SUMMARY INDEX SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE May 3, 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	Approved as presented	2
d. Approval of Minutes		
March 22, 2010	Approved as presented	2
March 29, 2010	Approved as presented	2
April 5, 2010	Approved as presented	2
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. 2010-2013 TIP Amendment	Recommended	2-4
b. Draft MTP Presentation	Discussion	4-6
MPO OFFICER REPORT	Discussion	6
TCC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS	None	6-7
ADJOURN - Next Meeting: May 24, 2010	Adjourned at 2:45 p.m.	7

MINUTES OF THE SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE MONDAY, May 3, 2010

INTRODUCTIONS:

a. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Mark Tibbetts in the absence of Chair John Romero at approximately 1:30 p.m., on the above date in the Coronado Room, Santa Fe Community Convention Center, 201 West Marcy, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

b. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT

Shelley Cobau for Jack Kolkmeyer – Santa Fe County
Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fe County
Reed Liming – City of Santa Fe
Joseph Martínez for Robert Martínez – Santa Fe County
Larry Samuel – Tesuque Pueblo [arriving later]
Greg Smith – City of Santa Fe

MEMBERS ABSENT

John Romero, Chair – City of Santa Fe Jon Bulthuis – Santa Fe Trails Jack Valencia for Josette Lucero – NCRTD Eric Martínez for Chris Ortega – City of Santa Fe One Vacancy - RPA

STAFF PRESENT

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Claude Morelli - NMDOT Mike Gomez Rick Devine

c. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Liming moved to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Cobau seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

d. Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 22, 2010, March 29, 2010 and April 5, 2010

March 22 -

Ms. Cobau moved to approve the minutes of March 22, 2010 as presented. Mr. Liming seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

March 29

Mr. Liming moved to approve the minutes of March 29, 2010 as presented. Ms. Cobau seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

April 5

Mr. Smith moved to approve the minutes of April 5, 2010 as presented. Mr. Liming seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Samuel arrived at this time.

1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no communications from the public.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

a. Review and Recommendations on the Amendment to the 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Plan (NM599/Jaguar Drive Interchange)

Mr. Wilson didn't know how much detail to provide. He handed out two maps on the Jaguar interchange. It came to MPO because of its regional significance and had to be in the TIP and MTP. This location was identified in the 1980's and the ROW was secured but it was never built because it had a low ranking in the 599 study. So taking advantage of a private developer's funding was advantageous. Also Jaguar was an arterial roadway. There was a section on the west to connect to Aviation Drive. The

project cost was \$9.6 million.

The developer was getting the agreement with City and State. The City would take over the bridge and roadways and the State would take the on-off ramps. This would go to TPB on May 13. The State Transportation Committee meets on May 20. Mr. Gallegos concurred.

- Mr. Liming noted the project was approved for annexation and zoning last week.
- Ms. Cobau asked if part of it was going into county jurisdiction. There was secondary access down there.
- Mr. Gomez said it was just a portion of the property. The connection would be to the frontage road and possibly a future overpass from the corridor study. They were providing the ability to do that at some point.
 - Ms. Cobau asked if it was grade separated.
 - Mr. Gallegos said it was similar to what had been proposed.
- Mr. Wilson said the project had been out for comment since March 23rd and received no comment. It was also on the web site.
- Mr. Smith asked if the access would also be on the east side toward Tierra Contenta.
 - Mr. Wilson agreed.
- Mr. Liming moved to recommend to the TPB that the Jaguar interchange be on the TIP. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.
 - Mr. Gallegos asked for an update on the schedule.
- Mr. Gomez said the design was awaiting this approval and the City's. they had 20% of the design done and were going forward on the geo-technical and the underground utilities. Then they would get permits for exploratory work. The groundbreaking date was April 15, 2011. They were using the same aesthetic treatment as Ridgetop Road and would go to the Arts Committee for recommendations on colors.
- Mr. Wilson noted that it had been anticipated to have groundbreaking in FY 10. He asked if that made a difference.
 - Mr. Gallegos said it would as they only did quarterly amendments.
 - Mr. Gomez suggested they could start construction earlier on it, depending on

approvals and the weather. He didn't know how long it would take for Public Works, Finance and City Council. He also had to take it to Airport Committee and Arts Commission.

- Mr. Gallegos said it would be FY 11 then.
- Ms. Cobau asked if there were any approvals needed from DOE.
- Mr. Gallegos said the bridge clearance and DOT would take care of that.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Presentation of the Preliminary DRAFT Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

Mr. Tibbetts handed out the preliminary draft of the MTP. This version was "preliminary draft" meaning it had a few gaps and placeholders. It was a document to be commented on until finished. He pulled some sections off where they would see blanks or minimal amounts and were not finalized. The most major parts were there.

They were going through repackaging. It had the basic information. It would be refined this week to get comments from the Committee and would be on the web site next Monday. The maps would become 11x17 foldouts.

The other information had been discussed previously. They were still working on final fiscal constraint for the projects and that would be done by next Monday.

The first section was the introduction and listed the requirements and factors and guiding principles. The next was public participation section. The table of contents was not quite in sync.

They had meetings on the 11th and 12th at the Library and SFCC. ON the 13th they would have a public meeting at the TPB.

The third section was on network transportation facilities. It started on page 11 and went through the different issues involved with investments in the facilities. Bridge improvements would have short term, mid range, and long term. It would take the short term up to 2020 and anticipated funding on those. They tried to be all-inclusive here and determine what was more significant than others. That was on pages 20-23.

Mr. Wilson explained that they highlighted the changes and indicated the source of these projects on the right hand column as well as time frame and reports. He asked member to let them know what was not clear but to not be too concerned with format now. Ideas for formatting were welcome. Any ideas for recommendations were appreciated too.

Mr. Tibbetts went on to page 24. They broke this down into passenger rail service, transit services and inter-modal. The transit centers were at Sheridan and Santa Fe Place. The train stations could be centers and the Railyard. Plan was for a \$5 million center at Guadalupe and Montezuma. Intermodal had a section on bikeways. Airport facilities were shown too. The FAA dealt mostly with that but they put it in here because of the comments from people that there was no bus services there.

Tim Rogers put together the bikeways and trails section. The Pedestrian Plan was on page 46.

The Mayor's Committee on Disability was working on a grant and ADA cuts and crosswalks were being put in. They were trying to have city and county work together on safe routes to schools.

The last section was Transportation System Management and it was yet to be added.

Mr. Tibbetts said the goals really had not changed since the last one five years ago.

Mr. Liming asked if it would have a map in front of this table. Mr. Tibbetts agreed and it would show both projects that were fiscally constrained to 2020.

Mr. Wilson handed out a revised Road Network Map with a project at Caja del Rio with bike lanes. That project was part of a 2008 bonds issue so they would call it programmed. It was funded. Another went over to Airport Drive on the west side of 599. It didn't need to be included in fiscal constrained. The other was on Highway 14 which was approved for design. He asked Ms. Cobau if any impact fees were available.

Ms. Cobau said \$2.4 million had been set aside. She thought that would cover them so it could be changed to programmed. It was private/public and getting ready to be released for bids. Robert Martínez was in charge of it.

- Mr. Gallegos said he needed to hear from Mr. Martínez because they were thinking of funding some of the improvements along Hwy 14.
 - Mr. Liming asked if Richards was a study.
- Mr. Wilson said it was originally but after the white paper, it was determined to no longer be a study and moved up as a recommendation. The other section to the north was still unclear.
- Ms. Cobau referred to page 15 on the projects of Siler and West Alameda and asked if they would be modified to include the improvements on Siler Road.
 - Mr. Wilson said this was basically just a snapshot.
 - Ms. Cobau said it seemed important for them to know the impact but maybe it was too early.
 - Mr. Wilson said they would know more in about it in six months. Once they got the numbers, they could

bring it.

Ms. Cobau thought it might be important in the decision making process.

Mr. Wilson said it was part of the UPWP. He recommended they digest it and give comments back - first brush comments, etc.

Mr. Tibbetts asked them to keep in mind that the 30 day period would begin after this week and the final draft would come to TCC beforehand.

Ms. Cobau said for the transit information it would be helpful to know the cost per person or passenger.

Mr. Tibbetts said the ridership per route they had for Santa Fe Trails.

3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Wilson reminded them that last week he emailed the Tiger 2 grant information. There were a couple of questions from the City and one from Mr. Jandáček and he talked with Mr. Morelli about giving a brief overview of the program. He scanned through the document and application.

Mr. Morelli explained that the Tiger 2 was \$500 million nationally. It was another competitive grant program based on several criteria. There were set asides for rural at \$150 million and also planning funding. The evaluation criteria were summarized and it was in the Federal Register. It was not an easy application to fill out but the planning grants were easier. Also HUD had a challenge grant of \$40 million. HUD, DOT and EPA were thinking of combining them. Mid Region was probably applying for HUD. This was an 80/20 split unless it was rural (which was 100% federal).

Mr. Wilson asked if the preapps were due in June. Mr. Morelli said in July.

Ms. Cobau asked about the remaining money left over from South Meadows.

Mr. Wilson said it was because it would be finished and paid for long before they thought. So in the fall they had to do a new update and at that time would decide on it.

Mr. Gallegos agreed the MPO needed to decide where to put that money. Next spring they would formulate a new stipulation.

Ms. Cobau was hoping for Rabbit Road as a priority.

Mr. Tibbetts said they were working with the County and SFCC on a meeting to look at the road access to SFCC and how it might change or modify the road network and to prioritize those changes. Part of it was catalyst for the bond next fall for improvements to the SFCC. They would use a portion of it to

have access to a connection with Rabbit Road. They were concerned with not having a second entrance and didn't like the first one.

Mr. Wilson said the purpose of that Task Force, made up of City, County and neighbors was to brainstorm to find the best solution. The public meetings would be May 11 at SFCC, May 12 at the Library to cover the plan and then the TPB on the 13th. They would also set up a table at Community Days.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

There were no communications from TCC Members.

5. ADJOURN - Next TCC meeting: Monday, May 24, 2010

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

	Approved by:	
Submitted by:	John Romero, Chair	
Carl Boaz, Stenographer		