

# **Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)**

## **Minutes of the SERTPO Committee Meeting**

**February 16, 2023 – 10:00 am**

**Hybrid Meeting (Virtual/In Person)**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

*Member (or Alternate) listed in Alphabetical Order*

Baker, Shelia	City of Hobbs
Bunch, Clint	City of Clovis
Burns, Jason	Eddy County
Chavez, Steven	City of Portales
Kennedy, Kevin	Village of Capitan
Jarvis, Joe	City of Ruidoso Downs
Jennings, Dan (Councilor)	Town of Hagerman
Jones, Walon	Curry County
Honeycutt, Jeffrey	Lincoln County
Little, Christopher	Mescalero Apache Tribe
Lovato, Ricky	Roosevelt County
Myrick, Van	City of Jal
Najar, Louis	City of Roswell
Onsuresz, Jackie (Councilor)	Village of Loving
Osborne, Debbie	City of Alamogordo
Patterson, Jeff	City of Carlsbad
Sales, Rudy	Village of Hope
Serna, Samantha	Village of Ruidoso
West, Joe	Chaves County

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Bradley, Jerry (Mayor)	City of Texico
Brito, Candy	City of Eunice
Burkett, Mickey (Mayor)	Village of Dora
Dean, Ray (Mayor)	Town of Carrizozo
Garcia, Roman (Mayor)	Town of Vaughn
Green, Barry (Mayor)	Village of Melrose
Gutierrez, Amy (Mayor)	Town of Tatum
Hall, Jubal	Village of Cloudcroft
Ingram, Justin	Village of Fort Sumner
King, Kris (Mayor)	Village of Causey
Lucero, Amanda	De Baca County
Martinez, Vidal	City of Lovington
Needham, Corey	Lea County
Porter, Tom	Otero County
Powell, Justin	Town of Dexter
Powell, Leona	Village of Grady
Sainz, Robert (Trustee)	Village of Tularosa
Salazar, Ysidro (Mayor)	Town of Lake Arthur
Seely, Sam (Mayor)	Village of Corona
Summers, Kim	Town of Elida
Valverde, Summer	City of Artesia
Whitecotton, Toni	Village of Floyd

Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)  
Minutes of February 16, 2023 Meeting

---

**COG/NMDOT STAFF PRESENT:**

Arnett, Manon	NMDOT - Roswell
Briley, Alan	NMDOT - Roswell
Burr, Mary Ann	Southeastern New Mexico Economic Development District (SNMEDD)
Coslin, Libby	NMDOT - Roswell
Griffin, Curtis	NMDOT - Roswell
Matta, Louis	NMDOT - Roswell
Navarette, Eric	NMDOT - Las Cruces
Olds, Shane	NMDOT-Roswell
Rodriguez III, Raul	Eastern Plains Council of Governments (EPCOG)
Sanchez, Francisco	NMDOT District 2 Engineer

**GUESTS PRESENT: \***

Allen, Glenda	City of Roswell (Alternate)
Avitia, Jesus	Souder Miller & Associates
Burroughes, Claire	City of Clovis (Alternate)
Carbajal, Sonia	Village of Hope
Doss, Russell	Souder Miller & Associates (Hobbs)
Flores, Carol	Roosevelt County
Lee, Debi	SNMEDD Consultant
Martinez, Alonzo	Horrocks (Las Cruces)
McAlister, Thomas	
Palomino, Alex	Souder Miller & Associates (Roswell)
Runyan, Richard	Dennis Engineering
Sanchez, Daniel	Roosevelt County
Sasser, Shanna	NM Dept of Finance & Administration
Shields, David	Bohannon Huston (Las Cruces)
Zapata, Adriana	Chaves County

*\*Unknown caller and virtual attendee present*

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM (8)**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Committee Vice-Chair Jeff Honeycutt opened and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Members and guests participated with the Pledge of Allegiance. With nineteen members present, a quorum was established. Introductions were held.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Jason Burns moved onto the approval of the agenda. Louis Najar made a motion to approve the agenda, as presented. Ricky Lovato seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no objections, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Kevin Kennedy made a motion to approve the November 29, 2022 minutes as presented. Louis Najar seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no discussion or objections, the motion passed unanimously.

**PRESENTATION: NMDOT Permitting**

Curtis Griffin, District 2 Traffic Management Analyst  
Shane Olds, District 2 Traffic Section Permit Agent

Mr. Griffin and Mr. Olds introduced themselves to the members. Additional staff of the Traffic Division were introduced (slide): Jim Skonhovd, Traffic Engineer; James MacCormack, Asst Traffic Engineer; Mike Jones, Traffic Technician; and Barry Galloway, Traffic Technician. Mr. Griffin continued and explained that the Utility permit is the most common. These permits are used by the oil/gas industry and cities for water or any utility in NMDOT Right-of-Way (ROW) that crosses overhead, under, parallel, or in any way enters the NMDOT ROW. The permits are permanent installations and are executed for 25 years with the submission of an as-built plat. Driveway access permits are very common. Individuals may not obtain these permits, however, they should for safety reasons. The Division follows the State Highway Access Management Manual (SAMM) for the rulings on distances and speed. Traffic Control permits, usually issued to contractors with an approved traffic control plan, ensure safety during construction. Any work requiring a traffic control plan requires this permit.

Special events are important during certain times of the year, requiring road closures. These permits should be acquired as the Division has to detour traffic. The Division will assist with the development of a traffic control plan. The Division is trying to set up plans that can be used year to year with the different cities to simplify the process. Landscape permits allow beautification around driveways and businesses, such as plantings and other items along the ROW. State and local rules, setbacks and ADA compliance are considered. While there are some fence permits, they are not as common.

Temporary permits are used mostly by the oil and gas industry. Permits are given for waterlines used for frack jobs, and they usually run along the road, sometimes through an existing covert or some other pipe to get under the road. Removal must occur within ninety (90) days. The most frequent use is for waterline (fresh water). Temporary access is primarily used for site development for a limited time. When work is completed, all must be returned to their original condition—not a permanent driveway.

E-permitting (online permits) is a project being worked on, along with the rest of the state. It is anticipated to affect and benefit fiber optic projects and the oil/gas activity. Permits are anticipated to remain the same, but users will be able to submit permits online. The Division staff will still be available to help. While a timeline has not been established, it should be available within the year. Business cards were made available for contact information.

Alan Briley, NMDOT Roswell, explained that the emphasis on the first couple of slides is in-town development. Major corporations, usually engineers, contact NMDOT and provide a form of development plan beforehand. The Traffic Division engineers (and the presenters) determine locations and the type of preparatory work needed. For some of the smaller developments in-town, the District requests, as part of the local governments' permitting processes, to always include NMDOT Traffic Division if the location is on a state highway (e.g., driveway installations). Except for major corporations and franchises, several entities and such do not realize that they need to come through NMDOT.

Mr. Griffin responded to a question from the audience regarding utility permitting. He also commented that small towns' permitting would go through their office if work is on a state or federal highway. Their office can also assist if the type of highway is in question. Jason Burns inquired if NMDOT has taken steps to expedite the traditional processes with the use of SAMM and traffic impact analyses. He provided examples of the industries, their activity and contact with the County. Mr. Briley responded that the e-permitting is going to simplify permitting as contractors and others will be able to save input and have easy access for the future.

## ACTION ITEMS

### A. Discussion and Approval of Transportation Project Fund (TPF) Scoring Criteria/Policy and Timeline

The Chairman provided background whereby members requested a review of the TPF process which included member input (survey) and subcommittee review. An overview of the proposed Mission and Vision statements was given. The Chair mentioned that while much detail will be covered during this meeting, there is also going to be a workshop on February 22, 2023. Ms. Burr added that the SNMEDD Executive Director wanted to have training for those entities who have never applied for TPF and to include an overview of transportation programs. The training is being held at 10:00 am in Room 110, at the ENMU-R Campus Union Building. Invites will be sent out, not only to those who have never applied, but to all to reach those who seek a better understanding of the reasoning of the criteria (TPF).

Regarding *Capital* in the criteria, the Chair explained that he has had communications from different entities regarding this criterion. He referred to the section where it reads “one application per funding year for single road, bridge or connecting road intersection termini project, two application limit.” He recommended changing the criteria to one application limit and change wording from “one application, per funding year, for single road, bridge, or connecting road intersection termini project” to “one application per funding year per entity, or multiple roads, bridge connecting, or road intersecting termini’s.” The Chair explained that following discussions, the capital projects really need to be directed. With the amount of funding and the number of applications anticipated, one capital project should be appropriate. The change will help the evaluation process, both in the time and evaluation processes. Following an inquiry, the Chair clarified that *Capital* is for one application for \$4 million per year per entity; *Maintenance* remains as two applications up to \$2 million each; and *Design* is one application per funding year, two applications, \$500k per application. Entities who really need some planning funding can utilize TPF and then find alternate sources of funding for projects.

Jackie Onsurez requested clarification on *Capital*, regarding the one application with a \$4 million cap and whether it can be for multiple infrastructure projects. The Chair recommended entities to apply for similar projects (e.g., apply separately for roads, apply separately for bridges). While the SERTPO would try to grade if a project includes a road and bridge, it is recommended that the projects be similar, to make it easier for District 2 to make a recommendation for a single application. The Chair reminded all that *Capital* is defined as an improvement to the road. If designs are ready, the plans can be submitted, and the application will be evaluated as presented.

Louis Najar stated that while he is not in disagreement, he urged caution if an entity is including multiple routes on a capital project and provided examples. The Chair also added that during the subcommittee meeting, point values were increased. Last year there was a total of 35 points, and it was changed to 120 points [Capital]. Points were increased so SERTPO could grade better, have more of a spread, make a recommendation, interpolate, and get an accurate score of conditions and designs.

Francisco Sanchez, District 2 Engineer, spoke to the criteria, how it is broken out, and impact on the formula (i.e., if the formula still works). Multiple roads projects, especially for municipalities, may lead to a hybrid. The District Engineer provided examples of different types of improvements, including surfacing. He cautioned members on multiple routes as scopes of work for capital is not going to fit into one box.

The Chair expressed that when SERTPO meets for the presentations and grading, hopefully a newly appointed Commissioner (STC) and District 2 Engineer will be attending. Presentations will be done for all applications, including maintenance. Time limits are anticipated and will be shared with members. Clarification was requested for capital projects. Members were urged to refer to page 1 of the TPF scoring criteria. The Chair responded that it reads “one application per funding year for multiple

road termini, bridge or connecting road projects. One application limit.” The Chair went on to point out that the attachment with the formula was shared with members and gave an overview. He described the rankings from the previous year and explained that for this year, the top three capital projects within the allotted funding will be sent up as 1, 2 and 3. Multiple fours and fives for maintenance will be recommended, based on those who received funding recently and those who have not received funding, based on discussions of the two-year limit on contracts. Design projects will be prioritized as 6, 7 and 8. Remaining maintenance will then follow design, and remaining design to follow maintenance. Applications that are not included in the top recommended rankings will not be rejected. All applications that meet the State criteria will be submitted.

An inquiry was made on the scoring process. The Chair reviewed the timeline, addressing when PFFs are due (3/13/23); the District 2 review period (3/14/23 through 3/27/23); and the applications packages deadline (4/17/23). A self-scored scoring sheet with each application is recommended for member review and consideration during the rating. The intent is to have a very clear and concise scoring process. Applicants should be able to objectively score their projects, using the criteria, and anticipate what the score will be. The Chair continued with the timeline, with the meeting packet deadline (4/28/23) and meeting date for evaluations and presentations (5/4/23). It is anticipated to be a day-long meeting. Raul Rodriguez III made an inquiry into time limits for the presentations. A precise time limit can be determined once the number of applications to be received is known. The Chair described the prior year’s process of forty-four applications with no presentations for maintenance as all were given top points. He provided an estimate of five to eight minutes per presentation. Mr. Najar commented that with self-scoring, the evaluation would continue as a group; questions may be asked of the applicant for clarification; and discussion can be held on scoring, whether higher or lower. The process would resemble one held in earlier years for the Roadway program. He commented that five minutes should be ample time. There will be a presentation for every application for the District Engineer, the Committee and hopefully the newly appointed Commissioner.

Mr. Najar requested members to put forward any comments before a motion is made. Samantha Serna requested that the rating meeting be held the following week due to zoning training on May 4-6, 2023. Following light discussion, the meeting date was changed to May 8, 2023. Louis Najar made a recommendation of moving the date for application packages due from May 17<sup>th</sup> to May 19<sup>th</sup> due to the TransCon conference held that week, to which there was concurrence. Ms. Burr commented that there had been an inquiry into when to submit information for the *Application Verification* as listed on the criteria. The Chair responded that the verification is intended to be submitted with the application. It is used to verify and justify an applicant’s requested score. The Chair called for any additional recommendations or revisions. With there being none, Louis Najar made a motion to approve the TPF scoring criteria and application timeline process with the amendments of one application on Capital as presented by Chairman Burns, timeline change of April 19<sup>th</sup> as the application package due date and the next SERTPO meeting date for rating applications as May 8, 2023. Jeff Honeycutt seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken, and with there being no discussion or objections, the motion passed unanimously.

**B. Resolution No. 23-001 Approving Public Meeting Notice Requirements**

With there being no discussion or questions regarding the resolution, Louis Najar made a motion to approve Resolution No. 23-001 Approving Public Meeting Notice Requirements as presented. Kevin Kennedy seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken with no objections. Motion passed unanimously.



## **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

### **SERTPO Program Managers Update**

Mary Ann Burr announced new members, Jackie Lee Onsurez, Councilor, Village of Loving; Jon Crunk, Commissioner, Lincoln County; and Glenda Allen (Alternate), City of Roswell.

Regarding the TAP Program, Ms. Burr informed members that three applications (i.e., PFFs) were received and feasibility reviews have been conducted. Staff are currently working with application packets, received by the deadline of February 15, 2023. One application was received from Portales, and two applications were received from Mescalero. Staff will continue to work application packets and turn them in by the March 10, 2023 due date.

Members were reminded of the training for next week. Ms. Burr explained that originally the training targeted those entities that have never applied for TPF, but the invitation is now extended to everyone. Transportation Day is scheduled at the Legislature on March 9, 2023. ADA training is also scheduled that same week on March 7-9, 2023. Jessica Best, NMDOT District 2, added the third day of training with the first two days quickly filled.

Regarding Plan activity, Dexter's Comprehensive Plan is coming to completion by the month of April. Hope's Comprehensive Plan is in the process of selecting its Planner. Hagerman's Asset Management Plan currently has their Request for Proposals advertised.

Handouts regarding the NMDOT Annual Public Entity Sale and Annual Hardship Sale were made available on the sign-in table, as well as handouts of the draft TPF Timeline and NMDOT TPF Call-for-Projects.

Raul Rodriguez III spoke to the outreach conducted to municipalities in his region. He is anticipating membership confirmations or has received confirmations from the Village of House (Tomi Miller, Village Clerk); Village of Melrose (Meadow Forget, Mayor) and Village of Causey (Janet Caviness, Councilwoman). Mr. Rodriguez attended the EPCOG Board meeting on March 8<sup>th</sup>, at which time he updated members with transportation activity, to include the TAP/RTP/CRP applications and the TPF Call underway.

### **Local Project Updates / NMDOT Updates**

Alan Briley, District 2, announced his retirement at the end of April. He has forty years in public and civil service. Mr. Briley also spoke about the upcoming ADA training, which has had a good response from local communities. Currently, the District has over \$200 million in construction activity. Regarding the US 285 corridor, there are four projects, from the state line through Loving at approximately \$110-\$120 million. He informed members that in his nearly eight years, District 2 has received statewide-projects-of-the-year on four occasions, which is a good percentage. District 2 does quality work and compliance. He anticipates seeing members at future SERTPO Committee meetings.

Regarding Local Government Road Fund (LGRF), Louis Matta, District 2, commented on their Call-for-Projects with a deadline approaching on March 15, 2023. Staff are currently updating their LGRF PowerPoint and are hoping to have it ready for the training for next week. Copies of the District 2 Permitting presentation will be shared with members, and it was announced that Ms. Burr has a new email address. Inquiry was made regarding Cradle-to-Grave training. Louis Matta explained that a PowerPoint had been in use due to the pandemic. Mr. Matta indicated that if anyone still needs assistance, they can arrange a one-on-one meeting with the entity. An inquiry was made into LGRF funding levels, to which Mr. Matta responded the funding levels have remained flat. The County Arterial program is by formula, and final numbers will not be known until after the legislature. A new LGRF handbook is coming out and will be on the NMDOT website. When the new handbook is released, District 2 will send out notifications.

Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)  
Minutes of February 16, 2023 Meeting

---

District 2 Engineer Francisco Sanchez commended all members for their efforts in the TPF criteria and evaluation process. He is familiar with other Districts' activities, and he believes SERTPO has the best structure being put forth to be equitable to all communities in southeastern New Mexico. He added that new Cabinet Secretary Ricky Serna is an advocate for local entities. The District continues to voice the benefits of TPF as it is one of the best programs they have. They continue to see a level of funding for TPF. He thanked everyone for their support.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

Chairman Burns described a new planned physical layout for future meetings, with meetings continuing in hybrid format. Louis Najjar offered information to members regarding proposed changes for the use of the meeting facility by public entities. The next meeting date is May 8, 2023.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Louis Najjar for adjournment. Motion was seconded by Jeff Honeycutt. A call for votes was taken. With there being no objections, the motion passed, and the meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Committee Chair/Vice Chair

5-8-2023  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Program Manager

5-8-23  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)**

## **Minutes of the SERTPO Committee Meeting**

**May 8, 2023 – 8:30 am**

**Hybrid Meeting (Virtual/In Person)**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

*Member (or Alternate) listed in Alphabetical Order*

Aldridge, Stephen (Mayor)	City of Jal
Austin, Sarah	City of Portales
Bullington, Kathy	City of Texico
Bunch, Clint	City of Clovis
Burns, Jason	Eddy County
Daubert, Mitch (Mayor)	Town of Dexter
Dean, Ray (Mayor)	Town of Carrizozo
Denney, Bill (Mayor)	Village of Cloudcroft
Forget, Meadow (Mayor)	Village of Melrose
Gallegos, Louie (Mayor)	Village of Fort Sumner
Garcia, Roman (Mayor)	Town of Vaughn
Gutierrez, Amy (Mayor)	Town of Tatum
Kennedy, Kevin	Village of Capitan
Jarvis, Joe	City of Ruidoso Downs
Jennings, Dan (Councilor)	Town of Hagerman
Jones, Walon	Curry County
Honeycutt, Jeffrey	Lincoln County
Little, Christopher	Mescalero Apache Tribe
Lovato, Ricky	Roosevelt County
Najar, Louis	City of Roswell
Needham, Corey	Lea County
Onsurez, Jackie (Councilor)	Village of Loving
Osborne, Debbie	City of Alamogordo
Patterson, Jeff	City of Carlsbad
Randall, Todd	City of Hobbs
Roberts, Howard (Mayor)	City of Lovington
Sales, Rudy	Village of Hope
Sallee, Debra	Town of Lake Arthur
Serna, Samantha	Village of Ruidoso
West, Joe	Chaves County

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Brito, Candy	City of Eunice
Burkett, Mickey (Mayor)	Village of Dora
King, Kris (Mayor)	Village of Causey
Porter, Tom	Otero County
Powell, Leona	Village of Grady
Sainz, Robert (Trustee)	Village of Tularosa
Seely, Sam (Mayor)	Village of Corona
Summers, Kim	Town of Elida
Valverde, Summer	City of Artesia
West, Bill (Commissioner)	De Baca County
Whitecotton, Toni	Village of Floyd



**COG/NMDOT STAFF PRESENT:**

Arnett, Manon	NMDOT - Roswell
Burr, Mary Ann	Southeastern New Mexico Economic Development District (SNMEDD)
Coslin, Libby	NMDOT – Roswell
Dodge, George	NMDOT – Santa Fe
Gallardo, Judith	NMDOT – Las Cruces
Matta, Louis	NMDOT – Roswell
Navarette, Eric	NMDOT – Las Cruces
Rodriguez III, Raul	Eastern Plains Council of Governments (EPCOG)
Sanchez, Francisco	NMDOT District 2 Engineer

**GUESTS PRESENT: \***

Allen, Glenda	City of Roswell (Alternate)
Avitia, Jesus	Souder Miller & Associates
Beshaler, Nancy	City of Alamogordo
Carbajal, Sonia	Village of Hope
Darrow, Megan	City of Clovis
Fernandez, Fatima	Village of Loving
Flores, Carol	Roosevelt County
Fresquez, Ray	Stantec (Roswell)
Fulkrod, Brian	Village of Melrose
Garcia, Yolanda	Town of Vaughn
Garza, Manuel	Village of Loving (Alternate)
Henry, Anthony	City of Hobbs
Lee, Debi	SNMEDD Consultant
Martinez, Alonzo	Horrocks (Las Cruces)
Martinez, Ashley	Wilson & Co., Inc. (Albuquerque)
Miller, Verlyn	Miller Engineering Consultants (Albuquerque)
Palomino, Alex	Souder Miller & Associates (Roswell)
Runyan, Richard	Dennis Engineering (Socorro)
Sanchez, Adam	Village of Ruidoso (Alternate)
Sanchez, Daniel	Roosevelt County
S-Hernandez, Cynthia	Souder Miller & Associates (Las Cruces)
Vega, Vyanca	Village of Cloudcroft
Wall, Jamie	Village of Fort Sumner

*\*Unidentified callers and virtual attendee present*

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM (8)**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Jason Burns opened and called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. Members and guests participated with the Pledge of Allegiance. With thirty members present, a quorum was established. Introductions were held.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Jason Burns attended to the approval of the agenda. Ricky Lovato made a motion to approve the agenda, as presented. Louis Najar seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no objections, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Jeff Honeycutt made a motion to approve the February 16, 2023 minutes as presented. Walon Jones seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no discussion or objections, the motion passed unanimously.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **A. Transportation Project Fund (TPF) Review, Discussion and Possible action due to Funding Limitations and/or Possible Action on TPF Evaluation & Prioritization Process**

The Chairman requested any comments from members before the rating of project applications started. Following light discussion, to include adherence to the rules and protocol, it was determined that due to a misstatement during the February training, project applications under both categories of capital and design would be permitted.

### **B. Transportation Project Fund (TPF) Presentations and Scoring Evaluations**

The Chairman reminded all of the seven-minute time limits for capital, with one minute warning reminders. He encouraged presenters to give an overview, to be followed by questions from the group.

#### **CAPITAL Presentations / Scoring Evaluations**

1. **Capitan** – Tiger Drive Improvements

Presenter: Kevin Kennedy, Emergency/Project Manager

Mr. Kennedy provided an overview of the project via PowerPoint presentation. He explained how the road is used, displayed photos of the alligator cracking on the road, and answered any questions.

Scoring: Points given, 104

2. **Clovis** - Purdue Ave Storm Drainage Improvements

Presenters: Clint Bunch, Public Works Director  
Megan Darrow, Marketing, Communication & Grant Coordinator

Mr. Bunch spoke to the capital project application using PowerPoint presentation. Photos of the drainage issues were provided, and Mr. Bunch responded to questions from the group.

Scoring: Points given, 82

3. **Fort Sumner** – 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Drainage Improvements

Presenters: Jamie Wall, City Clerk  
Louie Gallegos, Mayor

Ms. Wall gave an overview of the Village's project, which included aerial mapping and photos showing the condition of the road. All questions were answered.

Scoring: Points given, 70.

4. **Jal** – 2023 Roadway Improvements

Presenters: Stephen Aldridge, Mayor  
Ray Fresquez, Stantec

Mayor Aldridge provided an overview of their project, via PowerPoint, and Mr. Fresquez, Stantec engineering consultant, assisted with responding to questions from members.

Scoring: Points given, 84.

5. **Portales** – South Ave K Improvements

Presenter: Sarah Austin, City Manager

Scoring: Points given, 82.

Ms. Austin described the location of the project, which includes construction, ADA improvements, sidewalk improvements and pedestrian access. Funding amount requested was covered. The City Manager clarified that the design is now 100% complete, and they are ready to start the bid process. Ms. Austin answered questions from members.

6. **Roswell** – Hobbs St Mill/Fill-Sidewalk/ADA

Presenter: Louis Najar, City Engineer

Mr. Najar presented the capital project and answered any questions from members.

Scoring: Points given, 88.

7. **Ruidoso Downs** – All American Park/Senior Citizen Center Parking Lot

Presenter: Joey Jarvis, Public Works Director

Presenting virtually, Mr. Jarvis provided an overview of the Parking lot project and was available for any questions.

Scoring: Points given, 56.

### **DESIGN Presentations / Scoring Evaluations**

1. **Carrizozo** – 2024 Various Roadway Design

Presenter: Ray Dean, Mayor  
Ray Fresquez, Stantec

Mayor Dean presented Carrizozo's project, via PowerPoint, displaying mapping of the community, photos, and the funding request. He responded to questions. An ADA transition plan was recommended.

Scoring: Points given, 77.

2. **Cloudcroft** – 2023 Design for Priority 1 and 2 Roadway Improvements

Presenters: Vyanca Vega, Project Coordinator  
William Denney, Mayor

A PowerPoint presentation was made, to include mapping of the multiple streets included in the application. Ms. Vega answered questions.

Scoring: Points given, 72.

3. **Clovis** – Llano Estacado Roadway Design

Presenters: Clint Bunch, Public Works Director  
Megan Darrow, Marketing, Communication & Grant Coordinator

Presentation of the project was made, aided by a PowerPoint. Presenters answered questions from the group.

Scoring: Points given, 70.

4. **Clovis** – 21<sup>st</sup> Street Design

Presenters: Clint Bunch, Public Works Director  
Megan Darrow, Marketing, Communication & Grant Coordinator

PowerPoint presentation was given, and the presenters responded to questions from members.

Scoring: Points given, 70.

5. **Dexter** – Lake Van Drive Planning and Design

Presenter: Mitch Daubert, Mayor

Mayor Daubert presented and spoke to slides showing the Lake Van project area, desired types of improvements and funding request.

Scoring: Points given, 65.

6. **Fort Sumner** - 2nd and 3rd Street Drainage Improvements

Presenters: Jamie Wall, City Clerk  
Louie Gallegos, Mayor

PowerPoint presentation was displayed (presented earlier in Capital). Presenters responded to questions.

Scoring: Points given, 84.

7. **Hobbs** – SR 132 – Dal Paso Design

Presenter: Todd Randall, City Engineer

The City Engineer gave a quick overview of the project and amended the self-scoring sheet.

Scoring: Points given, 72.

8. **Loving** – 6<sup>th</sup> Street Roadway & Improvements

Presenters: Fatima Hernandez, Deputy Clerk  
Manuel Garza, City Clerk

Ms. Hernandez spoke to the desired improvements for the design application and pointed out the condition of roadways in addition to requested funding. She answered questions from members.

Scoring: Points given, 70.

9. **Mescalero** – Project No. 2 Combined Roadways (5.7 Miles) Design

Presenters: Christopher Little, Public Works Director  
Alex Palomino, Souder, Miller and Associates

Mr. Little discussed the project, which is being resubmitted as it was not funded last year. Mr. Palomino spoke about the benefits of combining smaller roads into a larger network, to attract contractors; conditions of the roads (illustrated with photos); and desired improvements. Discussion was held on partnerships.

Scoring: Points given, 77.

10. **Ruidoso** - US 70/NM 48 Intersection & NM 48 Corridor Reconstruction Design

Presenter: Samantha Serna, Community Development Director

Ms. Serna spoke to a feasibility study completed earlier for this project. The Village's focus is on safety and revitalization. An aerial map displayed the project area of the corridor and intersection. She responded to questions, including the phasing of the project.

Scoring: Points given, 77.

11. **Tatum** – 2024 Various Roadway Design

Presenter: Amy Gutierrez, Mayor  
Ray Fresquez, Stantec

The Mayor spoke to the needs of smaller communities and the Town's goal to improve the standard of living. She continued by speaking to the highlighted roads in residential areas on the displayed mapping, pointing out their 40% dirt roads within town limits. Mr. Fresquez answered questions on scope of work regarding proposed improvements.

Scoring: Points given, 70.

12. **Vaughn** – Street Improvements Design

Presenters: Roman Garcia, Mayor  
Yolanda Garcia, Town Clerk

The Mayor spoke to the status of their current TPF project. Regarding the new application, Ms. Garcia spoke to the local match, project area mapping, nearby public facilities, and desired improvements for the design. The Mayor continued by speaking to the current conditions (with photos) and connections to US 54, NM 35, and US 70. He emphasized the proposed streets serve school buses and school-related traffic. Presenters answered questions pertaining to scoring criteria.

Scoring: Points given, 60.

### **MAINTENANCE Presentations / Scoring Evaluations**

For expediency, the Chair requested applicants to speak about key points, to include what is to be accomplished with the project, spent money, the amount being requested and the method for procurement.

1. **Alamogordo** – 10<sup>th</sup> Street Concrete Box Culvert (CBC) Repair

Presenter: Debbie Osborne, Grant Coordinator

Ms. Osborne described the CBC and sidewalks requiring repair due to differential settlement and deterioration. Mapping showing its location on a busy intersection and photos of damage were displayed. Ms. Osborne shared recommendations from their recently completed Engineering Report and Geotechnical Report with members. Updated cost estimates were provided. The City, if awarded, anticipates going out to bid from thirty to sixty days.

Scoring: Points given, 40.



2. **Chaves County** – Pine Lodge/Red Bridge Project  
Joe West, Road Operations Director, answered questions as the group reviewed the scoring sheet.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
3. **Clovis** – Commerce Way Maintenance  
Clint Bunch, Public Works Director, responded to questions pertaining to the scoring sheet.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
4. **Clovis** – 21st Street Maintenance  
Clint Bunch, Public Works Director, answered all questions from members pertaining to scoring.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
5. **Curry County** – Maintenance Curry Roads  
Walon Jones, Road Superintendent, was available for questions on scoring.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
6. **Eddy County** – N. 13<sup>th</sup> Road Maintenance (Application withdrawn)
7. **Hagerman** – Various Street Rehabilitation & Maintenance  
Dan Jennings, Councilor, provided the requested information to members for the rating.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
8. **Hobbs** – S. Grimes Street Maintenance  
Todd Randall, City Engineer, spoke to the mill-and-fill project and answered the rating questions.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
9. **Hobbs** – W Millen Drive Maintenance  
Todd Randall, City Engineer, described the maintenance project and answered all questions.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
10. **Lincoln County** – Lincoln County Road Maintenance  
Jeff Honeycutt described his chip-seal/micro-surfacing project and answered rating questions from members.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.
11. **Lake Arthur** – Various Street Rehabilitation & Maintenance  
On behalf of Lake Arthur, Ray Fresquez, Stantec, spoke to the proposed work and streets included. He answered all rating questions.  
Scoring: Points given, 50.

12. **Loving** – Various Roads Maintenance Program

Jackie Onsurez, Councilor, described Loving's maintenance project and answered rating questions.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

13. **Melrose** – Various Roads Maintenance Program

Brian Fulkrod, Road Superintendent, and Meadow Forget, Mayor, spoke to Melrose's project and answered rating questions.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

14. **Roosevelt County** – Road Rehabilitation Project No. 1

Ricky Lovato, Road Superintendent, spoke to the proposed project and previous TPF project. He answered all rating questions.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

15. **Roosevelt County** – Road Rehabilitation Project No. 2

Ricky Lovato, Road Superintendent, answered all rating questions from members.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

Regarding Maintenance project applications, Ms. Burr stated that while inserting amounts into the draft Recommended Transportation Improvements Recommendations (RTIPR), two project applications exceeded the \$2 million limit. It was determined that both applications should be reduced to the \$2 million limit.

16. **Roswell** – 2<sup>nd</sup> St (US 380) Pavement Maintenance

Louis Najar, City Engineer, explained the proposed project(s) would utilize a statewide pricing agreement and described the types of improvements for the project area.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

17. **Roswell** – S. Atkinson Ave Pavement Maintenance

Louis Najar, City Engineer, spoke to the procurement method and described improvements.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

18. **Ruidoso** – Roadway Maintenance Project 1

Samantha Mendez, Community Development Director, explained that the mill and fill application is for Meander Drive, Cree Meadows Drive and White Mountain Drive. She added that the Village would be using the Cutler repaving statewide price agreement.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

19. **Ruidoso** – Roadway Maintenance Project 2

Samantha Mendez, Community Development Director, informed members of the four roads for this project, the length, and planned use of the Cutler repaving statewide pricing agreement.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

20. **Ruidoso Downs** – Reservoir Drive Improvements

Joey Jarvis, Public Works Director, offered that the project is mill and fill with possibly some base course compaction. He also spoke to the funding amount requested and local match.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

21. **Ruidoso Downs** – 2023 Road Improvements

Joey Jarvis explained that the proposed project is for multiple streets, and a double chip-seal will be used. The funding amount requested was provided. Further, Mr. Jarvis pointed out that the City has not received any previous TPF funding, and statewide pricing agreements will be used.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

22. **Tatum** – Various Street Rehabilitation and Maintenance

Mayor Amy Gutierrez spoke to their maintenance project and answered rating questions.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

23. **Texico** – Various Roads Maintenance Program

*Kathy Bullington AS 4-7-23*  
~~Connie Harrison~~, Councilor, offered information on Texico's maintenance project. She answered the rating questions.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

24. **Vaughn** – Street Improvements

Yolanda Garcia, Village Clerk, supplied the requested information, to include the project is chip-seal, and statewide pricing agreements will be used.

Scoring: Points given, 50.

Following the scoring process, the Chair inquired if there were any further comments/questions on the rating, to which there were none.

## INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

### SERTPO Program Managers Update

Ms. Burr informed members that the draft RTIPR has been prepared, lacking the points/ranking. Once the RTIPR is completed, in coordination with the Chairs, it will be shared and later uploaded with the applications to NMDOT. If a document is missing (e.g., a map), she urged members to get it turned in.

Ms. Burr gave an update on the statuses of the CDBG Comprehensive and Asset Management Plans. She further explained that no additional calls for the federal programs are anticipated throughout the summer (for the purposes of setting the next meeting date). The New Mexico Counties Annual Conference is June 12-16, 2023 in Farmington; and ICIP virtual trainings are currently being held. With summertime approaching, summer events/festivals within the region have been posted to the website (examples given). Members were urged to forward the information for any such tourism events in their communities.

Raul Rodriguez III, EPCOG, commented that their FY24 Regional Work Program report for the second quarter has been submitted. There is a Safe Streets Call-for-Projects out and the ADA/Title VI Compliance list is due by September 18, 2023. Notices of Funding Opportunities that are active include Wildlife Crossings and the PROTECT discretionary grants (which includes flooding, not usually available through

Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)  
Minutes of May 8, 2023 Meeting

---

programs and NOFOs). A call for projects for EV charging infrastructure projects is currently active. NMDOT is going to be assisting with grant writing, administration, and match for EV grant applications. EPCOG is willing to assist with EV grant writing for their three counties in SERTPO. The EPCOG Annual Board meeting is soon. There are Open Meetings Act webinars that are available for those interested.

**Local Project Updates / NMDOT Updates**

Francisco Sanchez, District 2 Engineer, expressed appreciation for all the presentations and hard work. George Dodge, NMDOT Santa Fe, explained that he is able to see the various TPF processes all over the state, and there are different processes and ways. Regarding funding levels, \$51 million came from the Legislature and the Secretary (NMDOT) added another \$15 million, which comes to the figure of \$66 million. It is possible with motor excise tax activity in the next year, the amount may be increased to \$70-\$72 million.

Discussion was held on meeting formats, with virtual attendance for listening allowable but not allowed for those applying for significant funding. Rotation of meetings was reintroduced, and a member commented on his preference for Roswell.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting date was scheduled for September 8, 2023 in Carlsbad, with location to be determined. A virtual option will be available, but not for participation. Louis Najar commented that the Roswell Convention Center is free for local governmental activities such as District meetings, etc. There will be an ICIP meeting at the Convention Center in October.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Amy Gutierrez, Mayor of Tatum, expressed appreciation to SERTPO. She expressed that she felt the scoring was very fair, and the small communities are not forgotten.

**ADJOURNMENT**


Motion was made by Louis Najar for adjournment. Motion was seconded by Jeff Honeycutt. A call for votes was taken. With there being no objections, the motion passed, and the meeting adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Committee Chair/Vice Chair

9-7-23  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Program Manager

9-7-23  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)**

## **Minutes of the SERTPO Committee Meeting**

**September 7, 2023 – 10:00 am**

### **In-Person Meeting**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

*Member (or Alternate) listed in Alphabetical Order*

Ball, Crystal	City of Lovington
Brito, Candy	City of Eunice
Bryant, Rebekah	Village of Tularosa
Burns, Jason	Eddy County
Chavez, Israel	City of Ruidoso Downs
Harrison, Connie	City of Texico
Kennedy, Kevin	Village of Capitan
McVey, Jo	City of Portales
Najar, Louis	City of Roswell
Patterson, Jeff	City of Carlsbad
Sanchez, Adam	Village of Ruidoso
Sanchez, Daniel	Roosevelt County
Vega, Vyanca	Village of Cloudcroft

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Bunch, Clint	City of Clovis
Burkett, Mickey (Mayor)	Village of Dora
Crunk, Jon (Commissioner)	Lincoln County
Dean, Ray (Mayor)	Town of Carrizozo
Forget, Meadow (Mayor)	Village of Melrose
Gallegos, Louie (Mayor)	Village of Fort Sumner
Garcia, Roman (Mayor)	Town of Vaughn
Gutierrez, Amy (Mayor)	Town of Tatum
Jennings, Dan (Councilor)	Town of Hagerman
King, Kris (Mayor)	Village of Causey
Leatherwood, Dusty (Commissioner)	Curry County
Little, Christopher	Mescalero Apache Tribe
Myrick, Van	City of Jal
Needham, Corey	Lea County
Onsurez, Jackie (Councilor)	Village of Loving
Porter, Tom	Otero County
Powell, Justin	Town of Dexter
Powell, Leona	Village of Grady
Rael, Stella	City of Alamogordo
Randall, Todd	City of Hobbs
Salazar, Ysidro (Mayor)	Town of Lake Arthur
Sales, Rudy	Village of Hope
Seely, Sam (Mayor)	Village of Corona
Summers, Kim	Town of Elida
Valverde, Summer	City of Artesia
West, Bill (Commissioner)	De Baca County
West, Joe	Chaves County
Whitecotton, Toni	Village of Floyd



Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)  
Minutes of September 7, 2023 Meeting

---

**COG/NMDOT STAFF PRESENT:**

Arnett, Manon  
Benavides, Isabel  
Burr, Mary Ann

Lujan, Jason  
Matta, Louis  
Sanchez, Francisco  
Soule, Vincent  
Surina, Julie

NMDOT – Roswell  
NMDOT – Santa Fe  
Southeastern New Mexico Economic  
Development District (SNMEDD)  
NMDOT – Santa Fe  
NMDOT – Roswell  
NMDOT District 2 Engineer  
Eastern Plains Council of Governments (EPCOG)  
Eastern Plains Council of Governments (EPCOG)

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Archer, Hazer  
Cavazos, Al  
Duran, Mingo  
Cummins, Shannon  
Martinez, Michael  
MacCornack, James  
Mijares, Kevin  
Peacock, Missy  
Ruvalcaba, Imelda

Eddy County  
Village of Capitan  
City of Portales  
City of Eunice  
Village of Ruidoso  
City of Roswell  
City of Lovington  
City of Texico  
City of Eunice

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM (11)**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Jason Burns opened and called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. With thirteen members present, a quorum was established. Members and guests participated with the Pledge of Allegiance. Introductions were held.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Jeff Patterson made a motion to approve the agenda, as presented. Louis Najar seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no objections, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Kevin Kennedy made a motion to approve the May 8, 2023 minutes as presented. Louis Najar seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no discussion or objections, the motion passed unanimously.

**PRESENTATION: ADA Transition Plans, ADA Policy Statements, & Title VI Plans**

Isabel Benavidez, ADA/Title VI Program Coordinator  
New Mexico Department of Transportation

Ms. Benavidez introduced herself and Mr. Jason Lujan, ADA/Title VI Program Support, and explained that their Department is looking for three updated documents from entities for future submissions. Ms. Benavidez' presentation covers the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), compliance obligations for local public agencies, ADA Transition Plans, the ADA Policy Statement, Title VI, and prohibited discrimination under Title VI.

The ADA is a civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities in all areas open to the public and became law in 1990. The law ensures that people with disabilities have the same rights and opportunities as everyone else. ADA regulations are broken into five separate titles: Title I – Employment; Title II - Public Services; Title III - Public Accommodations; Title IV – Telecommunications; and Title V – Miscellaneous. Title II applies to state and local governments and outlines the administrative processes to be followed, including requirements for self-evaluations; planning; requirements for making reasonable modifications to policies, practices, and procedures necessary to avoid discrimination; architectural barriers to be identified; and the need for effective communication with people with hearing, vision, and speech disabilities. Title II is regulated and enforced by the US Department of Justice (DOJ). 28 CFR Part 35 lists the requirements to ensure nondiscrimination in services.

If the state or local government has less than 50 employees, they need to submit a certification letter and an ADA policy statement. A complaint process is not required but strongly recommended. If a state or local government has 50 or more employees, they need to designate an employee as the ADA Coordinator. Further, the governmental entity needs to have an ADA transition plan, an ADA policy statement, and a complaint process. There is an exception for tribal entities because federal law recognizes tribal sovereignty.

When applications are received for funding, they are evaluated to determine that ADA is being considered. Lack of compliance may result in being ineligible for projects. Entities must comply with federal law. One of the best reasons to comply is to avoid lawsuits. DOJ has zero tolerance. Compliance prohibits public entities from isolating, separating, or denying people with disabilities the opportunities to participate in the programs or services offered. At some point, disabilities affect us all, either personally or people we know.

For entities with less than 50 employees and are not required to have an ADA transition plan, they must still comply with ADA. A transition plan must include the necessary steps to ensure its facilities and programs are accessible to persons with disabilities. Transition plans need to include identification of physical obstacles in its owned facilities, and the non-compliant critical facilities must be prioritized. Plans need to have a description of methods used to make those facilities accessible; must specify the schedule for taking any necessary steps to upgrade pedestrian access; and must be updated on a yearly basis. The designated individual responsible for the implementation and maintenance of the plan should be included and should be provide all contact information for them. It is vital to update that information whenever it is changed. Plans should then be integrated into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

The purpose of the ADA policy statement is so information can be made available to the public of the protections against discrimination in services, programs, or activities. It has traditionally been interpreted as a stand-alone document. Local public agencies (LPAs) need to have a compliance policy in place and must include instructions on how the public can submit a complaint, request a modification, file a grievance and have contact information to the responsible employee.

Title VI is covered by two civil rights acts and two executive orders. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity that receives federal funds or other federal financial assistance. The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 specifies that entities receiving federal funds must comply with civil rights legislation in all operations, not just in the program or activity that received the funding. The first Executive Order is on Environmental Justice (EJ), which requires each federal agency achieving EJ part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States. The second Executive Order deals with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and requires Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with LEP, and develop and implement a system to provide those services so that LEP persons can have meaningful access to them. Title VI ensures that protected groups have meaningful access to programs and activities.

Protected groups are individuals who are underserved and/or underrepresented. Examples of protected groups were listed/displayed. LPAs who receive federal funds from NMDOT are referred to as subrecipients. Subrecipients who receive federal funding are required to establish a Title VI program. Ms. Benavidez displayed the essential elements of a Title VI Plan, via PowerPoint, which include a Nondiscrimination Policy Statement; Title VI assurances; Title VI Coordinator (with contact information); monitoring and review process; Notice of Rights under Title VI; complaint procedures; investigation and tracking; data collection and analysis; public participation; LEP and EJ.

Ms. Benavidez listed the activities that accomplish Title VI compliance. Those activities include the development of policies and procedures to ensure non-discrimination practices and monitoring for compliance; having a complaint process; compliance assurances; training; community outreach and education; data collection; and documentation. She added that proactive and reactive measures must be defined and provided examples. Further, Title VI consideration must be included in all phases of the project, from planning to construction. The Program Coordinator discussed what is prohibited discrimination under Title VI and explained disparate treatment, retaliation, and disparate impact.

For compliance and enforcement, recipients/subrecipients are responsible for ensuring equal treatment, access, rights, and opportunities. Tools to help enforce compliance include agency self-monitoring; on-site reviews; assurances; demographic data collection to engage diverse populations; and awareness. The goal is to prevent discrimination before it starts. Strategies should include following best practices, which were explained. It needs to be ensured that any data collected is proper, current, and accurate. Proper public involvement helps in assisting with the decision-making process for programs or projects. It is helpful to create a trusting and respectful atmosphere; empower the community; and provide a two-way line of communication. The ADA Coordinator explained that their Department will conduct periodic reviews and evaluation periodically so entities should make sure they document their efforts appropriately. Employees and subrecipients should attend regular ADA/Title VI training. A link to the FHWA website was provided. Copies of the PowerPoint slides will be provided to members.

The plan submissions are due September 18, 2023. Submissions can be emailed to their office via e-mail. Ms. Benavidez recognized that there has been a lot of staff turnover, and entities having any difficulties are encouraged to call her for discussion. If there have not been any communications or plans on hand by the deadline, entities will not be eligible for federal funding going forward until the plans are updated and submitted.

A member inquired on whether the submission requirements were for both types of entities (under 50 employees, over 50 employees) to which the response was affirmative. For entities with less than 50 employees, a certification letter is needed. For entities with more than 50 employees, an ADA transition plan is required. Additionally, an ADA policy statement and Title VI Plan are required. Additional inquiry requested clarification on federal funding only (e.g., FEMA, FHWA, RTP program, federal bids, etc.). It does not apply to state funding. Ms. Benavidez explained that tracking for compliance from their Department occurs when federal funding is received. A list of entities who are current is distributed periodically from the Department to show statuses. An updated list past the September 18<sup>th</sup> deadline is anticipated from NMDOT. An inquiry was made on the document review on content being an annual requirement, considering staff changes. Ms. Benavidez responded yes. She explained that all these programs should be running, whether someone is in that position or not. If the public has a complaint, they should be able to reach someone to file the complaint and assist with the process. The Coordinator explained that what they discovered when they started the update in 2017, staff are gone, and phone numbers/emails do not work. The original intent in 2017 was for the Department to conduct formal reviews. Ms. Benavidez and Mr. Lujan will be reviewing all plans, making sure they have the essential elements. The plans are living documents and anytime there are employee changes, the plans should be updated consistently. Once the Department's program is underway, they should be requesting plans on a yearly basis, and they should be current and up to date.

The Chair offered that it is also a NMDOT requirement, for a state-funded *capital* project, to follow the ADA plan and bring it up to ADA code. For maintenance, one is just taking it back and not ripping it out and replacing like with capital projects.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

##### **Resolution No. 23-002 Approving the SNMEDD/COG and EPCOG FFY 23/24 RWP Formal Amendments**

Ms. Burr reminded members that the COGs have to periodically amend their Regional Work Program (RWP) when there is a change to a line item (budget or hours) over 20%. Such proposed changes come in the form of a formal amendment that requires SERTPO approval. The RTPO staff must submit proposed changes to their Liaison by a deadline (August 1<sup>st</sup>), per the Planning manual, and then present the Liaison-approved amendment to the Committee.

The formal amendments were provided in the meeting packets. Regarding budgeted hours, Ms. Burr explained that line items were reduced to accommodate increases in budgeted hours in specific categories. The increases in hours dealt with increased Transportation Project Fund (TPF) activity and additional time spent on the TPF training (SERTPO Bootcamp). Regarding budget, Ms. Burr explained that budget was moved from various line items to accommodate increases in the line items for payroll/fringe benefits due to COLA, insurance, and meeting/conference expenses. She provided the example of meeting fees increasing due to planning for longer meetings for TPF rating.

Vincent Soule, EPCOG, spoke to their formal amendment. Overall, they did have a five percent increase in tasked hours, and hours have been moved around for more efficiency. Function 6 had more administrative hours than originally anticipated, to include the COG updating their cost allocation plan. The budget section was detailed. Mr. Soule explained what triggered the formal amendment was a five percent increase in expenditure which, when considering the individual line items, required a formal amendment. Percentage increases/decreases were described.

The Chair commented on the amount of local outreach that is provided by the COG offices is tremendous. He added that hopefully TPF will fall off, with a few minor future tweaks and fewer meetings. He added that he enjoyed the Bootcamp training last year and thought it was beneficial to the smaller entities. Outreach is important, especially with constant staff changes within the entities. Mr. Najar noted that the two budgets presented had the same totals and inquired whether each COG/District receives the same amount. Mr. Soule responded that it is the same for each.

Kevin Kennedy made a motion to approve Resolution No. 23-002 Approving the SNMEDD/COG and EPCOG FFY 23/24 RWP Formal Amendments. Jeff Patterson seconded the motion. A call for votes was taken and with there being no objections, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

##### **Transportation Project Fund (TPF) Review and Discussion for FY 25 Application Cycle**

The Chair commented that SERTPO just went through the TPF process, which he felt went very smoothly and reflected what the Committee wanted. District 2 ended up with the most TPF funding in the state. It is a reflection based on need for the project(s). SERTPO is being effective in communicating its needs to the Secretary at the state level. SERTPO put up a proficient grading and rating system reflects what is wanted in terms of shovel readiness and the need for projects for this year's awards. The Chair opened the floor for any comments, suggestions, or tweaks to be considered for next year's process. He also commented that SERTPO needs to look at maintenance and the timeline for getting funding spent. There are a few that have some maintenance and design not encumbered or spent. The dollars awarded need to be spent

effectively. The District 2 Engineer and the Commissioners were congratulated for their behind-the-scenes work. Kevin Kennedy commented that the leadership came up with a good program that worked and expressed appreciation for the funding awarded. Capitan was awarded design, then capital. The Chair commented that maintenance monies are working too, giving examples of entities getting their projects completed.

A member inquired on the separate phase criteria for planning and design, referring to their design being ninety percent complete. The Chair explained that SERTPO currently evaluates design separately from construction and referred to Capitan as an example. Mr. Kennedy commented that it takes an extra year, but the entity gets the job done. There was an additional comment on maintenance. Maintenance projects were scored for all the different entities, and everyone pretty much had the same score. The member inquired whether, for next year, that system will be the same or if a different scoring process will be used so there can be more differentiation. The Chair explained that maintenance was prioritized as fours and fives this year. The recommendations for those that qualified with the higher scores were for those entities that had not awarded monies to get the rankings of fours, and the rankings of fives were for those who had been awarded funding last year. The ranking was to ensure everyone receives funding. Everyone has projects. District 2 did a very good job of making that money go far as it could. SERTPO put in a request that was higher than what was going to be awarded, which is done every year. Last year, the point value was increased to try to make some of that separation. The District Engineer spoke about how maintenance projects were very hard to differentiate and added that other Districts combine everything. He commented that he likes the process currently used as it brings the most value and restated that maintenance is difficult.

A member commented that he felt the process was good, by separating it (maintenance), an entity who received funding will likely be out in the next application cycle. Traffic counts could be considered which would favor larger municipalities with more traffic. A fair process was desired for the entities who do not have the resources that the larger entities do. Discussion continued, touching on larger entities putting forward larger-scale projects for capital; maintenance monies going a long way, taking roads back to original condition; and multiple applications demonstrating the need in southeastern New Mexico. Comments were shared where maintenance monies were vetoed last year (\$60 million for TPF and maintenance), and a big push is anticipated in the next legislative session to further fund TPF and infrastructure projects (out of an approximate \$3.4 billion of funding available).

A member inquired about the projects awarded. The list of awarded projects was handed out to members. Light discussion was held on the projects awarded. A member commented that if entities have not started with the process for next year, they're already running late. More monies are expected for TPF in the next year. A reminder was made that if an entity did not receive funding this year, they will receive points which gives a higher level—more separation. Encouragement was offered to pull out their project applications and doctor them up for the next cycle. The District Engineer added that with the process, four and five rankings should be one and two rankings in the next year. The Chair asked members to reach out if they have questions. The Chair added that the TPF rankings are planned for the Roswell location, to be more centralized (in person only with possible livestream viewing). Applicants should present in person. On another note, Texico made comment/correction on the minutes that their individual who presented during the last meeting should read as Kathy Bullington.

### **SERTPO Program Managers Update**

Mary Ann Burr spoke to the deadline for public comment of September 25, 2023, for the Southeast RTPCO Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. An email with the Draft Plan was submitted to members earlier. Transit and Rail staff were unable to present this date. They can present at a future meeting, but it would be on the final plan. Another item occurring in September is a Tribal/Local Public Agency (T/LPA) Certification training: 1) Roswell on 9/26-27/23 at the NMDOT Training



Academy; and 2) Hobbs on 9/20-21/23 at the Lea County Event Center (handouts were available on the sign-in table). September deadlines for the NM Regional Recreation Centers/Quality of Life Applications (Sept 13, 2023) and the Local Capital Outlay Project Cost Overruns (Sept 15, 2023) were provided, along with handouts (sign-in table). Ms. Burr continued by mentioning upcoming conferences in October: 1) 10/17-20/23 for the APA New Mexico Conference held at the Roswell Convention Center; 2) 10/18-19/23 for the Infrastructure Conference held in Las Cruces; and 3) 10/23-25/23 for the Outdoor Economics Conference held in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Regarding the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)/Recreational Trails Program (RTP), the guides are being prepared to be put out to comment and the TAP/RTP Coordinator (Santa Fe) is hopeful that the call may be out during the months of October or November.

Vincent Soule, Deputy Director (EPCOG), introduced their new SERTPO planner, Julie Surina. Ms. Surina introduced herself, giving some background, and offered her business card/contact information for anyone who needs assistance.

### **Local Project Updates / NMDOT Updates**

Francisco Sanchez, District 2 Engineer, thanked SERTPO for spending their monies. He commented that they evaluate statewide with the Secretary, and it makes a difference—District 2 is very efficient at spending down their funding. He added that District 2 is huge, with a vast network of 7,000 miles of highway to maintain. Much of their focus is on the highways, and they are systematically programming urban projects in the STIP. The District wants to address the needs of the communities, but it needs to be equitable. The District needs to know what the communities want. While communications oftentimes come via elected officials and others, entities may also contact their government liaison, Manon Arnett. He provided examples of projects and studies. He added that the State has a process to evaluate projects based on data. He concluded by asking entities to continue to make the small requests (e.g., lighting repairs, flashers, etc.).

Kevin Kennedy commented that he attended the recent Commission meeting and offered congratulations to the District 2 crew. He further stated that there had been discussion on TPF timelines, with entities receiving awards in late September or early October, prior to winter. He has an issue with the planning of it as it may take them to the spring; however, monies will be spent. The Engineer commented that they understood those issues and really see the value of planning and design, which is important to the SERTPO.

Louis Matta, NMDOT, requested members interested in the T/LPA training to be sure to register for the training (federal funding). The new Capital Outlay has been sent out for signatures on August 23, 2023. There are numerous LGRF projects that are expiring at the end of the year. He urged those who need extensions to send requests as soon as possible. While it is provided that extension requests should be submitted within sixty (60) days of expiration, these requests go to the District and must be turned around and submitted to Santa Fe. Selections for TPF have been made, and contracts will be going out. Mr. Matta mentioned that Ms. Arnett has been visiting local entities, with some of the entities experiencing staff turnover. District 2 will be sending a training notification at the end of the year about the time of a call for projects. Regarding construction projects, US 285 and 70 are wrapping up soon; US 60 in Clovis has begun; the Lovington project is going well; and other signal/lighting projects will be starting shortly. He spoke about additional projects in Carlsbad, Clovis, US 285/Hobson, and bridge construction. He reminded all to slow down in construction zones. Ms. Arnett asked members with whom she has not visited yet to meet up with her after the meeting. A member inquired on the TPF agreements. Mr. Matta stated they should be out soon, in September.

A member inquired on the email regarding the TPF awards as she did not receive it. Ms. Burr responded that the email went out to SERTPO representatives. Discussion was held on member mailings, the appropriate form, which reads *Representative/Alternate* and not *Policy/Technical*; discussion between the COGs

Southeast Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SERTPO)  
Minutes of September 7, 2023 Meeting

---

of a full listing of the SERTPO membership (online); and the possibility of having the status of membership appointments on a future agenda. The Chair commented on the diligence of having memberships updated by Ms. Burr.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Louis Najar announced that the New Mexico Planning and Zoning state conference is in Roswell, on October 17-20, 2023. He also introduced Senior Engineer, James MacCormack, who is expected to be designated as their alternate in the future. Mr. MacCormack provided his background to members.

**NEXT MEETING DATE/ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting date proposed was for November 30, 2023. There were no objections, and the City of Portales volunteered to host the meeting. Motion was made by Louis Najar for adjournment. Motion was seconded by Jeff Patterson. A call for votes was taken. With there being no objections, the motion passed by unanimous vote at 11:12 a.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Committee Chair/Vice Chair

11-30-23  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SERTPO Program Manager

11-30-23  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date