

SUMMARY INDEX
SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
February 22, 2010

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
INTRODUCTIONS		
a. Call to Order	Convened at 1:30	1
b. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
c. Approval of Agenda	Accepted as published	2
d. Approval of Minutes		
Jan 11, 2010	Approved as amended	2
Jan 25 2010	Approved as amended	2
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. HSIP Project Submittals	Discussion	2-3
b. Statewide Transportation Plan	Discussion	3-4
c. MTP Progress Report	Discussion	4-6
MPO OFFICER REPORT	None	6
TCC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS	Discussion	6
ADJOURN - Next Meeting: March 22, 2010	Adjourned at 2:45 p.m.	6

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FE MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, February 22, 2010**

INTRODUCTIONS:

a. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Mr. John Romero, Chair at approximately 1:40 p.m., on the above date in the Nambe Room, Community Convention Center, 201 West Marcy Street, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

b. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Romero, Chair – City of Santa Fe
Jon Bulthuis – Santa Fe Trails
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fe County
Shelly Cobau for Jack Kolkmeyer – Santa Fe County
Reed Liming – City of Santa Fe
Jack Valencia for Josette Lucero – NCRTD
Eric Martínez for Chris Ortega – City of Santa Fe
Greg Smith – City of Santa Fe

MEMBERS ABSENT

Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5
Robert Martínez – Santa Fe County
Larry Samuel – Tesuque Pueblo

STAFF PRESENT

Mark Tibbetts – MPO Officer [arriving later]
Keith Wilson – Senior Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

David Quintana – NMDOT
Claude Morelli - NMDOT
Greg White, NMDOT
David Harris - NMDOT

c. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Liming moved to approve the Agenda as presented. Mr. Valencia seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

d. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1. January 11, 2010

Ms. Cobau asked for a correction on page 7, 2nd sentence from the bottom where it should say, "The alignment needed to be looked at."

Mr. Liming moved to approve the minutes of January 11, 2010 as corrected. Mr. Jandáček seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. January 25, 2010

Chair Romero requested the following corrections to these minutes:

On page 6, next to last paragraph should say, "Chair Romero asked Mr. Wilson if the MTP would show publicly funded roads and developer funded roads."

On page 7, second line, should say "If the MPO chose to remove Governor Miles from the MTP according to the resolution, the City would pursue vacating any ROW."

Mr. Liming moved to approve the minutes of January 25, 2010 as corrected. Mr. Valencia seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no communications from the public.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

a. Review and Recommendation of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project Submittals

Mr. Wilson said the MPO failed to send notice for funding and it fell through the cracks. The City application would be due on the 25th and asked if the MPO could give a letter of support for it. Once

approved, it would come back for review.

Mr. Martínez explained that Public Works was planning to submit an application for Airport Road improvements and currently had the design split into 2 phases. They were awarded HSIP funding for FY 2010 The award would cover phase 1. So they were now asking for funds for phase 2 and February 25th was the deadline.

Mr. Wilson said the recommendation of the MPO-TCC would be good to support the application.

Mr. Martínez asked how they would accept a previously funded project.

Mr. Wilson said since it was a second phase it would be okay.

Mr. Martínez moved to recommend Airport Phase 2 for HSIP funding. Mr. Liming seconded the motion.

Mr. Morelli shared a process in another MPO where they got TCC approval and then it went through the COG contingent on having it in the STIP. That would accelerate receiving the funds.

Mr. Martínez amended his own motion to include approval contingent on the STIP. Mr. Liming agreed to the amendment and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Presentation of the New Mexico Statewide Public Transportation Plan – Greg White

Mr. White shared a PPT on the New Mexico Statewide Public Transportation Plan. He said it was one of his responsibilities to share the plan throughout the state.

Most of the slides were chapter headings. This was New Mexico's first statewide strategic plan. He believed planning had an inherent strength and create benefits of economies, cost savings and eliminating redundancies in the plans. It was a nice reciprocal process of reinforcement. The plan was to support regional and local plans. They worked on it for about 4-5 months in a couple of phases. They used this process in previous plans and it was an effective tool.

He briefly went through his presentation, highlighting the salient factors in the plan. The plan was the result of many organizations working together to obtain funding. There were four large centers. RTDs were key to the public transportation plan. They wanted this plan to be transparent. It identified 12 communities - located around the state. Some were going to be fiscally restrained and subject to public policy issues. Providing public transportation in rural areas was a major reason for the plan.

He noted that the plan was on line at NMDOT web site. He asked that the TCC members look through it to prepare recommendations for the Policy Board.

Ms. Cobau recalled he said GRT revenue would aid in funding. She asked if he could you expand on

that. She wondered about the study done before the Rail runner was done and asked if it was separate from GRIP.

Mr. White said GRT was important for funding in the state to keep public transit available. There were also 15 other sources of local funding - some of taxes, some of revenue sharing - quite a list.

Ms. Cobau said with GRT and property taxes depressed it wasn't clear where the money would come from. That could mean longer implementation schedules.

Mr. White said this was a conceptual plan so they didn't say what the precise amounts would require. Secondly, they did not use the TRIP analysis.

Mr. Valencia shared information on GRT projections. The statute allowed up to half cent increase for the RTD and they chose to do only $\frac{1}{8}$ which would provide \$8 million. So there were still \$24 million available for transit.

Mr. Bulthuis asked how the process worked at the MPO level. After the TPB approval in April he asked what would happen at the state level and who would officially endorse the recommendations.

Mr. White said it would all be done by the State Transportation Commission and would be very hands on.

c. Progress Report on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

Mr. Wilson apologized that his sick child prevented him from bringing this report.

Mr. Tibbetts said last time they met staff were just ready to start public meetings. They had less than 50 people who came to the three meetings. The maps that were shown included the County Sustainable Land Development Plan and City collectors were on it based on some of the TCC recommendations. They intended to have one map of future roads for city and county with improvements, extensions, etc. all on one map to be used by future development review processes to eliminate confusion on it. That was their goal. This was an ongoing process for next 3 months. The body of the paper was moving along with editing and rewriting. It would have sections on roads, bikeways and transit to have a coordinated plan as the outcome.

Staff would come back to next meeting which could be the first week of April as a special meeting to get comments.

Staff members were happy to have Tim Rogers helping with bikeways. They would meet with Mr. Bulthuis shortly regarding transit. There were just a few things to work on.

Mr. Wilson reported meeting with District 5 last week on fiscally constrained in order to make assumptions for the next round. Given the needs that were identified our MPO would get more money. The initial outcome of corridor studies would help identify the needs better.

Mr. Morelli asked Mr. Tibbetts if the TCC would review its UPWP in April.

Mr. Tibbetts said they would at the end of March -

Mr. Morelli asked when the public would view the UPWP.

Mr. Tibbetts said it was to be submitted by mid April so they should have a public meeting at the end of March.

Mr. Morelli reminded him that public review was required. He asked Mr. Tibbetts to send him an email on the schedule.

Mr. Liming thought it was a 30 day public process.

Mr. Morelli said it could be 45 days so late March might be too late. It might apply to the MTP also.

Mr. Tibbetts said it would help if the DOT could send him their deadlines.

Mr. Morelli said he had brought this up for almost a year now.

Mr. Tibbetts said they knew the deadline for the MTP was June 21st.

Mr. Morelli felt delivery to the public in late March was too late.

Mr. Bulthuis suggested that staff get the schedule updated for now.

Mr. Valencia said he met with Mr. Tibbetts last week to discuss the Transit Plan. The DOT assisted them in preparing their Plan. This was adopted in October before the GRT election so there were enhancements to it.

Mr. Tibbetts said when he spoke with Phil Gallegos and Miguel Gabaldon; he asked them for a reasonable number on fiscal restraint and was told \$5 to 10 million per year. Santa Fe had never received nearly that much because Farmington got much more. He hoped they could put 100% into implementing the corridor studies with a little bit for these other things.

Mr. Morelli thought Mr. Gallegos was saying the MPO could count of \$5 million and maybe up to 10. He said he needed to review those materials again and what fiscally constrained meant.

Mr. Tibbetts said the extension of Richards Avenue was brought up several times. At the TPB meeting staff was told to include that in their documents. They agreed to take the two extensions out that Councilor Ortiz had requested.

The Committee discussed briefly the items that should be added to the map and commented about traffic modeling scenarios.

Mr. Wilson said it included Las Soleras demographics with 200 park and ride spaces. It would not make a huge impact but it was included.

Ms. Cobau asked if the school district provided the locations of future schools.

Mr. Tibbetts said they knew about Rancho Viejo and Mr. Justin Slater was coming to the meetings for awhile and they were considering giving the school district a seat on the TPB but the school district didn't feel they wanted to do that.

Mr. Smith commented that Las Soleras had one or two schools in their plan.

Mr. Jandáček said it would be helpful to have school district boundaries for that map. Mr. Tibbetts agreed to work on that.

3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Tibbetts had nothing more to report.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Jandáček announced that the County Planning Department was scheduling a series of workshops on the SLDP. The Transportation chapter would be covered on March 17 from 2-4 p.m.

5. ADJOURN - Next TCC meeting: Monday March 22, 2010

Mr. Liming moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Jandáček seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Approved by:

John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer