



a program of

NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NWRTPO)

RTPO Joint Technical & Policy Committee Meeting
Wednesday, April 12, 2023
10:00 am
Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

AGENDA

ROUTINE ITEMS:

Item #	Item	Presenter
I.	Call to Order and Introductions	Dorothy Claw, Chairman
II.	<i>Action: Agenda</i>	Dorothy Claw
III.	<i>Action: Minutes – March 8, 2023 meeting</i>	Dorothy Claw

ACTION ITEMS: none

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Item #	Item	Presenter
IV.	<i>Review & Discuss: Project Feasibility Forms due – April 14 !!</i>	Robert Kuipers
V.	<i>Review & Discuss: Transportation Project Fund Progress</i>	Robert Kuipers
VI.	<i>Present: Vulnerable Road Users Summary Report</i>	Robert Kuipers

REPORTS: (10-minute limit)

Please submit Written Reports for inclusion in minutes

RTPO Program Report (<i>significant news only</i>) Including APER Report if available	Robert Kuipers
Local Member Reports (<i>significant news only</i>)	By Entity
New Mexico Department of Transportation Reports (<i>significant news only</i>)	RTPO Liaison (Neala Krueger) Tribal Liaison (Ron Shutiva) District 5 (James Mexia) District 6 (Bill Santiago, Michael Neely)

NEW BUSINESS/OPEN FLOOR: MEMBERS & GUESTS (5-minute limit)

ANNOUNCEMENTS & NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 – Grants Public Library, 1101 N. First Street, Grants, NM (unless otherwise determined or virtual via MSTeams)

ADJOURNMENT

NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

NWRTPO | Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization
 Joint Policy & Technical Committee
 NWRTPO Meeting Minutes

Wednesday March 8, 2023

10:00 a.m. – 11:50 a.m.

Virtual meeting executed via Microsoft Teams
 Due to COVID-19 Pandemic

ATTENDANCE:

Local & Tribal Governments	
Entity	Representative(s)
Pueblo of Acoma	Dennis Felipe Jr. – RTPO Vice-Chair
Pueblo of Laguna	Leonard Ludi
Pueblo of Zuni	Royce Gchachu, Roxanne Hughte
Navajo Nation	Margie Begay Priscilla Lee
Ramah Navajo	Dorothy Claw – RTPO Chairman
City of Grants	Don Jaramillo Shannon Devine
City of Gallup	Clyde Strain, Alicia Santiago
Village of Milan	Linda Cooke, Denise Baca, Felix Gonzales,
Cibola County	Kaci Bustos, Joseph Baca, Judy Horacek
McKinley County	Rodney Skersick
San Juan County	Absent (Nick Porell)
Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization - Ex-officio	Not in attendance

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT)	
Entity	Representative(s)
RTPO Liaison	Neala Krueger
District 5	James Mexia, Amanda Nino
District 6	Bill Santiago, Michael Neely, Clayton Garner
Tribal Liaison	Ron Shutiva
DOT Central Regional Design Office	James Sanchez, Juan Archuletta
Other NMDOT Staff / Guests	Claude Morelli - LTAP, Robert Hamblen – Gallup, Raymond Concho,

Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization	
Northwest NM Council of Governments	Robert Kuipers

Tally Sheet – Attendance & Quorum

Total Full Attendance:	Member Entities:	NMDOT	RTPO	Guests (Transit)	Full Attendance Norm:	
	12	Normally 4-5: DOT Liaison, Tribal Liaison, District 5 & 6 Representatives		varies	17 - 20	
Attendance – this meeting:	Member Attendance:	NMDOT Attendance:	Staff:	Guests:	Attendance % this meeting:	TOTAL:
	11	6	1	3	100%	21

ROUTINE ITEMS:

Item #	Item
I.	Call to Order and Introductions. The meeting was called to order at 10:10 am, Robert Kuipers welcomed those in attendance, and proceeded with (skipped introductions) approval of agenda and minutes. The virtual meeting was conducted via Microsoft Teams, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
II.	Agenda. RTPO Staff provided an overview of the day’s agenda topics and Dorothy Claw - Chair called for a motion: ACTION: Margie Begay - NDOT motioned; Dennis Felipe – Acoma seconded adoption of the agenda. All in favor – motion carried.
III.	Minutes (February, 2023). RTPO Staff provided time for review of minutes and there were no revisions requested, Dorothy Claw called for a motion. ACTION: Alicia Santiago - Gallup motioned; Linda Cooke - Milan seconded adoption of the minutes. All in favor – motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS: None

Discussion Items:

item #	Item	Presenter
IV.	Present: LTAP Training – Context Sensitive Solutions	Claude Morelli – UNM LTAP
BACKGROUND		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? Increasingly in recent years there are efforts to develop transportation infrastructure in a manner that respects, and honors local / regional cultures and communities; takes quality of place and environment seriously, provides hospitality to visitors and travelers, and engages the local/regional public on how development can honor regional history and culture. • Purpose. Inform RTPO members on this relatively new approach to transportation development. • Discussion/Finalization. UNM-LTAP – Claude Morelli will present on this subject 		
CURRENT WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members are encouraged to review the Guide to Context Sensitive Solutions 		
ANTICIPATED WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Context Sensitive Solutions for current and future development. 		
ATTACHMENTS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NMDOT Guide to Context Sensitive Solutions 		
BUDGET IMPACT		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		
ACTION ITEM		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 		

Presentation / Discussion:

- Claude provided this presentation, and will email it to me to provide to our members.
- The key elements of this presentation include: safety, stakeholders, and multi-modal connectivity

- In the **earlier years of CSS** – traditional focus was on technical skills, design, capacity and speed; the problems that emerged is that design standards change over time, and designing to current standards is much more expensive
- There was a lot of specialist bias and historic interstate highway development created community problems
- The attitude from USDOT was – “Trust us, we are the experts” – a hierarchal decision process that did not involve stakeholders or citizens. Very hard on small towns – limiting their economic growth opportunities.
- Resulted in major protests in communities along the highways
- **Change:** NEPA in 1969 engaged environmental, social and economic impacts
- **Title VI:** engaged environmental justice and equity vs. equality including consideration toward the handicapped
- CSS therefore emerged from “Old School” manner of management and new outcomes related to system performance came to be emphasized.
- Now due to stronger public engagement there is stronger consideration to societal and environmental consequences resulting in:
 - Consider all strategies
 - Multiple / diverse view points
 - Collaborative multi-agency involvement
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Consideration toward multi-modal interface
 - Performance based analysis
 - Functional classification including consideration toward pedestrians and bikes
 - More flexibility for design – to consider all modes of users
- **Basic Principals:**
 - Long range corridor planning
 - Project planning and environmental review
 - Design
 - Construction
 - Operations and maintenance
- **Design:**
 - Engage and meet vision and expectations of stakeholders
 - Work toward effective / efficient use of resources and safety for all users
- **CSS is DOT listening to stakeholders and citizens – stakeholders are key**

Item #	Item	Presenter
V.	Present: Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Updates	Robert Kuipers
BACKGROUND		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? Keep our members informed on updates to our (long range) Regional Transportation Plan • Purpose. Present any 2022 updates for the NWRTPO RTP • Discussion/Finalization. Member approval for minor updates to the RTP in FFY2022 		
CURRENT WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation and present on minor RTP updates in FFY2022 		
ANTICIPATED WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NWRTPO conducts RTP updates on an annual basis and major updates every 5 years. 		
ATTACHMENTS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation highlighting FFY2022 RTP updates 		
BUDGET IMPACT		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		
ACTION ITEM		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 		

Discussion:

- Major updates to our Regional Transportation Plan took place in FFY2020 – 2021, in sync. with NMDOT’s major statewide plan updates.
- Minor updates in FFY2022 were as follows:
- Completion of the Prewitt / Milan Transportation Master Plan – phase 1 to improve railroad and freight trucking access to the Prewitt and Milan Industrial Parks.
- Ongoing development of 200 miles of recreational trails in the Zuni Mountains of McKinley and Cibola Counties.
- Expanding freight opportunities along the I-40, US-491 and NM371 corridors as well as the BNSF Rail line.
- Growing tourism opportunities along our nationally designated Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, our Four-Corners Geo-tourism collaboration, and recreational trails development.
- Transportation support for industrial development and job opportunities that could be created within our regional industrial parks and the former Gamerco Mine area.
- We’ve created a new “Climate Change” section in **Goal 1- Operational Capacity** of the RTP, to support reduction in climate consequences thru such things as virtual meetings and electric vehicles – etc.
- **Goal 2 - Safety:** Our regional tribes have updated their highway safety plans – most recently Pueblo of Zuni; and recent RSA’s include NM118, NM602, NM53, and most recently – US491 for Twin Lakes, Mexican Springs, and Tohatchi Chapters.
- **Goal 3 – Asset Mgmt.:** Need to work on lighting agreements between NMDOT and our T/LPA’s.
- **Goal 4 – Mobility and Accessibility:** Autonomous vehicle research for safe corridors has commenced. There are major opportunities in our region for freight movement accommodation for rail and freight trucking exchange serving a multi-state region.
- **Goal 5 – Program Delivery:** We’ve created a new section entitled “Healthier Communities” – addressing the TOA scenic byway, Rt. 66 scenic byway, recreational trails, main-street projects, adventure tourism, regional lakes and campgrounds, along with major annual events.

Item #	Item	Presenter
VI.	Review & Discuss: RTIPR Update – PFF’s due April 14	Robert Kuipers
BACKGROUND		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? RTPO members will be updating our next biennial RTIPR with PFF’s for both a) ongoing projects still unfunded in our current RTIPR, and b) as well as new proposed projects. • Purpose. To help our members get started on PFF’s for any and all (both previous and new) projects to be included in our FFY2023-2024 RTIPR • Discussion/Finalization. Staff will present and discuss the process with members 		
CURRENT WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTPO members requested to commence PFF’s for ongoing and new projects for the RTIPR 		
ANTICIPATED WORK		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFF’s approved to move forward, will next commence the PFF process for regular and Transportation Project Fund projects, with TPF full applications due May 31, 2023. All other PFF’s will be due August 31. 		
ATTACHMENTS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for Projects Timeline (Feb. 2023 – March 2024), and full FFY2023-2024 Call for Projects Guidance 		
BUDGET IMPACT		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		
ACTION ITEM		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 		

Discussion:

- Reminder to all RTPO members that PFF’s for unfunded projects from our previous RTIPR, along with new project PFF’s are due by April 14.
- All newly proposed projects via these PFF’s will be reviewed, discussed and approved for inclusion in our new RTIPR with DOT District 5 and 6 staff in the first week of May (between May 1 – 5); if not approved, discussion around appropriate edits for approval, or other options will take place. These project consultation meetings are mandated.

Item #	Item	Presenter
VII.	Reports, Updates, Announcements	Robert Kuipers
BACKGROUND		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? Update RTPO members on news, training, funding, and other items of special interest • Purpose. Keep RTPO members up to date on critical information from NWRTPO and NMDOT sources 		
Informational Items		
Regional News & Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTPO Monthly Report and Staff hours summary for February, 2023 • Member Reports 		
Member Special Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None this meeting 		
NMDOT Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G to G Liaison: Neala Krueger • Tribal Liaison: Ron Shutiva • District 6: Bill Santiago & staff; District 5: James Mexia & Amanda Nino 		
News, Training & Funding Opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>FHWA Planning, Environment & Realty Reports</u>: 1/26/23 (winter 2023 Research Review), 2/9/23 (Human Environment Digest) • <u>NMDOT Govt. to Govt. Update</u>: 1/17/23, 1/23/23, 1/27/23 • <u>AASHTO Publications</u>: none • <u>NMDOT / UNM-LTAP</u>: Provides a very robust collection of training opportunities – staff forward news to members as it comes out from this source – reference at ltap.unm.edu – Online courses notice forwarded to members as LTAP emails come in. • <u>Title VI Training</u> is available to MPO’s and RTPO’s from Lisa Neie – Civil Rights Manager for FHWA New Mexico. These trainings can be customized to address member concerns and issues for their regions, if provided to her in advance. • <u>Email Change Notice from NMDOT</u>: All NMDOT staff emails have changed from @state.nm.us to @dot.nm.gov • <u>Pedestrian Safety Training</u>: 1/18/23, 2/22/23, 3/15/23 – three sessions • <u>RAISE Grant Guidance – Rural & Tribal Communities</u>: 1/20/23 • <u>USDA Seeks Applications to Improve Rural Transportation Systems</u>: 1/20/23 • <u>FHWA Value Capture Webinar</u>: Feb. 9 – emailed to members 1/26/23 • <u>USDOT Discretionary Grant Opportunities</u>: 2/2/23 • <u>NMDOT Public Entity Sale</u>: 2/6/23 • <u>LGRF presentation from Bill Santiago</u>: (presented at 2/8/23 RTPO meeting) 2/9/23 • <u>Rt.66 Improvements mp 11-27</u>: 2/14/23 • <u>USDOT Discretionary Grant Opportunities</u>: 2/17/22 • <u>E.V. Charging Minimum Standards Webinar</u>: 2/17/23 • <u>New Mexico & Alaska State Walking College</u>: 2/24/23 		

- More Funding Opportunities – “CDS”: 2/27/23
- National Transportation Statistics Update: Bureau of Transportation Statistics – 2/28/23

Members please note: none of these documents will be included in the full meeting package due to the physical size and the electronic megabyte size going forward – all of the cited documents have already been emailed in advance of the RTPO monthly meeting to our NWRTPO members. Some of the citations are ongoing from month to month regarding ongoing training or funding opportunities.

- Robert Kuipers provided his monthly report for February including:
- **2023 NM Transportation Project Fund: full applications are due by May 31**
- Members are reminded to stay on top of forthcoming funding opportunities; staff will do their best to keep members informed on opportunities along with submission deadlines.
- Mr. Kuipers also provided the staff hours summary for February, 2023; and the Public Notice for May, 2022 thru April, 2023 – indicating that our meetings will remain virtual due to COVID.

Local Member Reports (<i>significant news only</i>)	By Entity
---	-----------

New news in bold

Pueblo of Acoma

- **Gaylord Siow is now the Pueblo of Laguna Lt. Governor, so has resigned from his position in the Pueblo of Acoma. Dennis Felipe Jr. is now the primary RTPO representative for the Pueblo of Acoma; they are still looking for an alternate representative to the NWRTPO.**
- **The Mesa Hill Bridge project remains unfunded and ongoing as the #1 bridge project, but is fully designed and construction ready with support from NMDOT. The issue is just obtaining significant funding (around \$30 million) from USDOT with every round of major funding they provide. The Pueblo’s PS&E and EA are complete; The Pueblo is working toward finalizing the cultural clearances and right of way with the BIA and finalizing land status with Tribal leadership. Pueblo is working on the SP36 and SP30 connector roads to this bridge, along with a right of way map for the bridge. Pueblo is pursuing funding from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and other funding sources to include FHWA and TTP Bridge Program funds. The Pueblo will utilize on-call engineering services to complete planning and design phases in order to move toward construction.**
- **SP30 – Pueblo Road LGRF Cooperative Agreement and Tribal Resolution have been signed by Pueblo leadership and sent to Bill Santiago at DOT District 6. Pueblo is seeking additional funding due to inflation; this project is in progress for design and reconstruction.**
- **SP38 Haaku Road Planning & Design: Project consists of a 12.3 mile corridor to Acoma’s original village. Project is funded at \$2,900,000 for planning and design from the FY2023 Transportation Project Fund. The TPF cooperative agreement is finalized. Acoma will contact Clayton Garner at DOT Dist. 6 upon consultation selection for fund disbursement.**
- **M-123 San Fidel Creek bridge: This bridge on SP34 – Fatima Hill Road has been funded at \$137,049 for design thru FHWA Tribal Transportation Bridge Program funding. Approved to move forward**
- **M-124 Acomita Lake bridge on SP34 – Fatima Hill Road: Project is funded at \$380,000 for design thru FHWA TTP Bridge Program funding and now approved to move forward. NM 124 extension to NM117 is on hold – funded for design thru Trans. Project Fund.**
- Tribal Admin. met with the Federal Highway Administration along with Ron Shutiva, providing information on TTP and FHWA; a powerpoint on challenges and opportunities with CMGC (*Construction Management / General Contractor*) funding, and discussion on ICIP training.
- **Acoma’s Tribal Transportation Improvement Program (TTIP): FY2022 finalized.**
- **CMGC2 – 4 Projects are now complete and in close out.**
- **The Pueblo has received \$1.5 million from Senator Heinrich for the Acoma Business Park. Design of this park is now complete. Full project will run around \$35 million.**
- **NM124 Extension to NM117 has been partially funded thru the Transportation Project Fund which is our current #1 roadway priority. The Pueblo will collaborate with NMDOT Dist. 6 and has submitted an agreement and resolution for approval. The Pueblo is now waiting on an agreement to proceed from NMDOT Secretary Sandoval. It appears that unlike DOT Dist. 6 advice, the Pueblo will first have to execute design (funded at \$1 million) and cannot go directly to construction. This project is on hold due to archaeological sites.**

- **On call engineering services:** RFP has been issued beginning January 2023 – selection process to take place in March, 2023.
- **SP302 is completing environmental assessment, and is in closeout for design with the BIA.**
- **Pueblo is seeking funding for design and full reconstruction of SP30 – Pueblo Road (10.6 miles).**
- **The Pueblo is working with DOT Dist. 6 to address drainage issues for the San Lorenzo Road (SP35).**
- **The Pueblo has completed their update to their Long-Range Transportation Plan; the update is posted on Acoma’s Community Development Office website.**
- **The Pueblo is also updating their Transportation Safety Plan at this time. The Pueblo was awarded TTP Safety Program funding at \$10,000 for this update and \$475,000 for SP30 Pueblo Road east end safety redesign.**
- **Thru distributing a survey at the local Food Pantry, the Pueblo has achieved a 41% response rate from the public for both transportation plans!**
- **Mainstreet Project: The Pueblo will add several projects to the CMGC suite to include projects for housing and economic development. Preparing amendments to conduct engineering studies, land surveys, geotechnical studies, drainage analysis, right of way surveys and proforma.**
- **The Pueblo’s Local Govt. Road Fund projects were finalized with NMDOT – will issue an RFP in the near future**
- **Acoma is seeking “Sky City Scenic Byway” funding, and will pursue Pueblo Council approval to pursue grant funding next year; as well as a Tribal Council resolution for tribal byway designation. Neala Krueger will inform NMDOT – Beth Foreman to provide byway funding contact information.**
- **The Pueblo would like to invite local, county and other tribal entities within the Pueblo region to consider partnering for construction project funding, as bundling projects saves money, as the Pueblo has learned from CMGC (Construction Management / General Contractor) funding.**
-

Pueblo of Zuni

- **The Pueblo is working on drainage improvements along the NM53 corridor mp 15.5 to 19.5 – creating culverts and ponds.**
- **The Pueblo submitted an application to update their Transportation Safety Plan; and was awarded funding to update their Tribal Transportation Safety Plan in 2022; and conduct an RSA on NM53 from mp 13.5 to 18. Notice of award was received late yesterday – Feb. 7.**
- **NMDOT Contract #CN6101091 – Meridian Contracting working on drainage issues and retention ponds; this includes installing concrete box culverts. Asphalt paving will continue when weather permits.**
- **Have received FHWA Tribal Transportation Program funding for FFY22. – Prepping for construction in FY23.**
- **The Pueblo Transportation Dept. will be issuing two RFP’s in the near future. One is to plan, design and construct a new transportation facility to include Ashiwi Transit; and the other is for planning, design and reconstruction of BIA Route 5 – Nutria Road.**
- **The Pueblo is under lock down with little administrative activity due to COVID-19 pandemic; the Pueblo has extended re-opening until sometime in the future, depending on how long COVID-19 persists.**
- **Bid packages for Shiwi Ts’ana Elementary School access and Z301 / NM53 intersection improvements were opened July 12 – with one bid submitted. Notice of award offered to Albuquerque Sparling Construction company for both projects combined.**
- **Zuni purchased a dump truck with FHWA Coronavirus funds.**
- **The Pueblo is looking to purchase a backup generator for the Andrew Othole Memorial Airport.**
- **Zuni Transportation Dept. submitted documents to the Governors Office to fund two historical and cultural sites of significance with related road improvement projects.**
- **US Dept. of Treasury set aside \$20 billion for Native American Tribes under American Rescue Plan. Zuni received it’s first distribution – Road Dept. will submit road improvement project that leads to significant historical site for tourism**
- **Road maintenance projects continue related to flooding around the Pueblo.**
- **Royce is now also the Airport Manager. Receipt of FAA grant agreement for developing an Airport Master Plan for the Andrew Othole Memorial (AOM) Airport. The master plan will be developed by the Pueblo’s airport consultant – Armstrong Consultant’s, Inc.**
- **Erin Kenley, TTP Director and Brian Allen, TTP Fields Operation Manager – both from the Office of Tribal Transportation visited Zuni on August 10 and met with the Governor and Tribal Council on a number of issues. Discussed the tribal self-governance program within the US DOT and FHWA.**

- The Pueblo continues to update its long-range transportation plan. The plan is now in final draft form and being put out on the Pueblo website and Facebook for public comment. The draft plan is awaiting recommendations for next steps on how to present to the public.
- The pedestrian trail project plan is now 100% complete – will move forward for FHWA approval.
- On-call A/E consultants are working on designs for Ruins Road, North/South Sandy Springs Road, Harker Circle, the intersection of Ojo Caliente/Pia Mesa and pedestrian trails. Ruins Road is now at 95% completion.
- Ongoing road maintenance around the Pueblo. This includes crews addressing mowing, culvert repairs, blading gravel or dirt roads, asphalt pothole repairs and vegetation control.
- Virtual Presentation meeting with NMDOT and WHPacific on the NM53 Drainage project being designed by by WHPacific to make improvements from MP15.5 to 19, due to undersized culvert pipes and overtopping of flood waters on NM53 (also Zuni Mainstreet). First meeting was held on October 7.
- There are demolition projects in the Pueblo for the Lemon Tree/Zuni Laundromat building and the old Zuni Water Dept. building.
- The Pueblo is undertaking construction of an RV Park.
- The Pueblo has worked with Ashiwi Transit and Gallup Express to extend transit service to the Ramah Navajo area.
- The Pueblo has engaged contractual on call engineering services for future transportation development.
- The Ashiwi transit system received a national award at the 2019 National RTAP (*Rural Transportation Assistance Program*) conference. **Ashiwi Transit received another award plaque for their service during the COVID pandemic.**
- Ashiwi Transit will resume when all safety precautionary measures have been installed on the transit vehicles. Local and Gallup services will resume on a limited basis, but only on demand or appointments. Extension to Ramah / Pinehill is temporarily on hold until further notice around COVID-19 concerns. Ashiwi Transit is now back in service. **Hope to resume transit discussions with the Ramah / Pinehill area soon.**

McKinley County

- **CR-19 improvements. CR19 – 18.6 miles of chip-sealing is now complete and striping is finished making this project almost complete; just 7 miles of fencing to go.**
- **The County's Local Government Road Fund projects for FFY2021 are now complete; working on certifications for 2022 projects at this time. LGRF Manuelito Canyon road alignment is now complete.**
- **The County Road Dept. has issued Purchase orders for a bridge on CR15 and a bridge on CR43; these bridges are now at 60% to completion.**
- The County had their ribbon cutting ceremony for Manuelito Canyon bridge replacement on September 10, 2021 – the event was well attended by State and regional legislative leaders along with President Jonathon Nez of the Navajo Nation.
- The County will benefit with \$23 million for improvements to the Carbon Coal Road intersection in Gameraco with US491, which leads to the developing Energy Logistics Park (and potential Inland Port). **This project is now complete!**
- The County has finished chip sealing Pine Haven road; will use remaining funds to finish improvements on Allison road.
- **Cousins Road and CR-1 will move into phase 2 repairs; Cousins road will get 4 miles of chip seal. Superman Canyon Road (CR43) and Old Church Rock Mine Bridge (CR15) are next projects on the list. The County Road Dept. has issued purchase orders for a bridge on CR15 and a bridge on CR43. Church Rock Mine Bridge is getting started at this time. The 2023 Transportation Project Fund has funded another Superman Canyon road – CR43 bridge at \$2,716,334.00.**
- **The County is realigning CR5 – Manuelito Canyon road – LGRF funds; has applied 4 miles of chip seal on CR6 – now waiting on rain delays. The alignment for this road is now complete.**
- Ongoing county-wide maintenance including blading, patching potholes, cleaning culverts, repairing bridges / guardrails, etc. The County has completed the ZMTP Milk Ranch Trail Head.

Gallup

- **Gallup Mainstreet Project** – Ground breaking May 13; construction commenced July 1. **Coal Avenue Commons** both MAP and Legislative Agreements have been executed by the State. The City is working with Wilson & Co. and NMDOT District 6 on the final PS&E. City Council approved Wilson & Co.'s professional engineering proposal for construction management. The Mainstreet grant resolution was approved by City Council for this project. Between MAP, State Legislative, Economic and City funding the Coal Avenue Commons project phase 1 is now complete with final walk

thru executed 7/20/21. The City has been funded for phase 2 from the NM Transportation Project Fund – and has been awarded \$3,500,000 from this fund to complete this project. The city commenced construction on May 2, starting with alley improvements. Intersection of Coal Ave. and 2nd Street is now complete with additional drainage structure. Phase 2 construction is now complete. First to Second street is now complete, working on 1st Street to Coal Avenue next.

- East Nizhoni and West Aztec improvements are currently in design phase – East Nizhoni received news from NMDOT Dist. 6 that the City was awarded MAP funding for East Nizhoni Ave - \$900,000. Phase 2 Nizhoni Blvd. and College Drive intersection construction began on 10/17/22 and is currently on Winter suspension. East Nizhoni was also awarded \$350,000 from the NM FFY2023 Transportation Project Fund. East Nizhoni phase 3 is out to bid – closing on 2/21/23 and is on the City Council agenda for construction award approval for March 14, 2023. West Aztec – meeting with property owner has been executed and now moving forward to complete design. Working on a West Aztec utility easement agreement and met with Dist. 6 staff on 2/28/23.
- West Aztec drainage legislative grant has been executed and engineering services have been awarded to begin design; notice of obligation has been submitted and approved by the state. Property owner has submitted proposal to City for utility easement – now completed and moving to complete design.
- Local Govt. Road Fund funded projects have completed mill and overlay for planned roads; received word from NMDOT Dist. 6 that the City was awarded funds for our next project. Working on close out paperwork and Coop letter of intent for 2023.
- The City has submitted a Letter of Intent for Coop funding.
- West Logan street repairs are being advertised
- 2nd and 3rd Street pedestrian safety improvements RFP for design was awarded, along with 2nd and 3rd Street Quiet Zone awarded for design.
- CDBG RFP was awarded – working on paperwork for DFA approval. An Extension Request was sent to DFA; construction to commence in the Spring.
- Federal Aviation Admin. application for \$5 million has been submitted for our airport taxi-way and connectors. The City has been awarded and construction began on April 11, 2022. Construction is now complete and project in close out.

Milan

- The Village had a ribbon cutting ceremony for a new soccer complex and is improving a baseball field.
- Airport road is moving forward to phase 2 and 3 for bridge replacement and road repairs in April.
- There has been some flooding but no major problems. Sewer system improvements are in design including a lift station. Swimming pool and water system improvements are ongoing, as well as the baseball field.
- Cottonwood road is in design.
- Working toward street improvements for Willow Drive, Elkins Road, Motel Drive and Tiejien Street
- Various ongoing lighting projects
- Need to address repair for NM605 bridge
- Need to address a Mill Road and Rail crossing

Ramah

- Ramah is looking to draft an agreement with Cibola County for road maintenance.
- Ramah has submitted applications to repair / replace two bridges.
- Winter maintenance is ongoing.
- Condolences to the community for the loss of Shane Lewis, who accomplished significant transportation development on behalf of the Ramah Navajo community.
- Ramah Navajo has filled two positions after the departure of Shane Lewis with Dorothy Claw as primary transportation developer and Tom Martine as transportation assistant – these individuals are also the primary and alternative representatives to the NWRTPO.
- Ramah Navajo is updating their Long Range Transportation Plan at this time, and in the process of prioritizing projects. Public meeting took place January 3 . Ramah is also working on Administrative Policies and Procedures.
- BIA 175 is the next new project for Ramah Navajo – seeking funding at this time.
- Working on signage for BIA 125 and 122.

- **Ramah has applied to the MEGA grant for improvements to BIA 125 mp. 18 – 26**
- **Ramah received a safety grant for \$300,000 which will help supply new guard rails.**
- **Looking to reconstruct BIA 145 and BIA 195**
- Completed PFF's for NM53 & BIA 125 intersection and Pine Hill school pedestrian ADA improvements.
- Some weather related road maintenance and repair going on at this time.
- **Ramah is developing RSA's for ten (10) intersections for NM53 and other tribal roads.**
- Dorothy and Tom are acclimating with ongoing Ramah transportation projects at this time and updating the Ramah Long Range Transportation Plan, completing an annual report, and looking for training opportunities.
- Acting executive director for Ramah Navajo Chapter's 638 Grants & Contract Programs issued a memorandum for employees to return back to work and follow CDC guidelines within each Chapter program RNDOT is back in operation and continues to maintain roadways.
- BIA Projects Update:
 - BIA 125 mp 18 – 24.6 – received approved design exception report for this project from FHWA and will move to finalize the project. BIA 125 MP 0 – 4.4 received approval from NNHPO on the updated Cultural Report document and Categorical Exclusion. Awaiting ROW documents for BIA 195 in Ramah Band Land to RN Realty Office. BIA 113 and 145 received final report and will review final documents with tribal officials
 - BIA 195: submitted ROW documents to RN Realty Office; **more focus on this road going forward.**
 - BIA 145 and BIA 113: Received draft report for BIA 145 and BIA 113. **More focus on BIA 145 going forward.**
- RNDOT Transportation Technician is vacant and will advertise for the position.
- Submitted grant applications for the NOFO on Tribal Transportation Program Safety Funds.
- BIA 125 striping project is complete; **BIA 125 mp 0-4 and mp12 – 24.6 are now construction ready.**
- NMDOT LGRF received all certifications and submitted a letter of disbursement. Awaiting on contractor to return signed Notice of Award for BIA 125 striping project.
- Cancelled Transportation Committee Meetings until COVID-19 Restrictions are lifted.
- Submitted road signs replacement maintenance project for 2021 LGRF cycle.
- NMDOT LGRF received some certifications and will coordinate with Utility providers. Received ROW certification and submitted letter requesting disbursement.
- Assisting with RN Community Development Department for the Navajo Nation Rural Addressing Project.
- Ongoing general maintenance for area roads, cattle guards and signage, blading and shaping, potholes and base course patching (incl. school bus routes). Cleaning and replacing roadway signs. Field fence repairs, post replacements and gate repairs.
- **Ramah Navajo has submitted a BUILD Grant application.**

Cibola County

- Cibola County has hired a new Road Superintendent by the name of Ed Salazar.
- The County is doing "blade and shape" maintenance on 84.7 miles of 14 County Roads; and a variety of other maintenance (cattle guards / culverts / sign repair / tree trimming & weed control / mowing / pot-hole patching / and minor road repairs) for 24 county roads.
- **The County has completed an emergency bypass at this time for the CR-5 Moquino bridge, and is awaiting TPF 2023 funding to repair the bridge in the future.**
- **The county continues undertaking flood damage repairs**
- **The county is working on chip sealing a variety of roads at this time.**
- **The County has commenced development of the Zuni Mountains Quartz Hill Trail.**
- ZMTP RTP trail project is funded for FFY2020 construction – working with McKinley County for trails development beginning with the Quartz Hill Trail Head. Construction will likely not proceed until FFY2021 Spring & Summer for the Cibola portion of the Zuni Mountain Recreational Trails. **Cibola County has now been cleared to be the fiscal agent for this project and will no longer need McKinley County's assistance; trail development and construction is commencing.** Cibola, COG and NMDOT staff had a virtual internal planning meeting on Jan. 19 at 9am with Arnold from the Forest Service to discuss updated scope of work for this project. **The County has commenced work on the Trail Head project and has submitted an extension request to JoAnn Garcia at NMDOT.**
- Cibola County has submitted an RFP due March 23 for a new public safety building, and will conduct a pre-proposal meeting; six (6) construction firms have responded thus far.
- CR-18B and CR1 road / bridge projects are current priorities. CR-18B awarded LGTPF funding – LGTPF contract is complete and submitted. CR18-B – RFP closed Friday – 12/4 and are currently reviewing applications – much

appreciation to JoAnn Garcia from NMDOT District 6. Two firms responded to the RFP and the Cibola Commission determined the award at their January 14 meeting. **CR18-B has commenced ROW work; drainage work is ongoing and construction for CR18-B bridge to commence in August or Sept. ; CR-1 has issued an RFP to Engineering Firms.**

- **CR-57 A is having a culvert replaced, and the County is starting on cattle guard replacements, as well as removing sand on various roads related to wind conditions.**
- Coop projects will begin soon.
- Ongoing County wide maintenance for County and Forest Roads.

Grants

- The City recently had a ribbon cutting ceremony for the pedestrian bridge on 2nd Street. **The bridge and channel are almost completed. 2nd Street Shared Path Loop has been awarded \$1.1 million in TAP funding.**
- Riverwalk trail: Design at 100% from WHPacific, Project is on hold for the time being.
- First Street phase 2 – Adams to Roosevelt: design at 100%; added a pond and lift station on Geis Street for drainage; allotted \$1.8 million from 2019 state legislature for **final phase 3 from Washington to Roosevelt which was recently awarded is now complete.** Final PS&E was scheduled for this August and project letting is scheduled for September. Total project stands at \$6.2 million. **Striping is now complete; anticipated completion coming soon.**
- 2nd street bridge out to bid for construction to commence in July – **2nd Street Channel project is now complete for Jefferson Ave. to the Rio San Jose.**
- Washington bridge replacement over 2nd Street through LGTPF funding will include a walking opportunity for High School students; project construction is underway – commenced in June. **Funding was awarded at \$750,000 for the Anderman to Sage St. portion from NM CDBG funds.**
- Lobo Canyon and Roosevelt intersection improvements are underway and ongoing. **Roosevelt Bridge is at 100% design and going out to bid soon.**

Pueblo of Laguna

- **Leonard Ludi is now the primary representative for Laguna; as Elroy Keetso has taken a job at NM Indian Affairs.**
- **The Pueblo remains under COVID restrictions, and is looking for a transportation specialist – no other major news now.**
- **The Pueblo remains closed to the public, and administration is closed until the COVID-19 Pandemic resides. For I-40 MP 111 – 117 exists are closed to the Pueblo. Access NM124 via I-40 MP108 and 117 exits.**
- Gaylord informed COG RTPO staff that the Pueblo has six official villages – not seven – staff will execute this correction going forward.
- **The Pueblo is consulting with the MRRTPPO for Laguna Pueblo lands within their jurisdiction.**
- The Pueblo is pursuing an FHWA grant to develop a Pueblo-wide (all Villages / roads) Safety Plan and will be seeking data sources identifying various crash incidents, and high crash incident locations; may need assistance from the RTPO or DOT with analyzing crash data. The Pueblo has a number of State Routes, where high speeds impact upon more fatal crashes.
- NM124 Bike and Pedestrian Trail – Paraje to the Kawaika Center project is complete – working with NMDOT for close out.
- NM124 Bike and Pedestrian Trail Encinal Road to State Road 279 is complete and in close out.
- **NM124 Rio San Jose to Roundabout bike & ped path: Design is complete. PS&E checklist is complete – project planned to be let February – March, 2021. NM 124 design is complete, anticipating construction in Spring of 2022.**
- **L26 Rainfall Road from Cubero Wash to Seama bridge M108: Construction has been completed, including a bike & ped. trail. Final audits in progress and project is in close-out.**
- **M137 bridge at Laguna Subdivision: Construction complete and project in close out with BIA.**
- **Mill, Overlay, Striping & Enhancement Projects: Construction is complete for L503 – Veterans Memorial Road, L200 Postal Postal Road and L245 Raindrop Road. The Pueblo is developing the next phase on four BIA routes: LGRF/BIA Road Maintenance Striping Projects – phase 2 & 3: Phase 2 – L500 Mountain Ash Loop and L500 Central Park Road; Phase 3 – L540 Veterans Memorial Road and L200 Elizabeth Bender Road. No bids were received so the Pueblo is working with NMDOT to sole-source these projects.**
- **Local Govt. Road Fund: projects will go out for construction bids soon.**
- **LGRF / BIA Road Maintenance Mill, Overlay & Striping Projects: Phase 2 & 3: Phase 2 – the Pueblo is working on the next phase for four BIA routes: phase 2 for L500 Mountain Ash Loop and Central Park roads. Phase 3 for L540 –**

Veterans Memorial Road and L200 Elizabeth Bender Road. **Contract amendments submitted and received. Local Govt. Road Fund and trail projects to commence soon.**

- **NM 124 Roundabout:** The repairs to the roundabout are being coordinated by NMDOT, no start date has been determined. **NM124 Road Diet has received an extension and is in final design for Rio San Jose to the Roundabout (6100764 project control no.) – this includes a bike and pedestrian addition.**
- **L24 Rainfall Road:** design changed to two phases, **Ph-1 Road & Trail at final 100% design, and in ROW review. The Concrete Box Underpass is now eliminated, and DOT Dist. 6 proposes to build an I-40 bridge over L24 road.** Construction funded for \$1.9 million from the LGTPF fund!
- **L26 Deer Dancer Road:** at **100% design, working on ROW amendments and E.A.**
- **L243 Acorn Road design:** completed 100% design and PS&E review from the BIA. **Construction to begin in the Spring.**
- **M154 Pagueate Wash Bridge:** **PER is complete – design phase will commence later this year.**
- **M108 San Jose River Bridge-Seama:** **PS&E, and ROW complete; EA, FONSI and NOI are in progress. Bridge is now at 100% design.**
- **L248 Bluejay Road and L248 Blue Star Loop:** **Design is in progress now at 30%. PER report is now in progress to include ROW review.**
- **Pueblo's Safety Plan:** **Plan is now complete – close out letter sent to BIA.**
- **NMDOT I-40 Safety Project:** The Pueblo met with NMDOT on March 3. **Design is at 100%; Construction by MSC1 is on-going on the east bound lanes from MM112 – 116..**
- The Pueblo has completed L26 Rainfall Road along with two trail projects.

Navajo Nation – Northern Agency

- **New Navajo Nation Leadership in Administrative and Legislative branches. Garrett Silversmith will remain in charge of NDOT.**
- **NDOT has completed \$170 million in projects in the past seven (7) years.**
- **NDOT will be meeting with the Hopi leaders on mutual road projects sometime soon.**
- **Navajo DOT is updating their Long Range Transportation Plan at this time.**
- **Local Govt. Road Fund projects will commence implementation soon for both Eastern and Northern Navajo.** Priscilla Lee – NDOT is working on extensions for FFY2019 projects. 2018 projects are complete at this time.
- **Northern and Eastern – currently updating regional road routes to present on Feb. 22 to the Navajo Council. Also updating Chapters on BIA Road Inventory to help fund 15 mile regional routes maintenance.**

Navajo Nation – Eastern Navajo

- **Edwin Begay is the Senior Planner for Eastern Navajo indicated that NDOT is now updating Chapter routes and will follow up with Chapters for resolutions and inventory training.**
- Emergency repair work is ongoing for road repairs related to heavy Monsoon rainfall. Busy fixing Chapter access roads – primarily in Arizona and now in New Mexico.
- **Recently Arlando Teller – USDOT met with Anthony Dimas and Billy Moore to discuss Navajo roads.**
- Working on TTIP projects across the Navajo Nation.
- Providing Chapters technical assistance for ingress and egress – including the BIA and NM / AZ DOT. The BIA will provide road inventory training to NDOT.
- **Navajo Transit is now under Navajo DOT.**
- NDOT is also gearing up for school bus route improvements and asking route maps from the various Navajo Nation schools. **NDOT is completing School Bus Route mapping at this time. There is currently much concern around school bus routes and bridges which buses cannot cross.**
- **Transportation Project Fund project application was approved by DOT for the west Tsayatoh Road in Eastern Navajo at \$2,450,000.**
- NDOT is meeting with Chapters around regional priorities and funding; **Iyanbito bridge request remains a priority around significant rail crossing delays (especially around emergency response concerns).**
- There are concerns with overgrazing, along with dust storms and sand on roadways – NDOT will present to NM Indian Affairs on these concerns.
- For both Northern and Eastern Navajo there have been major road washouts due to flooding, which NDOT is addressing as best they can. NDOT staff will also be undertaking BIA Road Inventory training.

- **NDOT is asking Chapters for new projects, and follow up with Chapters on Capital Outlay.**
- **At this time, the Navajo DOT has no representatives to the NWRTPPO other than Margie Begay – they are working to identify new representatives for Northern, Eastern and Ft. Defiance Agencies.**

Proposed New Roadway Lighting Projects have no Planning, Designing or Construction funding, but the respective Chapters will be seeking funds to begin Road Safety Assessments, Design, and Construction: All these projects will be added to RTIPR for future funding of the projects.

- Smith Lake Chapter- Seeking RSA studies and street lighting at Hwy 371 & N49
- Crownpoint Chapter- Seeking RSA studies and street lighting at N9 & Hwy 371 intersection
- Becenti Chapter- Seeking RSA studies & Street lighting at Highway 371 & N9
- Coyote Canyon Chapter- Street lighting at Intersections of Highway 491 and N9, Milepost 15-15.5
- Whiterock Chapter- Seeking RSA & Street lighting at Highway 371 & store junction, chapter access roads
- Standing Rock Chapter- Seeking RSA & Street lighting at N9 & Chapter access road intersection.
- Little Water Chapter (Eastern)- Seeking RSA & Street lighting at Highway 371 and N7119
- Mexican Springs Chapter- Completing RSA, and seeking street lighting at Highway 491 & N30
- Naschitti Chapter- Completing RSA, and seeking street lighting at Highway 491 & Bus turnaround MP 32
- Tohatchi Chapter- Completing RSA and seeking street lighting at Highway 491 Milepost 22-24
- Twin Lakes Chapter- Completing RSA, and seeking street lighting at Highway 491 & Chapter access road/school access road, Milepost 13 – 13.5 and other lighting at Highway 491 & Giant store/Johnson road, Milepost 9.8 – 10.3

New Mexico Department of Transportation Reports (significant news only)	RTPO Liaison (Neala Krueger) Tribal Liaison (Ron Shutiva) District 5 (James Mexia, Stephanie Medina) District 6 (JoAnn Garcia; Bill Santiago)
--	--

Multimodal Planning & Programs Bureau – Neala Krueger

- **Quality Assurance Reviews:** are forthcoming against a May 31 deadline
- **Transit & Rail Public Transportation Survey was issued in the March 3 Govt. to Govt. Update** – encouraging RTPO members to review and respond.
- **Upcoming news & funding:** FHWA Urban Area Boundaries, and USDOT Safe Streets for All funding is forthcoming

NMDOT Tribal Liaison – Ron Shutiva

- **Ron participated in Indian Day at the Legislature in Santa Fe on February 3.**
- **Ron is trying to meet with new tribal legislators and engage with DOT District staff.**
- **There is concern around litter and trash along I-40 intersection within the Pueblo of Laguna area.**
- **A corridor study is under consideration for I-40 from Arizona to Albuquerque – this will include consideration toward developing three lanes for this highway in each direction, given the truck freight traffic.**
- **Ron continues to work on engaging tribes around state corridors and is seeking help from regional media.**
- **Justin Reese is the new Cabinet Secretary for NMDOT.**
- **There will be a session on I-40 improvements with NDOT.**
- **Ron recommends phasing projects due to increasing costs**
- **House Memorial 13 is executed for a study on the Ramah area Wolf Sanctuary Road for improvements.**
- **NM 118 drainage study request from Mark Freeland – Navajo Tribal Council.**
- **Iyanbito Chapter is requesting a bridge over the BNSF Rail Line. (Another consideration would be extending a paved road west to the Church Rock bridge – might cost less).**
- **Ron is considering setting up quarterly tribal meetings with the DOT Districts, with consideration toward priority tribal projects.**

- Ron reminded members to pay attention to the “Buy America” guidelines. Our region did well for this round of TPF funds.
- Ron reminded members to stay on top of funding opportunities – with \$ billions forthcoming – remember to prepare for environmental requirements (which are time consuming) for this funding.
- **Shiprock Bridge replacement is being sought by Rep. Charles-Newton and under consideration with the Feds and Daryl Bradley from NDOT. Shiprock Chapter supports this project (but not critical at this time).**
- **Ron is now on the LTAP Board.**
- **Hoping to push for NM64 projects and NM491 north of Shiprock projects; along with the Hogback rockslide mitigation on US491.**
- **Concern that the NDOT is not involved with the NM I-40 studies.**
- **There’s a new Indian Highway Safety Grant out from the BIA.**
- Reminding members to keep on top of deadlines for ICIP, TIF, and LGRF.
- **Transportation Project Fund: better to phase then have a shortfall on funding for proposed projects.**
- A national broadband project is establishing a broadband corridor along I-40, and will involve tribal discussion with Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma and Navajo Nation.
- **Ron is encouraging tribal members to pursue bridge funding.**
- **Ron reminds tribal members to pursue support and related letters of support from state and national legislators.**
- NM118 drainage analysis project is finally in progress as the Navajo Council is working on agreements with the local governments in the region of the study between Churchrock and Iyanbito; **need coordination with NDOT.**
- Ron reported on the NM118 drainage analysis that took place between the Iyanbito and Ft. Wingate I-40 intersections at previous meetings. Ron indicated he feels that NM118 drainage issues remain unresolved to this day (in spite of two studies!) and the Navajo Nation DOT remains non-responsive!

NMDOT District 5 – James Mexia, Amanda Nino

- WHPacific is being contracted for a study on needed road and intersection improvements on US 64 – MP 0 – 20 (which includes the Shiprock School Zone). This project will be divided into two phases funded separately and referencing the District 5 HSIP plan for 2021 including a) primary / major Chapter or community intersections from Shiprock to the Arizona border and b) the Shiprock School Zone.
- The NM371 and N36 intersection near Northern Edge Casino is at 60% design; need ROW clearance / easement from NDOT.
- D-5 staff are managing project proposals for the 2021 Local Government Road Fund, and have received awards from the DOT General Office in Santa Fe for the next fiscal year.
- **Work is pending for NDOT Capital Outlay and N.O.O. – Please contact DOT District 5 SOON!!! Remember that Capital Outlay requires monthly report updates. Amanda encouraged RTPO members to provide Capital Outlay (CPMS) updates or the funding can be reverted.**
- **Watch out for funding deadlines!**

NMDOT District 6 – Bill Santiago, Michael Neely, Clayton Garner

- **DOT District 6 Office is still under renovation – nonetheless, DOT 6 staff will resume full time office work starting January 1, 2023.**
- **With a lot of local govt. turnover including RTPO members, staff training may be needed to bring new staff with transportation focus up to speed.**
- **Bill reminded RTPO members that all NMDOT staff have new emails as: dot.nm.gov**
- **Clayton Garner echoed Amanda Nino’s comments from Dist. 5 encouraging RTPO members to undertake CPMS updates for Capital Outlay projects so as to retain their funding.**
- **Local Govt. Road Fund** – as Stephanie from District 5 mentioned, the 5 certifications are also required before LGRF projects are considered construction ready. Keep District 6 informed on progress – the time is now critical to request an extension amendment as previously funded LGRF cycle is in close out! Extension requests are due by October 31 (including a resolution)! **The new LGRF call for projects has a March 15 deadline.**
- **Bill Santiago encourages RTPO members to pay attention to application deadlines around forthcoming funding. Also, be aware of staff changes at NDOT, NMDOT, and local governments.**
- **The FY2023 Transportation Project Fund applications must include a supporting resolution.** DOT District 6 has provided a template. Request a match waiver ASAP – due end of September.

- **Get signed agreements to DOT Dist. 6 soon, including supporting resolutions.**
- **Keep DOT District 6 staff informed on progress for the Transportation Project Fund. 5 certifications takes time – try to get these executed during this Winter season so you are construction ready in the Spring!!**
- **Bill reminded RTPO members that the MAP funding proposals will be due soon.**
- Mike Neely is on board with NMDOT District 6 to assist the RTPO's participating in the District 6 region – include Mr. Neely on all communication.
- Mr. Clayton Garner will fill JoAnn Garcia's former position at the District. Reminding members to remind others that traffic safety is important in construction areas.
- Lisa Vega is now the Director for DOT District 6, as Larry Maynard has retired.
- For Local Government Road Fund projects – the District needs certifications for all projects – many RTPO members are not following LGRF guidance for project development and are trying to close out projects without having reported progress to the DOT or following what the program requires – this could jeopardize funding.

Reminder: NMDOT will have a new email: staff_member@dot.nm.gov.

NEW BUSINESS/OPEN FLOOR: MEMBERS & GUESTS (5-minute limit) - None

ANNOUNCEMENTS & NEXT MEETING: No announcements – next meeting April 12, 2023 – virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams

ADJOURNMENT (11:50 am) Dennis Felipe – Pueblo of Acoma motioned; and Alicia Santiago – Gallup seconded for adjournment - motion carried by acclamation.

MEETING ACTIONS:

Staff:

- **Transportation Project Fund Internal Deadlines:** Implementation – complete – all proposed projects have been approved and are now authorized to move forward. **A new TPF Call for Projects has been issued for FFY2023. RTPO members have completed 2023 TPF application packages, staff have submitted to NMDOT and seven (7) projects were approved to move forward for the NWRTPO (Grants, Acoma, McKinley, Gallup, Cibola, Milan, Eastern Navajo).**

MEMBERS:

- **Members are encouraged to review your respective sections in these minutes and report to RTPO staff on which portions / bullet sentences can be eliminated as no longer pertinent or completed, as these sections make the minutes incredibly lengthy!!**
- **NMDOT:** Remind Staff and RTPO Members of impending deadlines for various projects and deliverables.



a program of
NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization
(NWRTPO)**

Agenda Item #IV: Project Feasibility Forms due April 14

Subject: Remind RTPO members that PFF's are due this Friday – April 14

Prepared for: April 12 meeting

Date:

BACKGROUND

- **Why?** Every two years now COG admin. requires RTPO staff to completely clear the RTIPR and have RTPO members submit new projects, and resubmit projects already cited in the previous RTIPR.
- **Purpose.** This is to keep projects up to date, based on local government priorities.
- **Discussion/Finalization.**

CURRENT WORK

- Members to submit new and previous projects PFFs for each section of the RTIPR

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Members to submit new and previous projects into RTIPR sections for forthcoming funding opportunities. If necessary, the COG / NWRTPO can extend submission deadlines.

ATTACHMENTS

- Current Project Feasibility Form and Transportation Project Fund Project Feasibility Form

BUDGET IMPACT

- None

ACTION ITEM

- N/A

T/LPA PROJECT FEASIBILITY FORM (PFF)

For assistance, contact Robert Kuipers, RTPO/MPO Planner, at (505) 722-4327 or rkuipers@nwnmcoq.org



GENERAL INFORMATION

Preparation Date: _____ Project Title: _____
Requesting T/LPA: _____ Governing Body Approval:
YES ___ NO ___ PENDING ___
Person in Responsible Charge: _____ Phone: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Type (Circle/boldface/underline all that apply):
ROADWAY **TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE** **BRIDGE** **SAFETY** **OTHER**
If you chose "OTHER" please clarify here:

Route Number and/or Street Name: _____

Project Termini: _____ Beginning Mile point ____ Ending Mile point ____

Total length of proposed project: _____

Project Phases to be included in request (Circle/boldface/underline all that apply):
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING **CONSTRUCTION** **CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT & TESTING**

PLANNING FACTORS

National Planning Factors

Goals to be addressed (circle/boldface/underline all that apply):
*Support Economic Vitality | Increase Safety for Motorized and Non-Motorized Users |
Increase Security for Motorized and Non-Motorized Users | Increase Accessibility and Mobility for People and
Freight | Protect and Enhance Environment, Energy Conservation, Quality of Life |
Enhance Integration and Connectivity | Promote System Management and Operation |
Emphasize System Preservation | Enhance Travel and Tourism |
Improve System Resiliency, Reliability and Reduce or Mitigate Stormwater Impacts*

Justification of how this project meets or addresses the goals circled above (use additional pages if necessary):

Begin typing here. Box will expand as needed.

New Mexico Climate Change Goals

Goals to be addressed (circle/boldface/underline all that apply):

Reduction in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions | Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) | Increased Adoption of Cleaner Vehicles

Please describe how this project addresses the goals selected above (use additional pages if necessary):

Begin typing here. Box will expand as needed.

PROJECT COSTS

Column A			Column B		
If project is <u>not</u> phased, complete column A only.			Total Phases No. (1, 2, 3, I, II, III, etc.):		
If project is phased, list the amount of funding being currently requested in Column A and complete Column B.			The amount below represents the cost of the entire project and will be greater than Column A.		
Project Cost: \$			Total Project Cost: \$		
Percentage Estimates:			Phased projects are usually large and divided into parts or phases. If you wish to supply any additional information, list comments here:		
Total Local Match	%	\$			
Total Federal Share	%	\$			
	100%				

DISTRICT REVIEW:				
By:	Date:	Recommended:	Yes	No
T/LPA REVIEW:				
By:	Date:	Recommended:	Yes	No

Type district comments here. Box will expand as needed.

Topics to discuss during PFF meetings:

- Is the Tribal/Local Public Agency (T/LPA) familiar with the NMDOT T/LPA Handbook? Has the person in responsible charge attended one of the T/LPA Handbook trainings?
- The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires public agencies with more than 50 employees to create a transition plan to achieve program accessibility requirements. (Except tribal entities)
 - Does the LPA have an approved plan on file with the NMDOT?

- If the LPA has fewer than 50 employees, has NMDOT received an official letter listing employee names and positions (to include part time employees but not elected officials)?
- LPAs with fewer than 50 employees still need an ADA policy. Does the LPA have an ADA policy?
- Does the LPA have an approved Title VI plan on file with the NMDOT? (Tribal entities are not required to have a Title VI plan).
- Is this project included in any other planning documents? (Comprehensive Plan, ICIP, etc.)
- Is the project within NMDOT ROW? If so, does the district support the project?
 - Are agreements necessary for maintenance and operations? (Lighting agreements, landscaping, etc.)
- Is there a need for proprietary items or brand-specific items on this project? If so, Public Interest Finding/certification is required and should be discussed.
- Does the T/LPA have the minimum match required for the project? Is the T/LPA using in kind match: entity furnished items/labor/materials/equipment? This needs to be approved up front and written into the agreement.

- The T/LPA needs to understand the reimbursement process and be prepared to pay all costs up front. The T/LPA must follow district instructions for submitting invoices for reimbursement.
 - Does the T/LPA have the capability to pay all costs up front?
 - Does the T/LPA have the capability to adhere to 90 day project closeout process?
- Certified testing is required during construction and is eligible for reimbursement.
 - Has the T/LPA included funding for testing in the consultant management estimate above or does the T/LPA have certified employees that can provide materials testing?
- Does the T/LPA know the Buy America requirements for steel and iron?
 - **NOT the same as Buy American, this is not reimbursable or allowed on federal projects**
- The T/LPA must follow the NMDOT specifications as outlined in the "Specs for Highway and Bridge Construction" unless the appropriate NMDOT Design Center grants permission prior to design for the T/LPA to use other specs.
- Does the T/LPA have maintenance and operations costs accounted for?

- Does the T/LPA have a good track record for responsible use/tracking of federal funds? Have they met closeout deadlines? Have they successfully completed other federally funded projects in a timely manner?
- Has the T/LPA had any issues with design/construction in the past?
- Does the T/LPA have major audit findings that would prevent them from being a responsible fiscal agent?

GENERAL INFORMATION

Preparation Date: _____ **Project Title:** _____

Requesting T/LPA: _____ **Is there an approved Governing Body resolution for this application**
(Applicant) YES NO PENDING If pending, date expected _____

Responsible Charge

Name: _____ **Phone:** _____

Title: _____ **Email:** _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Type (Check all that apply):

ROADWAY BRIDGE SAFETY PLANNING/DESIGN OTHER

If you chose "OTHER" please clarify here: _____

Project Scope: _____

Is the request to address a bridge on the NMDOT's Local Bridge Priority List for Replacement/Rehabilitation?
 NO YES If yes, please indicate bridge #: _____

Is the request to continue or advance a phase of a previous project?
 NO YES If yes, please indicate funding sources and scope of previous phase below.

Funding Source: _____

Previous Phase Project Scope: _____

Completion Date of Previous Phase: _____

Current Phase being requested: _____

Project Location

Route Number and/or Street Name: _____

Project Termini:

Beginning Mile point and/or intersection: _____

Ending Mile point and/or intersection: _____

Total length of proposed project: _____

NOTE: A local government project that is located in full or in part within a department right-of-way or NHS route must be administered in accordance with the "Tribal/Local Public Agency Handbook".

A local government project that ties into, connects or crosses a department right-of-way or an NHS route, or when the project may have an effect on existing improvements within department rights-of-way, requires the approval of the department.

Is the project located in full or in part within a department right-of-way or NHS route?

NO YES If yes, the project must be administered in accordance with the Tribal/Local Public Agency Handbook and follow all requirements and procedures.

Does the project tie into, connect or cross a department right-of-way or an NHS route, or will the project have an effect on existing improvements within a NMDOT right-of-way? "Letter of Approval" from the NMDOT District Engineer?

NO YES If yes, a "Letter of Approval" is required from the NMDOT District Engineer.

Will the project impact known environmental and/or cultural resources?

NO YES If yes, please clarify _____

Is this project tied to any past or future federal funding?

NO YES If yes, please identify _____

NO YES Does the Local Entity intend to apply for Match Waiver Funding?

Project Phases to be included in request (Check all that apply):

PLANNING

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING/DESIGN

CONSTRUCTION

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT & TESTING

*RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION**

* Projects that are for ROW acquisition will need to follow NMDOT ROW acquisition requirements if the entity intends to utilize federal funding in any subsequent project phase.

PROJECT COSTS:

Column A (Not Phased)			Column B (Phased)	
If project is not phased, complete column A only. If project is phased, list the amount of funding being currently requested in Column A and complete Column B.			Total Phases No. (1, 2, 3, I, II, III, etc.):	
			The amount below represents the cost of the entire project and will be greater than Column A.	
			Total Project Cost: \$	
Percentage Estimates:			Phased projects are usually large and divided into parts or phases. Please clarify how the requested project funding relates to the total overall project. Identify future phases and estimated costs.	
Total Local Match	5%	\$		
Total State Share	95%	\$		
Total cost	100%	\$		

T/LPA REVIEW:				
By:	Date:	Recommended:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
NMDOT DISTRICT REVIEW:				
By:	Date:	Recommended:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

<p><u>NMDOT District comments.</u></p>
<p><u>NMDOT Environmental Bureau comments.</u></p>

Topics to discuss during all PFF meetings:

- Is this project included in any other planning documents? (Comprehensive Plan, ICIP, etc.)
- Does the T/LPA have the minimum match required for the project? If not, does the T/LPA intend to apply for a match waiver?
- Does the T/LPA have a good track record for responsible use/tracking of state funds? Have they met closeout deadlines? Have they successfully completed other state funded projects in a timely manner?
- Has the T/LPA had any issues with design/construction in the past?
- Does the T/LPA have major audit findings that would prevent them from being a responsible fiscal agent?

Additional topics to discuss during PFF meetings ONLY if project is on or intersects with an NMDOT or NHS route:

- Is the Tribal/Local Public Agency (T/LPA) familiar with the NMDOT T/LPA Handbook? Has the person in responsible charge attended one of the T/LPA Handbook trainings?
- Is the project within NMDOT ROW? If so, does the district support the project?
 - Are agreements necessary for maintenance and operations? (Lighting agreements, landscaping, etc.)
- The T/LPA must follow the NMDOT specifications as outlined in the "Specs for Highway and Bridge Construction" unless the appropriate NMDOT Design Center grants permission prior to design for the T/LPA to use other specs.



a program of
NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization
(NWRTPO)**

Agenda Item #V: Transportation Project Fund Progress

Subject: Inform RTPO members on Transportation Project Fund opportunity for 2024

Prepared for: April 12 meeting

Date:

BACKGROUND

- **Why?** Project feasibility forms are due by April 14 – including TPF projects; and full TPF application packages are due May 31.
- **Purpose.** Our RTPO members have done exceptionally well with the NM TPF fund in the past, and we hope to continue this opportunity which almost doubles the projects we can complete in each biennial RTIPR season – generally averaging between \$15 & 20 million.
- **Discussion/Finalization.**

CURRENT WORK

- Get the TPF – PFFs in by Friday – April 14 !!!

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Finish the Complete 2024 TPF application packages by / before May 31 !!!

ATTACHMENTS

- TPF guidance, and PFF

BUDGET IMPACT

- None for the NWRTPO, but major funding for our member governments

ACTION ITEM

- N/A

Transportation Project Fund – 2024

1) Complete Package:

- Cover Letter
- Project Category
- Project Feasibility Form
- **Resolution of Sponsorship** indicating availability of 5% match or letter from chief executive indicating the same (or request match waiver)
- Map of project location including mileposts
- Right of Way: If local govt. does not own ROW need a) support letter from ROW owners, or b) support letter from NMDOT District Office

2) Application Deadline: May 31 – 3:00 pm

3) Funding Available: \$100 million

4) Project Ranking:

- If RTPO does not rank projects (in our case all ranked #1 – one project per member govt.) – submit letter to Cabinet Secretary stating that we will not rank projects but will allow the DOT District to do this on our behalf. Prioritizing criteria are provided in the Jan. 26 TPF Call for Projects.
 - Is the project ID'd as priority in local plans
 - Project readiness – can project commence within 3 months of reception of executed project agreement
 - Priority bridge – does the project address a bridge on the NMDOT Local Bridge Priority List
 - Phasing: is project part of a phased project previously funded by other state funds; is the project part of a phased project previously funded with TPF? If so – what year?

5) Uploading approved applications to FTP website: RTPO's should upload FTP applications to the FTP website on behalf of the local entities. For this reason, I have asked our members to submit complete application packages to me by May 23.

6) Federal Funds: If the project is on the RTIPR, local entities must ensure that no federal funds have or will be used on the project.

7) Drainage or Utilities: Drainage work is an allowable expense as long as it is part of / supports the overall project. Utility work can only be included if it is required to mitigate the impacts of the proposed construction – otherwise must be paid by another local or state funding source.

8) Federal Funds: Federal funds may not be used as part of a TPF funded project.

9) DOT District Offices: DOT District will review the applications to ensure all paperwork is filled out correctly, and verify that the proposed work can be accomplished in the time allotted and the funding is enough to complete the phase or project. The Districts provide a priority list of projects to the Cabinet Secretary based on evaluation criteria. The District Engineer can re-prioritize projects for submission to Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet Secretary can also re-prioritize projects submitted to the Transportation Commission.

10) State Transportation Commission: The state Transportation Commission is responsible for the final approval of awards.

11) Tribal Entities: Tribal entities can qualify for a hardship waiver only if the Dept. of Finance approves a financial hardship qualification certification. Tribal entities can use Tribal Transportation Funds as their match – but this must be disclosed in the application.

12) Soft or In-kind match: Soft or inkind match is not allowed.

13) TPF Full application packages due: May 31, 2023 – submit by / before 3:00 pm – for FFY 2024 projects



a program of
NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization
(NWRTPO)**

**Agenda Item #VI: Vulnerable Road Users Summary
Report**

Subject: Present the new HSIP Vulnerable Road Users Guidance

Prepared for: April 12, 2023 RTPO meeting

Date:

BACKGROUND

- **Why?** It remains important to provide equal access including transportation for handicapped and elderly citizens, and RTPO's and DOT's can contribute and support developing infrastructure and services to accommodate these citizens.
- **Purpose.** Raise RTPO members awareness and commitment to citizens who need assistance to access products and services.
- **Discussion/Finalization.** Present summary information, and additional information for RTPO members to review and familiarize, in order to better serve our elderly and handicapped citizens.

CURRENT WORK

- None

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Review and familiarize with this program and seek funding opportunities to execute recommended projects

ATTACHMENTS

- Vulnerable Road Users guidance

BUDGET IMPACT

- None

ACTION ITEM

- N/A

Vulnerable Road Users Summary:

- Encouraging data driven safety analysis for all forms of transportation development particularly with vulnerable users in mind.
- Consideration toward vulnerable road users should be involved for development of policies, rules and procedures, that address barriers to safety.
- All states nationally must complete a VRU safety assessment by Nov. 15, 2023 (23 U.S.C. 148 (I)(1)) and include this in the HSIP plan.
- State DOT's will be required to identify high risk safety areas and develop a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks to VRU citizens for these areas or places. This includes data such as location, functional classification, design speed, and high risk time of day.
- Consider the demographics of locations of fatalities and serious injuries, including race, ethnicity, income and age.
- Data should investigate where vulnerability will occur – traffic volume, land use, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, activity / shopping centers, hotels, schools, bus stops – etc.
- States are required and local govts encouraged to ID high incidence areas for traffic injuries and deaths. Recommend safety improvements and evaluate (quantify) safety performance alternatives.
- Develop strategies to reduce high risk locations. Develop a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks – including consultation between the RTPO, tribal and local govts, counties and the state.
- Separate bike / pedestrian lanes and create pedestrian refuge islands.
- Consider slowing traffic including road diets.
- Consider cross-walk visibility enhancements, pedestrian hybrid beacons, lighting – etc.
- Implement speed enforcement strategies.
- Complete Streets Design – executing complete street design improves safety across the board for all transportation system users. (Can include curb ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, transit stops and elimination of physical barriers.
- Potential Funding:
 - HSIP
 - State Planning & Research Funds
 - Federal, State, Local and Private funding
 - TAP program
 - FHWA Pedestrian and Bicycle funding
 - SS4A (Safe Streets and roads For All)
 - Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program
 - Transit Flex funding.

Vulnerable Road Users Guidance Summary (RTPO - HSIP – 2023)

National Roadway Safety Strategy from USDOT – issued Jan. 27, 2022 recommends a Safe System Approach, which addresses the safety of all road users, including those who walk, bike, drive, ride transit, and travel by other modes. It involves a paradigm shift to improve safety culture, increase collaboration across all safety stakeholders, and refocus transportation system design and operation on anticipating human mistakes and lessening impact forces to reduce crash severity and save lives. To achieve the vision of zero fatalities and to Build a Better America, vulnerable road user safety should be fully considered in a State’s transportation investment decisions, from planning and programming, environmental analysis, project design, and construction, to maintenance and operations. States should use data-driven safety analyses to ensure that safety is a key input in any decision made in the project development process for all project types and fully consider and improve the safety of all road users, especially vulnerable road users, in project development. FHWA encourages States to use the lessons learned from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment process to also identify policies, rules, and procedures that may be barriers to safe travel by vulnerable road users, and take steps to change them.

FHWA will work with States to ensure the inclusion of project elements that proactively address racial equity, access for elderly people and people with disabilities, workforce development, and economic development, and that remove barriers to opportunity and accessibility, including automobile dependence in both rural and urban communities, and which redress prior inequities and barriers to opportunity.

All States are required to complete an initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment by November 15, 2023 (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(1)) and include it as part of their State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(13)(G)). States should update their VRU assessment every five (5) years typically in sync with their State Highway Safety Program update; and the VRU can be included in the state SHSP doc.

As part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, the State shall use a data-driven process to identify areas of high-risk for vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A)). The State must consult with local governments, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and regional transportation planning organizations that represent a high-risk area (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(4)(B)) and develop a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks to vulnerable road users in areas identified as high-risk (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(B)).

A Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment includes an assessment of the safety performance of a State with respect to vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(16)). To assess the safety of performance with respect to vulnerable road users, the State must perform a quantitative analysis of vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries that:

- i) Includes data such as location, roadway functional classification, design speed, speed and time of day;
- ii) considers the demographics of the locations of fatalities and serious injuries, including race, ethnicity, income, and age; and
- iii) based on the data, identifies areas as “high-risk” to vulnerable road users.

As part of the state's HSIP each state should have a system to differentiate safety problem identification analysis and countermeasures between vulnerable road users and other road users. Data analysis should include location, roadway functional classification, design & speed limit, and time of day.

Data should also investigate where vulnerability will occur – such as traffic volume, land use, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, activity centers, shopping centers, hotels, schools, residential & commercial areas, employment areas, bus stops – etc. Data can also be contributed from transit, public health agencies, emergency medical services and emergency response agencies – etc. Analysis should consider the demographics of locations for serious injuries and deaths, including race, ethnicity, income, age – etc. Additional sources of data include:

- EIScreen: Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool – (EPA)
- FHWA – HEPGIS Maps: Socioeconomics and Equity Analysis (FHWA)
- Transportation Disadvantaged Census Tracts (arcgis.com) (USDOT)
- The Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJ)
- Social Vulnerability Index (CDC)

Identification of High Risk Areas:

States are required to identify high risk areas representing danger to VRU citizens; recommended strategies include:

- High Injury Network Analysis: mapping corridor areas where a high incidence of traffic injuries and fatalities occur
- Predictive Safety Analysis: Identify roadway sites with potential for safety improvement and quantify alternative safety performance alternatives. (This includes crash, roadway inventory and traffic volume data to provide reliable estimates for proposed roadway safety improvements.)
- Systemic Safety Analysis: Examine crash and roadway data in combination to ID high-risk roadway features that correlate with various crash types. This analysis identifies locations at risk for severe crashes, even if there is not a high frequency at these locations.

States should consult with local govts (County, Municipal, Tribal, Special Districts), MPO's, RTPPO's on high risk areas. Consultation should provide knowledge and perspective on factors contributing to safety concerns and identify strategies to address high risk areas. RSA (Roadway Safety Audits) can be executed around high risk areas.

Program of Projects or Strategies:

A VRU safety assessment should include a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks. This should typically include consultation between state, county, tribal and local gov. agencies.

Consideration toward "Complete Streets Design Model" and "Americans with Disability Act" (ADA) transition plans should be taken into consideration. A "Safe System Approach" entails:

- Eliminate death and serious injury for all road users
- Anticipate and accommodate human errors
- Strive to keep crash impact energy on the human body to tolerable levels
- Proactively ID safety risks in the system
- Build layers of protection so if one part of the system fails, another part provides protection

Increasing visibility and matching vehicle speeds to the built environment advances the safe system approach and improves safety for VRU users. Additional considerations that support this include:

- Separate users in space: separated bike / pedestrian lanes, pedestrian refuge islands
- Implement physical features to slow traffic – self-enforcing roads / road diets
- Separate users in time – pedestrian / traffic signals
- Increase attentiveness and awareness – crosswalk visibility enhancements, pedestrian hybrid beacons, lighting
- Implement speed enforcement strategies – speed safety cameras

Complete Streets Design:

Executing Complete Street design models improves safety across the board for all users – including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transit users, children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, motorists and freight vehicles. Complete Streets encourages consideration toward design for appropriate speeds, separation of various users in time and space, connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders – including people with disabilities, and implementing safety countermeasures.

ADA Compliance:

This regulation requires all public agencies to provide safe and equal access to any and all individuals with disabilities. This includes consideration toward curb ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, transit stops, and elimination of physical barriers.

Local and regional transit providers must also comply with ADA access for persons with disabilities as well as all pedestrians and bicyclists.

Potential Funding:

- HSIP (*Highway Safety Improvement Program*)
- SP&R (*State Planning & Research Funds*)
- Consider federal, state, local and private funding sources
- Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Funds (eligible highway projects)
- FHWA Pedestrian and Bicycle Funding Opportunities
- SS4A – Safe Streets and Roads for All program
- Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program
- “Transit Flex” funding

This summary document condenses 19 pages of Vulnerable Road Users Safety guidance down to 3 pages of the most critical information.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Highway
Administration**

Memorandum

Subject: **ACTION**: Vulnerable Road User Safety
Assessment Guidance (Due date:
November 15, 2023)

Date: October 21, 2022

From: Cheryl J. Walker 
Associate Administrator, Office of Safety

In Reply Refer To:
HSSP

To: Division Administrators

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide background and guidance to clarify the requirements for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment as described in 23 U.S.C. 148(l), as amended by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (Pub. L. 117-58, also known as the “Bipartisan Infrastructure Law” (BIL)). All States are required to develop a Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment as part of their Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 148(l).

This guidance also incorporates principles consistent with the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) [*Policy on Using Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Resources to Build a Better America*](#), dated December 16, 2021.

Except for the statutes and regulations cited, the contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the States or the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide information regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.

Table of Contents

- 1
- Purpose** 1
- Definitions**..... 3
- Background** 3
 - Prioritizing Vulnerable Road User Safety in All Investments and Projects**..... 3
 - Equity**..... 4
 - Climate Change and Sustainability** 5
- Guidance**..... 6
 - Schedule and Frequency**..... 6
 - Initial Assessment**..... 6
 - Updates** 7
 - Review** 7
 - Statutory and Regulatory Requirements**..... 7
 - Using a Data Driven Process**..... 7
 - Consultation** 10
 - Program of Projects or Strategies** 11
- Potential Funding Opportunities** 15
 - Development**..... 15
 - Implementation** 15
- Relationship to other HSIP and Vulnerable Road User Activities** 17
 - SHSP and Related Action Plans** 17
 - HSIP Implementation Plan**..... 17
 - HSIP Annual Report**..... 17
 - Local Safety Plans** 17
- Questions** 17
- Attachment** 18
 - Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment Template**..... 19

Definitions

The following terms are used throughout this guidance:

A **Safe System Approach** means a roadway design that emphasizes minimizing the risk of injury or fatality to road users; and that: takes into consideration the possibility and likelihood of human error; accommodates human injury tolerance by taking into consideration likely crash types, resulting impact forces, and the ability of the human body to withstand impact forces; and takes into consideration vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(9)).

A **Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment** is an assessment of the safety performance of a State with respect to vulnerable road users and the plan of the State to improve the safety of vulnerable road users as described under 23 U.S.C. 148(l). (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(16)).

A **vulnerable road user** is a nonmotorist with a fatality analysis reporting system (FARS) person attribute code for pedestrian, bicyclist, other cyclist, and person on personal conveyance or an injured person that is, or is equivalent to, a pedestrian or pedalcyclist as defined in the ANSI D16.1-2007. (See 23 U.S.C. 148(a)(15) and 23 CFR 490.205). A vulnerable road user may include people walking, biking, or rolling. Please note that a vulnerable road user:

- Includes a highway worker on foot in a work zone, given they are considered a pedestrian.
- Does not include a motorcyclist.

Background

Vulnerable road users accounted for a growing share of all United States roadway fatalities in recent years.¹ An even larger number of vulnerable road users are injured each year in collisions involving motor vehicles.² On March 2, 2022, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) released its 2020 annual traffic crash data³ showing that 38,824 lives were lost in traffic crashes nationwide that year. That number marks the highest number of fatalities since 2007. In addition, as compared with 2019 data, bicyclist fatalities were up 9.2 percent (from 859 to 938) and pedestrian fatalities were up 3.9 percent (from 6,272 to 6,516). NHTSA also published early estimates for 2021 roadway fatalities.⁴ The total projected pedestrian fatalities increased by 13 percent from 2020 to 2021 and bicyclist fatalities increased by 5 percent from 2020 to 2021. Addressing the safety of vulnerable road users through a multifaceted, collaborative, and comprehensive approach allows people that walk, bike, and roll full and safe access to our transportation system.

Prioritizing Vulnerable Road User Safety in All Investments and Projects

The United States Department of Transportation's (USDOT) [National Roadway Safety Strategy](#) (NRSS) (issued January 27, 2022) commits the USDOT and FHWA to respond to the current

¹ <https://www-fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Main/index.aspx>

² <https://cdan.dot.gov/query>

³ <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813266>

⁴ <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813298>

crisis in traffic fatalities by “taking substantial, comprehensive action to significantly reduce serious and fatal injuries on the Nation’s roadways,” in pursuit of the goal of achieving zero highway deaths. FHWA recognizes that zero is the only acceptable number of deaths on our Nation’s roads and achieving zero is our safety goal. FHWA therefore encourages States and other funding recipients to prioritize vulnerable road user safety in all Federal highway investments and in all appropriate projects.

At the core of the NRSS is the adoption of the [Safe System Approach](#), which addresses the safety of all road users, including those who walk, bike, drive, ride transit, and travel by other modes. It involves a paradigm shift to improve safety culture, increase collaboration across all safety stakeholders, and refocus transportation system design and operation on anticipating human mistakes and lessening impact forces to reduce crash severity and save lives. To achieve the vision of zero fatalities and to Build a Better America, vulnerable road user safety should be fully considered in a State’s transportation investment decisions, from planning and programming, environmental analysis, project design, and construction, to maintenance and operations. States should use data-driven safety analyses to ensure that safety is a key input in any decision made in the project development process for all project types and fully consider and improve the safety of all road users, especially vulnerable road users, in project development. FHWA encourages States to use the lessons learned from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment process to also identify policies, rules, and procedures that may be barriers to safe travel by vulnerable road users, and take steps to change them.

Because of the role of speed in fatal crashes, FHWA is also providing new resources on the setting of speed limits and on re-engineering roadways to help encourage safer travel speeds through design. FHWA recommends that States use a Complete Streets Design Model on roadways where adjacent land use suggests that trips could be served by varied modes, and to achieve complete travel networks for various types of road users. A Complete Streets Design Model prioritizes safety, comfort, and connectivity for all users of the roadway, including but not limited to pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities.

Equity

Fatalities impact communities differently, particularly for people not in a vehicle. Bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities are overrepresented for American Indians, Black or African-Americans, and Hispanic or Latinos compared to total bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities.⁵ Therefore, States should ensure that Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessments address equity by considering the impacts to these communities. The BIL provides considerable resources to help States and other funding recipients advance projects that consider the specific circumstances affecting community members’ mobility and safety needs and allocate resources consistently with those needs, enabling the transportation network to effectively serve all community members. FHWA will work with States to ensure the inclusion of project elements that proactively address racial equity, access for elderly people and people with disabilities, workforce development, and economic development, and that remove barriers to opportunity and accessibility, including

⁵ [National Roadway Safety Strategy \(transportation.gov\)](#)

automobile dependence in both rural and urban communities, and which redress prior inequities and barriers to opportunity.

States are responsible for involving the public, including by seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems and underrepresented populations, in transportation planning and complying with participation and consultation requirements in 23 CFR 450.210 and 23 CFR 450.316, as applicable. *Underserved communities* means populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life. Underserved communities include Black, Latino, and Indigenous and Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and other persons of color; members of religious minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; and persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality.⁶

To assist with these public engagement efforts, FHWA expects the State to engage with all impacted communities and community leaders to determine which forms of communication are most effective.⁷ These individuals can provide insight on the unique circumstances impacting various disadvantaged and underrepresented groups so that new channels for communication may be developed. State can then use this information to inform decisions across all aspects of project delivery including planning, project selection, and the design process. This is particularly relevant to the high-risk areas identified as part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment.

Climate Change and Sustainability

The United States is committed to a whole-of-government approach to reducing economy-wide net greenhouse gas pollution by 2030. The BIL provides considerable resources—including new programs and funding—to help States and other funding recipients advance this goal in the transportation sector. In addition, the BIL makes historic investments to improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure, helping States and communities prepare for hazards such as wildfires, floods, storms, and droughts exacerbated by climate change.

FHWA encourages the advancement of projects that address climate change and sustainability. To enable this, recipients should consider climate change and sustainability throughout the planning and project development process, including the extent to which projects align with the

⁶ Executive Order 13985, Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government, 86 FR 7009 (Jan. 25, 2021) <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/>. ⁷ USDOT has published guidance on promising practices that can help USDOT funding recipients meet the requirements of meaningful public involvement and participation. Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making (October 2022), https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-10/Promising_Practices_for_Meaningful_Public_Involvement_in_Transportation_Decision_making.pdf.

⁷ USDOT has published guidance on promising practices that can help USDOT funding recipients meet the requirements of meaningful public involvement and participation. Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making (October 2022), https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-10/Promising_Practices_for_Meaningful_Public_Involvement_in_Transportation_Decision_making.pdf.

President’s greenhouse gas reduction, climate resilience, and environmental justice commitments. In particular, FHWA encourages recipients to fund projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging increases in walking, bicycling, and rolling trips, and that support fiscally responsible land use and transportation efficient design. FHWA also encourages recipients to consider projects and strategies in the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment that address environmental justice concerns.

Guidance

The purpose of this guidance is to clarify the requirements for a Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment as described in 23 U.S.C. 148(l). Specifically, for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, this guidance addresses: (1) schedule and frequency, (2) statutory and regulatory requirements, (3) potential funding opportunities, and (4) the relationship between the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment and other HSIP and vulnerable road user activities.

Per 23 U.S.C. 148(l)(7)(B), FHWA consulted with various States and safety stakeholders in the development of this guidance. Consultation included listening sessions, outreach at meetings and conferences, and a request for information on the implementation of the BIL in the Federal Register.⁸ Public comments received in response are available at www.regulations.gov (Docket No. FHWA-2021-0021). FHWA considered all relevant feedback received in the development of the guidance that is presented below.

Schedule and Frequency

Initial Assessment

All States are required to complete an initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment by November 15, 2023 (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(1)) and include it as part of their State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(13)(G)).

A State’s initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment should be included in its SHSP as an appendix. The outcomes from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment quantitative analysis and program of projects or strategies should be incorporated into relevant SHSP emphasis areas, strategies, and actions, as appropriate, and implemented through State and local planning procedures.

If the State does not plan to publish its SHSP update until after November 15, 2023, the initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment may be included as a separate document (e.g., an addendum) from the existing SHSP. If the initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is included as an addendum, it will still need to be approved by the Governor of the State or a responsible State agency official that is delegated by the Governor (23 CFR 924.9(a)(3)(iv)) and posted to the website along with the SHSP (23 U.S.C. 148(h)(3)).

⁸ 86 FR 68297 (Dec. 1, 2021).

Updates

Each State must update the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment with subsequent SHSP updates. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(5)). States are required to update their SHSP no later than 5 years from the previous approved version. (23 CFR 924.9(a)(3)(i)).

FHWA acknowledges that every State is on a different SHSP update cycle. After a State submits its initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, if its first subsequent SHSP update is published on or before November 15, 2024, the State can confirm that no substantive updates are needed because the information from the initial assessment is still current and then incorporate the initial 2023 Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment as an appendix in their updated SHSP. If the first SHSP update after the completion of the initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is published after November 15, 2024, then FHWA expects the State to update the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment and include it as part of the SHSP update as an appendix. FHWA expects that Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessments will be an iterative process, where agencies will learn and develop a more sophisticated approach over time.

Review

The State shall submit the initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment to their respective FHWA Division Office no later than November 15, 2023, either as part of the SHSP update, or as an addendum to an existing SHSP. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(1)). Per 23 CFR 924.9(a)(3)(iii), FHWA approves the process for the updated SHSP, which includes the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. Therefore, the FHWA Division Office will review the initial Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment to ensure it meets the applicable requirements and approve the process, consistent with SHSP update requirements. The FHWA Division Office may seek input on the Vulnerable Road User Safety assessment from the applicable NHTSA and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Regional offices as part of the review process. In future years, the subsequent Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment will be reviewed and approved as part of the regular SHSP update process approval.

Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

As part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, the State shall use a data-driven process to identify areas of high-risk for vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A)). The State must consult with local governments, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and regional transportation planning organizations that represent a high-risk area (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(4)(B)) and develop a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks to vulnerable road users in areas identified as high-risk (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(B)). Additional information about each of these requirements is provided below.

A template that outlines the suggested content and structure for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is included as an attachment.

Using a Data Driven Process

A Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment includes an assessment of the safety performance of a State with respect to vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(16)). To assess the safety

performance with respect to vulnerable road users, the State must perform a quantitative analysis of vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries that-

- (i) Includes data such as location, roadway functional classification, design speed, speed limit, and time of day;
 - (ii) considers the demographics of the locations of fatalities and serious injuries, including race, ethnicity, income, and age; and
 - (iii) based on the data, identifies areas as “high-risk” to vulnerable road users.
- (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A))

Use of Data

As part of the State’s HSIP, a State shall have in place a safety data system with the ability to perform safety problem identification and countermeasure analysis and to differentiate the safety data for vulnerable road users from other road users. (See 23 U.S.C. 148(c)(2)(A)(vi)). The State shall use the safety data system, and any other relevant data, to perform the quantitative analysis of vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries using, at a minimum, data from the most recent 5-year period for which data is available. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(3)). However, States may consider more years of data. This may be appropriate, for example, when the 5-year sample size is insufficient to distinguish patterns and the facility, adjacent land uses, and traffic volumes have not changed significantly during the longer time period.

The data analysis shall include data such as location, roadway functional classification, design speed, speed limit, and time of day. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A)(i)). Data may also include indicators of where vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries are likely to occur, such as volume data, land use (generators of walking and bicycling trips, such as major activity centers, shopping centers, hotels, schools, residential areas near or adjacent to commercial establishment, transit/bus stops, or employers) and infrastructure indicators of people walking and bicycling (such as sidewalks, transit stops, transit corridors, worn paths that indicate pedestrians are in the area but lack adequate facilities, and bikeways).

States should use the best available data to understand the contributing factors related to vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries. FHWA recommends that States give special consideration to ensure Tribal areas are included in the data analysis. FHWA also encourages States to partner with other agencies to aggregate data sources and supplement existing data collection efforts. For example, partnering with the State Department of Public Health, Department of Emergency Medical Services, and Medical Examiner may provide additional insights on crash outcomes. Local agencies may also have additional data (e.g., travel patterns, pedestrian and bicyclist counts, and other data such as near miss events) that States can include in the quantitative analysis. Transit agencies may have data on transit ridership and facility inventories for pedestrian catchment areas. Transit ridership information is available from FTA’s [National Transit Database \(NTD\)](#) Program, which is the Nation’s primary source for information and statistics on the transit systems of the United States. States that have data integration capabilities will benefit from a more complete understanding of vulnerable road user safety issues.

Consideration of Demographics

The quantitative analysis of vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries shall also consider the demographics of the locations of fatalities and serious injuries, including race, ethnicity, income, and age (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A)(ii)). In addition to demographics of locations, FHWA encourages States to also consider the demographics, including disability status, of the *people* that are killed and seriously injured in traffic crashes, if possible. There are various sources of demographic data, including but not limited to:

- [EJScreen: Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool](#) (EPA)
- [FHWA - HEPGIS Maps: Socioeconomics and Equity Analysis](#) (FHWA)
- [Transportation Disadvantaged Census Tracts \(arcgis.com\)](#) (USDOT)
- [The Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool](#) (CEQ)
- [Social Vulnerability Index](#) (CDC)

Many agencies take demographics into account by integrating equity factors in safety analysis. Examples of agencies that have considered equity in safety can be found in [FHWA's Noteworthy Practices Database](#) (search by topic "Equity in Safety").

Identification of High-Risk Areas

The HSIP requires States to identify hazardous locations, sections, and elements that constitute a danger to vulnerable road users. (23 U.S.C. 148(c)(2)(B)(i)). In addition, as part of the quantitative analysis of vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries, States must identify areas as high-risk to vulnerable road users (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(A)(iii)).

States use various data-driven safety analysis approaches to identify high risk areas for vulnerable road users. States can use their own methodology or adapt other approaches to best meet their needs. These approaches might include:

- [High Injury Network \(HIN\) analysis](#) which includes the mapping of corridors where high numbers of people have been killed and severely injured in traffic crashes. This methodology has been used by Vision Zero cities across the country. A State could also develop an HIN modal subset for vulnerable road users.
- [Predictive safety analysis](#)⁹ which helps identify roadway sites with the greatest potential for improvement and quantifies the expected safety performance of different project alternatives. Predictive approaches combine crash, roadway inventory, and traffic volume data to provide more reliable estimates of an existing or proposed roadway's expected safety performance.
- [Systemic safety analysis](#)¹⁰ or risk-based models, which use crash and roadway data in combination to identify high-risk roadway features that correlate with particular crash types.

⁹ <https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsdp/ddsa.aspx>

¹⁰ <https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/systemic/>

Systemic analysis identifies locations that are at risk for severe crashes, even if there is not a high crash frequency at these locations.

Each State will identify high-risk areas based on the results of their quantitative analysis using the required data and demographics information, as well as consideration of the Safe System Approach. A high-risk area may be a geographic region (e.g., a county or region covered by an MPO), specific facility type (e.g., major arterial), specific location (e.g., a corridor or intersection) or other priority area (e.g., work zones and Tribal areas). The [FHWA Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Website](#) includes a list of Data Tools and Resources that are available to help the State identify high-risk areas for vulnerable road users.

Consultation

States are required to consult with local governments, MPOs, and regional transportation planning organizations that represent a high-risk area. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(4)(B)). Local governments include counties, townships, municipalities, special districts, and other general purpose authorities that are under the jurisdiction of local governments. If a high-risk area is located within Tribal lands, FHWA recommends that States also engage with Tribal Governments. States should also consult with transit agencies if transit stops or stations are located within the high-risk area.

For purposes of a Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, FHWA encourages States to “consult” as provided in the planning process. Per the Transportation Planning and Programming definitions in 23 CFR 450.104, consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with an established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken.

The purpose of the consultation requirement for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is to gain local knowledge and perspective on the factors contributing to the safety concerns at the high-risk areas and to identify potential projects or strategies to improve the safety of vulnerable road users, including their access to transit, in these areas. States may also consult with local governments, MPOs, and regional transportation planning organizations regarding local safety data that may be available to include the quantitative analysis required to identify high-risk areas. These parties may also have insights on policies, rules, and procedures that could be revised to better ensure the consistent consideration of the safety needs of vulnerable road users across all project types.

FHWA also encourages States to consult institutional, advocacy, and community groups, particularly those that represent populations that may be underrepresented based on the demographics of the locations of fatalities and serious injuries. These stakeholders will often have first-hand knowledge of challenges and barriers to walking, biking, and rolling in their communities, and insights for solutions that might work best to reduce vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries given their unique community characteristics.

Each State should establish a process to consult with the various entities that represent a high-risk area. States may leverage existing consultation efforts to gather input from the various government agencies, planning organizations, and stakeholder groups that represent high-risk

areas. This may include road safety audits (RSAs) or consultations performed as part of the regular transportation planning process.

RSAs are a proactive, formal safety performance examination of an existing roadway or future roadway project and its surrounding area. RSAs are performed by a multidisciplinary team independent of the project and use an established process. RSAs consider all road users, account for human factors and road user capabilities, document findings and recommendations in a formal report, and require a formal response from the road owner. RSAs are a tool that can be used to consult with government agencies, planning organizations, and other members of the community to determine contributing factors and potential solutions to address safety concerns in the high-risk areas.

Consultations involved in existing planning processes may also provide insights into contributing factors and potential solutions for high-risk areas identified via the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. The State may have already identified a project or strategy to improve vulnerable road user safety in the identified high-risk areas. States should consult existing planning documents, such as the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan,¹¹ HSIP Implementation Plan, or local road safety plans, to determine if any of the projects in these documents could address the needs identified in the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment.

Program of Projects or Strategies

The Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment shall include a program of projects or strategies to reduce safety risks to vulnerable road users in areas identified as high-risk. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(2)(B)). In developing the program of projects or strategies, the State shall take into consideration the input from the consultation described above, as well as the Safe System Approach. (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(4)). The State should also consider the Complete Streets Design Model, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plans, and other requirements and expectations as they are developing their program of projects and strategies for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. Each of these considerations is described in more detail below.

Safe System Approach

Since the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is part of the State's SHSP, FHWA recommends that States consider additional elements in their Safe System Approach beyond those specified in 23 U.S.C. 148(a)(9). The FHWA encourages States to view a Safe System Approach as –

- aiming to eliminate death and serious injury for all road users;
- anticipating and accommodating human errors;
- keeping crash impact energy on the human body within tolerable levels;
- proactively identifying safety risks in the system;

¹¹ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/safety/public-transportation-agency-safety-program/small-bus-transit#SmallBusApp>

- building in redundancy through layers of protection so if one part of the system fails, the other parts provide protection; and
- sharing responsibility for achieving the vision zero goal of zero deaths and serious injuries among all who design, build, manage, and use the system.

Projects that separate users in time and space, match vehicle speeds to the built environment, and increase visibility (e.g., lighting) advance implementation of a Safe System Approach and improve safety for people that walk, bike, and roll. FHWA encourages States to prioritize countermeasures and strategies as follows to align with the Safe System Approach:

1. Separate users in space (e.g., separated bike lanes, walkways, pedestrian refuge islands)
2. Implement physical features to slow traffic (e.g., self-enforcing roads, road diets)
3. Separate users in time (e.g., leading pedestrian interval)
4. Increase attentiveness and awareness (e.g., crosswalk visibility enhancements, pedestrian hybrid beacons, lighting)
5. Implement speed enforcing strategies (e.g., speed safety cameras)

It is also important to note that issues may vary by area type (e.g., there may be different issues for rural, urban, or suburban areas). States should also consider these potential differences and apply appropriate strategies based on context.

The program of projects or strategies for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment should take into consideration all road users, modes of travel and elements of a Safe System (Safe Roads, Safe Speeds, Safe Vehicles, Safe Road Users, and Post-Crash Care).

Complete Streets

As detailed in FHWA’s recent Report to Congress: “Moving Toward a Complete Streets Design Model,”¹² FHWA encourages States and communities to adopt and implement Complete Streets policies that prioritize the safety of all users in transportation network planning, design, construction, and operations. Section 11206(a) of the BIL defines “Complete Streets standards or policies” as those which “ensure the safe and adequate accommodation of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, children, older individuals, individuals with disabilities, motorists, and freight vehicles.” A Complete Streets Design Model includes careful consideration of measures to set and design for appropriate speeds; separation of various users in time and space; improvement of connectivity and access for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders, including for people with disabilities; and addressing safety issues through implementation of safety countermeasures. Implementation of the model includes systematically changing policies, rules, and procedures to consistently prioritize safety for all users across all project types. By addressing Safer Streets and Safer Speeds, the Complete Streets Design Model serves as an implementation strategy of the Safe System Approach.

¹² FHWA, Moving to a Complete Streets Design Model: A Report to Congress on Challenges and Opportunities, March 2022. <https://highways.dot.gov/sites/fhwa.dot.gov/files/2022-03/Complete%20Streets%20Report%20to%20Congress.pdf>

ADA

The ADA of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities and ensure equal opportunity and access for persons with disabilities. The USDOT's Section 504 regulations apply to recipients of the Department's financial assistance. (*See* 49 CFR 27.3(a)). Title II of the ADA applies to public entities regardless of whether they receive Federal financial assistance. (*See* 28 CFR 35.102(a)). The ADA requires that no qualified individual with a disability shall, because a public entity's facilities are inaccessible to or unusable by individuals with disabilities, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any public entity. (28 CFR 35.149). A public entity's pedestrian facilities are considered a "service, program, or activity" of the public entity. As a result, public entities and recipients of Federal financial assistance are required to ensure the accessibility of pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way, such as curb ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and transit stops in accordance with applicable regulations.

Federal-aid funds are available to improve accessibility and to implement recipients' ADA transition plans and upgrade their facilities to eliminate physical obstacles and provide for accessibility for individuals with disabilities. States should consider their ADA transition plans as they develop their program of projects or strategies as part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. FHWA will provide oversight to State and local agencies to ensure that each public agency's project planning, design, and construction programs comply with ADA and Section 504 accessibility requirements.

Other Requirements and Expectations

Transportation System Access

The program of projects may not degrade transportation system access for vulnerable road users (23 U.S.C. 148(l)(6)). Safety risks to vulnerable road users should not be mitigated through efforts that reduce opportunities for, or the attractiveness of, walking, bicycling, rolling, or accessing transit. In addition, per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Section 6A.01¹³ "the needs and control of all road users through a [Temporary Traffic Control] TTC zone shall be an essential part of highway construction, utility work, maintenance operations, and the management of traffic incidents". Therefore, in carrying out projects States should also avoid temporary degradation of service for vulnerable road users during construction. Further, 23 U.S.C. 109(m) states that "the Secretary shall not approve any project or take any regulatory action under this title that will result in the severance of an existing major route or have significant adverse impact on the safety for nonmotorized transportation traffic and light motorcycles, unless such project or regulatory action provides for a reasonable alternate route or such a route exists."

Access to Transit

Vulnerable road user safety issues are likely to arise near transit stations, bus stops, and other places where transit (bus or rail) operates.

¹³ <https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/hdm/2009/part6/part6a.htm>

FHWA, working with FTA, seeks to help Federal-aid recipients plan, develop, and implement infrastructure investments that prioritize safety, mobility, and accessibility for all transportation network users, including vulnerable road users as well as transit riders, micromobility users, freight and delivery services providers, and motorists.¹⁴ This includes the incorporation of data sharing principles and data management.

FHWA encourages States to consider transit access as they develop the program of projects or strategies for the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. Regardless of how a person began their trip, they walk, bike, or roll to access transit. Transit agencies and roadway owners both play critical roles in improving the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. There are a variety of actions that transit agencies and roadway owners can implement to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists when accessing transit. These actions include designing safe pedestrian and bicyclist routes to transit facilities, as well as locating and designing transit stops and stations to provide safe and accessible facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. These treatments can be combined to maximize benefits to vulnerable road users. For instance, a curb extension can create a protected bicycle facility, reduce crossing distances, and calm traffic. Likewise, a Bus Rapid Transit facility in the center of a roadway can calm traffic, increase transit accessibility, create transit service that is faster, more comfortable, and more reliable, and reduce crossing distances for people crossing a roadway.

MPOs, transit agencies, and States should keep planning as a key element to understand where change and improvements are needed. Road owners such as State, city, and county governments can identify bicycle and pedestrian access to transit needs and potential improvements and document them in a plan or other official document, such as the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. This allows the agencies to act quickly when funding opportunities arise, provide documented support for improvements, and include these improvements when larger projects are implemented.

Projects

FHWA encourages States to consider use of FHWA's [Proven Safety Countermeasures](#) to address high risk areas for vulnerable road users. FHWA also encourages States to include innovative projects and strategies to improve the safety of vulnerable road users. Projects or strategies that include a new traffic control device or a different application of an existing device may require approval from FHWA to experiment with the device or its use. Additional information is available on the MUTCD Experimentation webpage.¹⁵

FHWA does not expect States to have a fully developed project for each identified high-risk area. The Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is a plan to improve the safety of vulnerable road users (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(16)) and must be included in the State SHSP (23 U.S.C. 148(a)(13)(G)). As such, FHWA recognizes that this is a planning level document and additional

¹⁴ FHWA, Improving Safety for Pedestrians and Bicyclists Accessing Transit, https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/ped_transit/fhwas21130_PedBike_Access_to_transit.pdf.

¹⁵ <https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/condexper.htm>

effort will be necessary to further develop the projects and strategies identified in the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment as part of the transportation planning process.

Projects or strategies to improve vulnerable road user safety for the identified high-risk areas will vary depending on the type of high-risk area identified. Examples of different projects or strategies for the various types of high-risk areas include, but are not limited to:

- Geographic Region – City or County - Develop Complete Streets Policy or Plan
- Facility Type – Major Arterial – Install center median island and Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons or Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons at mid-block crossings and ensure speed limits are set appropriately.
- Specific Location – Corridor – Implement RSA Recommendations
- Specific Location – Intersection – Implement protected intersection features
- Priority Area - Work Zones – Develop work zone safety and mobility policy to address vulnerable road users

Potential Funding Opportunities

Development

The development of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment may be financed with HSIP or State Planning and Research (SP&R) funds, subject to that program's eligibility requirements and the cost allocation procedures of [2 CFR part 200](#). (See 23 CFR 924.9(b)).

Implementation

Once the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment is complete, it is imperative that agencies implement the projects and strategies to realize their expected safety benefits. FHWA expects State and local governments to use the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment findings and recommendations to adjust project selection criteria and make other changes to guide investments to improve the safety of vulnerable road users.

The projects and strategies from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment can be implemented through a combination of Federal, State, local, and private funding sources.

These projects may be eligible under the HSIP, either as a highway safety improvement project (23 U.S.C. 148(e)(1)) or specified safety project (23 U.S.C. 148(e)(3)). See the [HSIP eligibility guidance](#) for additional information about specific HSIP eligibility requirements.

States that are subject to the Vulnerable Road User Safety Special Rule under 23 U.S.C. 148(g)(3) may also leverage the funds required to be obligated under that special rule to implement eligible highway safety improvement projects from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. See the [HSIP Special Rules guidance](#) for additional information about this potential funding opportunity.

Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside funds can be used on activities in furtherance of a Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. (23 U.S.C. 133(h)(3)(C)). See the [Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Implementation Guidance](#) for additional information. In addition, HSIP

funds may be credited toward the non-Federal share of the costs of a Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside project if the project is an eligible highway safety improvement project as described in 23 U.S.C. 148(e)(1) and is consistent with the State strategic highway safety plan. (23 U.S.C. 133(h)(7)(B)(i)). Using this provision, States can work with local governments to combine HSIP funds and funds that are set-aside for transportation alternatives projects to cover 100 percent of projects that address bicycle and pedestrian safety on public roads or publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathways or trails.

FHWA maintains a [Pedestrian and Bicycle Funding Opportunities](#) webpage¹⁶ that indicates potential eligibility for pedestrian and bicycle projects under USDOT surface transportation funding programs.

There are also a variety of discretionary grant programs that may provide potential funding opportunities for projects and strategies from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment, such as, the [Safe Streets and Roads for All \(SS4A\)](#) Program, or the [Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program](#). Additional information about these and other USDOT grant opportunities is available at <https://www.transportation.gov/grants>.

Transit Flex

Federal-aid funds can be “flexed” to FTA to fund transit projects for transit agencies. (23 U.S.C. 104(f)). A key goal of the use of Federal-aid funding on transit and transit-related projects is to provide an equitable and safe transportation network for travelers of all ages and abilities, including those from marginalized communities facing historic disinvestment. FHWA encourages recipients to consider using funding flexibility for transit or multimodal-related projects and to consider strategies that: (1) improve infrastructure for nonmotorized travel, public transportation access, and increased public transportation service in underserved communities; (2) plan for the safety of all road users, particularly those on arterials, through infrastructure improvements and advanced speed management; (3) reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and associated air pollution in communities near high-volume corridors; (4) offer reduced public transportation fares as appropriate; (5) target demand-response service towards communities with higher concentrations of older adults and those with poor access to essential services; and (6) consider equitable and sustainable practices while developing transit-oriented development including affordable housing strategies and consideration of environmental justice populations.

Under 23 U.S.C. 104(f) funds eligible for transit projects or transportation planning may be transferred (flexed) to the FTA and administered in accordance with chapter 53 of Title 49, U.S.C., except that the Federal share requirements of the original fund category continue to apply (23 U.S.C. 104(f)(1)). Should a State choose to utilize funds for transit projects, States should work with the FHWA Division Office to flex the funds to FTA to be allocated and obligated to the desired project. Transit projects that are funded with funds made available under Title 23, U.S.C., and are not flexed to FTA, must be administered in accordance with Title 23 and meet all applicable FHWA requirements (23 CFR 1.9(a)).

¹⁶ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/funding/

Relationship to other HSIP and Vulnerable Road User Activities

The HSIP includes several requirements to develop various plans and reports. This section describes the relationship between these activities and the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment.

SHSP and Related Action Plans

All States have an SHSP that identifies safety priorities and strategies for the State. Many States' SHSPs include an emphasis area for certain vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, bicyclists, or other nonmotorized users. These States may have a separate action plan to support implementation of the SHSP strategies for vulnerable road users. States that are an FHWA Pedestrian and Bicyclist Focus State may also have an existing Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. These action plans may serve as the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment if they meet all of the requirements in 23 U.S.C. 148(l), as described in this guidance.

HSIP Implementation Plan

Some States may be required to develop an HSIP Implementation Plan if they do not meet or make significant progress toward meeting their safety performance targets. (23 U.S.C. 148(i)). The HSIP Implementation Plan is a look-ahead document and describes how the State will achieve safety performance targets and long-term safety outcomes in the future. Specifically, the HSIP Implementation Plan includes a summary of the State's available HSIP funding, programs, and anticipated projects for the next fiscal year. All programs, projects, or strategies from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment that will be implemented through the HSIP must also be included in the HSIP Implementation Plan in the year the State will obligate HSIP funds for those projects or strategies. (23 U.S.C. 148(i)(2)(C)).

HSIP Annual Report

All States are required to complete an annual HSIP report that describes the progress implementing HSIP projects over the past year, as well as the effectiveness of previously implemented projects. (23 U.S.C. 148(h)). Any program, project or strategy from the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment that is implemented through the HSIP must also be reflected in the subsequent year's HSIP annual report. (23 CFR 924.15(a)(1)(ii)(B)).

Local Safety Plans

Local agencies or communities may have a local safety plan. Local safety plans come in all different shapes and sizes and might include, for example, a Local or Tribal Road Safety Plan, a Complete Streets Plan, a Pedestrian or Bicycle Master Plan, or a Comprehensive Safety Action Plan developed under SS4A. These local safety plans may address safety, facility plans for vulnerable road users, or both, and should be considered as part of the consultation required for areas identified as high risk for vulnerable road users under 23 U.S.C. 148(l)(4)(B).

Alternatively, if the high-risk area does not already have any such local safety plan, that may be a strategy to consider as part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment.

Questions

If you have any questions or need additional information about Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment or other HSIP requirements, please contact Tamara Redmon

(tamara.redmon@dot.gov or 202-366-4077) or Karen Scurry (karen.scurry@dot.gov or 202-897-7168).

Attachment

- Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment Template

Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment Template

FHWA encourages each State to use the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment Template provided below to ensure all requirements are met and provide all information necessary for FHWA to approve the process as part of the FHWA SHSP process approval. States can also provide additional information to reflect vulnerable road user safety needs and solutions as well.

Overview of Vulnerable Road User Safety Performance

- *Present historical trends for vulnerable road user fatalities and serious injuries over the past five years (or longer).*
- *Disaggregate trends by user type*
- *Compare vulnerable road user safety performance to overall safety performance*
- *Describe progress towards meeting or making significant progress toward meeting safety performance targets for nonmotorized users.*

Summary of Quantitative Analysis

- *Describe data, methodology and time-period of analysis used to identify high-risk areas to vulnerable road users*
- *Describe how demographics were considered as part of the quantitative analysis*
- *Provide a list of the high-risk areas to vulnerable road users identified based on the data and demographics information*

Summary of Consultation

- *Describe the process used to consult with required entities and other stakeholders about high-risk areas*
- *Provide a summary of the outcomes (i.e., safety concerns and potential solutions) of the consultation for each high-risk area*

Program of Projects or Strategies

- *Identify the program of projects and strategies to reduce the safety risks for vulnerable road users in the high-risk areas. States may consider developing an online interactive map identifying high-risk areas and proposed projects or strategies to address them.*

Safe System Approach

- *Describe how the Safe System Approach was considered as part of the Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment. Note: This could be a separate section of the Assessment or integrated throughout as appropriate.*



NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

a program of

NORTHWEST NEW MEXICO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NWRTPO)

Agenda Item #VII: Reports, Updates & Announcements

Subject: Discussion / Presentation Items

Prepared by: Robert Kuipers, NWRTPO

Date: 4/04/23

BACKGROUND

- **Why?** Update RTPO members on news, training, funding, and other items of special interest
- **Purpose.** Keep RTPO members up to date on critical information from NWRTPO and NMDOT sources

Informational Items

Regional News & Updates

- RTPO Monthly Report, Staff hours and Expenditure reports for March, 2023
- Member Reports

Member Special Reports:

- None this meeting

NMDOT Reports:

- G to G Liaison: Neala Krueger
- Tribal Liaison: Ron Shutiva
- District 6: Bill Santiago & staff; District 5: James Mexia or Amanda Nino

News, Training & Funding Opportunities:

- FHWA Planning, Environment & Realty Reports: none
- NMDOT Govt. to Govt. Update: 3/03/23, 3/23/23, 3/29/23
- AASHTO Publications: none
- NMDOT / UNM-LTAP: Provides a very robust collection of training opportunities – staff forward news to members as it comes out from this source – reference at ltap.unm.edu – Online courses notice forwarded to members as LTAP emails come in.
- Title VI Training is available to MPO's and RTPO's from Lisa Neie – Civil Rights Manager for FHWA New Mexico. These trainings can be customized to address member concerns and issues for their regions, if provided to her in advance.
- Email Change Notice from NMDOT: All NMDOT staff emails have changed from @state.nm.us to @dot.nm.gov
- NHI Appraisal Courses 141053 & 141054: These courses provide Right of Way training – 3/2/23
- Tribal Transportation News: 3/6/23
- USDOT News and Funding Opportunities: 3/6/23
- March 6 Grant Advisory: from Senator Heinrich – 3/6/23
- Human Environment Digest: news, training and funding – 3/9/23
- NMDOT – FTP Applications: Listing of TAP & CRP submissions from Shannon Glendenning – incl. 2 from our Mike Sage for Autonomous Commercial Truck & Mobility Complex and Commercial Truck Testing Technology Corridor Complex.
- Federal News on Forthcoming Funding Sources: 3/15/23
- LGRF Reminder from Bill Santiago: 3/15/23
- Electric Vehicle Charging Station Opportunities: 3/30/23

Members please note: none of these documents will be included in the full meeting package due to the physical size and the electronic megabyte size going forward – all of the cited documents have already been emailed in advance of the RTPO monthly meeting to our NWRTPO members. Some of the citations are ongoing from month to month regarding ongoing training or funding opportunities.



A PROGRAM OF Northwest New Mexico Council of Governments

NWRTPO | Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization

Monthly Report – March 2023

- A. 2023-2024 NWRTPO RTIPR Update:** This past year (FFY2021 – 2022) the NWRTPO executed a full Call for Projects which extended from April, 2021 thru March 2022. RTPO members submitted 53 project PFF's and PPF's for our 2021 – 2022 RTIPR update, 49 of which were presented and reviewed by DOT District 6 staff on June 29-30; 4 projects for Northern Navajo were reviewed by DOT District 5. The 2022 RTIPR has a total of \$175,686,550.00 for Roadway, Bridge, Planning, TAP, RTP, FLAP, HSIP, TPF and Transit projects. **The 2023 NWRTPO RTIPR Call for Projects Update commenced in February, 2023 to give our members a head-start; we are encouraging our members to consider and commence developing their priorities for the 2024 round of Transportation Project Fund (TPF) opportunity – full applications due May 31; the 2023-2024 Call for Projects will be completed in March of 2024, with the DOT Dist. 5 & 6 RTIP's. Project Feasibility Forms for previous and new projects are due 4/14/23!!**
- B. NMDOT Transportation Project Fund:** **A new 2024 TPF call for projects was issued with a deadline of May 31, 2023 for project submissions; staff are reminding RTPO members to submit their full applications via the FTP website by/before this deadline.** In 2022 staff cited eight (8) projects proposed from seven (7) of our member governments in our 2022 RTIPR. On August 18, 2022 the NM Transportation Commission awarded seven (7) proposed projects from the NWRTPO, and three (3) projects from the Farmington MPO at a total of \$19,747,334 for our three county region.
- C. MAP funding:** **City of Grants is executing their turn to pursue 2024 Municipal Arterial Funding, and submitted their application by the March 15, 2023 deadline.**
- D. GIS Data Gathering, Trails Development, Mapping and Compiling Work:** COG staff Carrie House continues to provide technical assistance and GIS mapping for development of 200 new miles of recreational trails in the Zuni Mountains in McKinley and Cibola Counties during FFY18 – FFY22; and continues contributing GIS mapping for regional transportation infrastructure. The NWCOG was the only New Mexico recipient of a NADO Impact Award for the ongoing development of 200 miles of recreational trails in the Zuni Mountains of McKinley and Cibola Counties. The Navajo Nation will soon be developing 80 miles of recreational trails in the Chuska Mountain range, complimenting the rec. trails being developed in the Zuni Mtns. The Pueblo of Laguna is developing bike and pedestrian trails connecting all six of their Pueblo Villages.
- E. Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway is Nationally Designated:** President Trump signed the "Reviving America's Scenic Byways Act of 2019" into law re-establishing the Scenic Byway Program. This provided the NWRTPO the opportunity to undertake a demanding process to pursue national designation for parts of our New Mexico TOA byway portion. RTPO and COG staff submitted the 2020 application for national designation for portions of our New Mexico Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway. The entire TOA byway corridor is shared by Counties in the 4-Corners region of Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado; the Utah and Colorado corridors are already nationally designated. **We received news that major portions of our New Mexico corridor are now designated as a National Byway corridor!** With the return of the federal Scenic Byway Program after a multi-year period when the program went away, **we are reconstructing the TOA Byway Council for New Mexico, and undertaking the challenging responsibility shared by participating counties to monitor and improve the national corridor, along with stronger participation in funding the byway, in collaboration with NMDOT staff. Staff submitted an application to update our Corridor Management Plan as the first rendition was done in November, 2008. This was recently awarded for funding in 2024.**
- F. Major Funding from Federal Sources:** The Federal Govt. and USDOT is providing funding for transportation development in billions of dollars – far beyond anything we've ever seen before, in some cases with short application timeframes. Members are encouraged to become familiar with these opportunities and take advantage of them.
- G. News, Training and Funding Opportunities:** The following training and funding opportunities have recently emerged:
- FHWA Planning, Environment & Realty Reports: none
 - NMDOT Govt. to Govt. Update: 3/03/23, 3/23/23, 3/29/23
 - AASHTO Publications: none
 - NMDOT / UNM-LTAP: Provides a very robust collection of training opportunities – staff forward news to members as it comes out from this source – reference at ltap.unm.edu – Online courses notice forwarded to members as LTAP emails come in.
 - Title VI Training is available to MPO's and RTPO's from Lisa Neie – Civil Rights Manager for FHWA New Mexico. These trainings can be customized to address member concerns and issues for their regions, if provided to her in advance.
 - Email Change Notice from NMDOT: All NMDOT staff emails have changed from @state.nm.us to @dot.nm.gov
 - NHI Appraisal Courses 141053 & 141054: These courses provide Right of Way training – 3/2/23
 - Tribal Transportation News: 3/6/23
 - USDOT News and Funding Opportunities: 3/6/23
 - March 6 Grant Advisory: from Senator Heinrich – 3/6/23
 - Human Environment Digest: news, training and funding – 3/9/23
 - NMDOT – FTP Applications: Listing of TAP & CRP submissions from Shannon Glendenning – incl. 2 from our Mike Sage for Autonomous Commercial Truck & Mobility Complex and Commercial Truck Testing Technology Corridor Complex.
 - Federal News on Forthcoming Funding Sources: 3/15/23
 - LGRF Reminder from Bill Santiago: 3/15/23
 - Electric Vehicle Charging Station Opportunities: 3/30/23

**RTPO APER Budgeted Staff Hours Summary
FFY2023**

March Monthly Report											
Function	Budgeted Hours	Q1	Jan. 22	Feb. 22	Mar-22	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total Actual hours	Balance	Percentage budgeted differs from actuals*
1	325	67.00	7.00	15.00	22.50	44.50	0.00	0.00	111.50	213.50	-65.69%
2	75	1.50	2.00	10.00	4.50	16.50	0.00	0.00	18.00	57.00	-76.00%
3	600	78.00	61.00	35.50	58.00	154.50	0.00	0.00	232.50	367.50	-61.25%
4	300	24.00	8.00	37.50	17.00	62.50	0.00	0.00	86.50	213.50	-71.17%
5	425	88.50	42.00	51.50	37.00	130.50	0.00	0.00	219.00	206.00	-48.47%
6	375	102.00	39.50	13.00	52.00	104.50	0.00	0.00	206.50	168.50	-44.93%
TOTAL	2100	361.00	159.50	162.50	191.00	513.00	0.00	0.00	874.00	1226.00	-58.38%

*If budgeted hours differ from actual hours by more than 20% in any function, provide a narrative explanation below

September Q-4 Expenditure Summary
FFY2023

	Q1 Request	Q2 Request	Q3 Request	Q4 Request	Total Budgeted Amount	Requests YTD (incl. current request)	Balance
a. Personnel	\$ 13,373.03	\$ 17,627.41	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 558,758.00	\$ 31,000.44	\$ 27,757.56
b. Fringe Benefits	\$ 3,157.76	\$ 4,261.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,150.00	\$ 7,418.91	\$ 7,731.09
c. Travel & Training	\$ 139.73	\$ 797.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,023.00	\$ 936.73	\$ 4,086.27
d. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
e. Supplies	\$ 614.95	\$ 1,080.22	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,591.00	\$ 1,695.17	\$ 2,895.83
f. Contractual	\$ 2,262.75	\$ 4,875.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,878.00	\$ 7,138.25	\$ 7,739.75
g. Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
h. Other	\$ 2,998.99	\$ 3,535.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,100.00	\$ 6,534.12	\$ 7,565.88
TOTAL	\$ 22,547.21	\$ 32,176.41	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 112,500.00	\$ 54,723.62	\$ 57,776.38
Local Match (20%)	\$ 4,509.44	\$ 6,435.28	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,500.00	\$ 10,944.72	\$ 11,555.28
Federal Share (80%)	\$ 18,037.77	\$ 25,741.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 43,778.90	\$ 46,221.10

Control Number: P621010	Invoice # 476	TOTAL	Local Match (20%)	Federal Share (80%)
Work Authorization (09/30/2020)		\$ 106,250.00	\$ 21,250.00	\$ 85,000.00
Quarter				
Q1 ending 12/31	22,547.21	\$ 22,547.21	\$ 4,509.44	\$ 18,037.77
Q2 ending 3/31	32,176.41	\$ 32,176.41	\$ 6,435.28	\$ 25,741.13
Q3 ending 6/30		\$	\$	\$
Q4 ending 9/30		\$	\$	\$
BALANCE		#VALUE!	\$	#VALUE!

*line items in excess of \$500 require a detailed explanation. Single purchases over \$500 require invoices and proof of payment

Public Notice

May 2022 – April 2023

The Northwest Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NWRTPO) Committee is scheduled to meet as follows. All meetings are open and accessible to the public, as well as virtually offered using Microsoft Teams application. All information is available and updated at: <http://www.nwnmcog.com/rtpo-meetings.html>

Please Note: At the time of publication all tribal locations indicated by * below remain closed to the public due to pandemic.

Wednesday, May 11, 2022 @ Grants Public Library, 1101 N. First Street, Grants, NM

Wednesday, June 8, 2022 @ Gallup Eastside Fire Station, 3700 Churchrock Street, Gallup, NM

Wednesday, July 13, 2022 @ San Juan County Fire Operations Center, 209 South Oliver Drive, Aztec, NM

Wednesday, August 10, 2022 @ NWNM Council of Governments, 106 West Aztec, Gallup, NM

Wednesday, September 14, 2022 @ Cibola County Management Office, 700 E. Roosevelt Ave., Grants, NM

* Wednesday, October 12, 2022 – @ Laguna Public Works Department, I-40 Exit 114 to NM124 Roundabout, then east on Old US66, then left on L55 Rodeo Road, north to first parking lot, Pueblo of Laguna, NM

Wednesday, November 9, 2022 @ McKinley County Office of Emergency Management, 2221 Boyd Ave., Gallup, NM

* Wednesday, December 14, 2022 @ Ramah Navajo Chapter, 434 BIA Rt. 125, Pine Hill, NM
(MP 4.2 south on BIA Rt. 125 from NM53 intersection in Mountain View)

* Wednesday, January 11, 2023 @ Pueblo of Acoma Tribal Auditorium, 33 Pinsbaari Drive, Acoma, NM

* Wednesday, February 8, 2023 @ Ashiwi College & Career Center, 67 Rt. 301 North – off Hwy. 53, Zuni, NM

Wednesday, March 8, 2023 @ NM Department of Transportation District 6 Office, 1919 Pinon Drive, Milan, NM

Wednesday, April 12, 2023 @ Milan Parks & Recreation Office, 409 Airport Road, Milan, NM

Hybrid Meetings can be joined directly or virtually on Microsoft Teams application – contact us for link.

Meetings are scheduled to begin at 10:00am and end when all business is concluded.

The purpose of these meetings is to review, discuss, and take any needed action on transportation issues of importance to the region, which includes Cibola, McKinley, and San Juan Counties. Attendance is welcome from all city, county and tribal governments and stakeholders within the northwest region. Interested citizens are welcome to attend.

For additional information, please contact: RTPO Program Manager Robert Kuipers at Northwest New Mexico Council of Governments, 106 West Aztec, Gallup, NM 87301. Phone: (505) 722-4327

Pursuant to the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, unless compelling reasons dictate otherwise, public meetings and hearings conducted by the RTPO in conjunction with the NMDOT will be held in accessible buildings and are open to the public. Given reasonable notice, interpreters and readers will be available to the hearing and visually impaired, and to those with limited English proficiency. Contact ADA Coordinator, Charles E. Trujillo or current staffer, at NMDOT (505) 470-6739.