments could be looked at and show how the comments were addressed.

Ms. Baer asked what the formal review process entailed.

Mr. Wilson said at least two public input meetings were planned and the plan would be presented to BTAC. He said a full overview was given to COLTPAC at the County. He said they could go back to the Planning Commission but he encouraged them to be involved through the public process.

Ms. Baer moved that the Draft Metropolitan Bicycle Master Plan be approved to go forward for public review. Mr. Jandáček seconded the motion.

Mr. E. Martinez liked the idea about a discussion on the operations and maintenance side and particularly about adopting a trail. He said a lot of bicycle volunteers seemed willing to help. He said he was comfortable with the plan but wanted to take one last look once updated before making a recommendation.

Mr. Wilson said the Committee would receive the final document and could provide written or verbal comment. He would send an electronic copy to everyone and produce a hard copy if wanted.

The motion to release the Draft Bicycle Master Plan was passed by unanimous voice vote.

d. Review and Discussion of the Proposed Tasks for the 2012-2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – *MPO Staff*

Mr. Tibbetts said comments from the January discussion on modifying the UPWP was to focus more on the tools the MPO could provide members, such as a traffic model.

He said The MPO would meet in a couple of weeks with Bob Shoal, the original developer of the traffic model to discuss the level the MPO should go to for a new aggregation of demographics. They would review the coding and whether to invest and how much of a change that would make. The discussion would determine the amount to be reapportioned in the budget to develop the UPWP.

Mr. Tibbetts said he would mail the draft for the Committee to review before the March meeting. He said currently it wasn't certain if there would be a reauthorization bill or a continuing resolution of the existing bill, or something else. He would know more in March.

Chair Romero asked how much time and money was spent in the UPWP for the Bicycle Master Plan to compare the costs and time spent on a small percentage of the community.

Mr. Wilson said the question wasn't the money spent; whether they spent \$50,000 or \$150,000, it was what was gained in the model's capability. He said the MPO isn't clear what would be gained in spending incremental amounts.

He said currently there are six or seven different demographics; three different household types, three or four different employment types. He said the MPO is committed to developing a model that is

useful. Their model was used for the I-25 Interchange Study and he assumed could be used for other interchanges or the 599 corridor.

Chair Romero said the plan was referred to but not used for the Cerrillos Road Study.

Mr. Wilson said Mr. Shoals was a model consultant and used revised graphic information and worked on the network coding within that area. He said Mr. Shoals did a robust validation of the base year model based on current counts and updated the demographics. The I-25/ Cerrillos Road project used a modified version of that model.

Mr. Wilson said Mr. Shoals could give them a good idea of the direction to go with the model and what it would take to get there.

Chair Romero thought the model hadn't taken into account commuter traffic. He said it acted as its own incubated community and that threw a lot of things off.

Mr. Wilson explained the current model volumes were essentially the daily trips divided by ten. He said there are a multitude of options to explore from developing a peak hour model, to finding a way to use a daytime model for the peak hours. He said he wanted to be able to export data from the model for visualization and to simulate different options or applications.

Mr. Wilson said in the reauthorization language it talked about getting rid of small MPOs and that was driven by the feeling that smaller MPOs don't have the modeling expertise of capability. He said if done right it is a good tool.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was also why the City would invest in improving the traffic count program and is looking at data through INFO Group. He said the group could almost instantly populate the fields. The City currently works with another consultant out of Nebraska that populates the fields based on local delineation.

He said the main criteria as a small MPO would be if the MPO is capable to do traffic and even if grandfathered would still be expectation of what the MPOs would be required to provide.

Ms. Baer said as a later member of the Committee, she wasn't sure she understood the mission or the relationship to the Transportation Policy Board. She said it would be helpful if that could be restated. She said her impression is that the Policy Board establishes policies through approval or rejection of projects, opposed to a proactive cognitive lead in what the policy should be in terms of transportation.

She asked if it was the role of the Committee to make a suggestion along those terms.

Mr. Tibbetts said every five years there is an MPO Plan that guides the policy and the action taken. He said the Committee's input greatly influenced how the document is put together. He said the process starts again in the fall of 2013 and those concerns could be addressed at that time. The vision of where the City wants transportation to go is stated in the document.

Mr. Fred Pearson asked if it was the plan for the major users of the modeling process, including the City/County and State, to sit in on the discussion.

Mr. Tibbetts said initially options would be looked at and that information brought back to the Committee for a recommendation.

Mr. Pearson thought the City would have different criteria and uses for the data and might ask different questions.

Mr. Tibbetts said as requests were dealt with there is a sense of what the City and County wanted. He said sometimes they wanted a ten-year projection as opposed to a 20 year projection and the problem before was they couldn't say. He said now the MPO tries to pin that down instead of something that would happen in 50 to 100 years.

Mr. Pearson said there is one source-the model developer who said what could and could not be done and the emphasis that could be given to aspects of the forecast.

Mr. Tibbetts said the developer developed the software and knows what the software could or couldn't do. The MPO thought the software a good fit.

Mr. Wilson said he would talk with Mr. Shoals about a workshop about modeling in layman's terms.

Mr. E. Martinez said MPO has a good idea of what entities need as far as use. He gave the Siler Study as an example where the model was used. He said if they could keep up with that, the MPO could be relied on for the information.

Mr. Quintana thought the one model they want is a peak hour demand model.

Mr. Jandáček said he would reiterate that from the County's perspective it would be useful to have the peak hours. Currently the County takes the developers word and wanted a tool to use to validate that.

e. Update on the Status of the Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization – *MPO Staff*

Mr. Wilson said the current continuing resolution would expire March 31. The Senate has a two year bill (MAP 21) that if adopted, started last October. The bill is bipartisan and the Senate could vote next week.

The House produced a five year bill and added a lot of other things like removing transit funding from transportation and putting it as a general fund. Mr. Wilson said he heard the House withdrew the bill and would re-draft it for a two year bill.

Mr. Wilson said a third bill was a six year bill that doubled the funding. He was unclear where that would go and would continue to send updates. He said the biggest issue was the Senate bill talked about eliminating the small MPOs. Several amendments would grandfather the existing smaller MPOs as the House bill had done. He said the Senate bill language was vague and needed clarification.

3. MPO Officer Report

Mr. Tibbetts said "regionally significant" needed clarification of what would go into the TIP and what shows in the long-range MPT. The language defines *regionally significant* as any improvement that affects the modeling side of the transportation network. An example of a regionally significant project was given.

Mr. Wilson said anything on the MPT regardless of funding, would have to be included in the TIP. He said they are working with FHA for clarification on what has to be included; all federally funded projects would go in the TIP.

Mr. Wilson said he would also clarify with the FHA that the MPT doesn't cover every project. He would work with them on boilerplate language that covers certain projects that are not anticipated.

4. Communications from TCC Members

There were none.


5. ADJOURNMENT – Next meeting, Monday March 26th, 2012

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Approved by:

John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Charmaine Clair", written over a horizontal line.

Charmaine Clair, Stenographer