

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**SFMPO-TCC MEETING**  
**May 23, 2011**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
ROLL CALL	Quorum Present	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved as presented	1-2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES April 25, 2011	Approved as presented	2
1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. 2010-2013 TIP Amendment/Public Review	Approved	2-3
b. 2012-2015 TIP Amendments/Public Review	Approved as presented	2-3
c. Presentation of NM599/CR62 Interchange	Presentations	3-6
d. UPWP Amendment & added funding	Discussion	6
3. MPO OFFICER REPORT	Discussion	6-7
4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS	Discussion	7
5. ADJOURNMENT - Next Meeting: June 27	Adjourned at 3:15 pm	7

**MINUTES OF THE  
SANTA FÉ MPO  
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
May 23, 2011**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

John Romero, Chair - City of Santa Fé  
Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5  
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fé County  
Shelley Cobau for Jack Kolkmeier – Santa Fé County  
Jack Valencia - NCRTD  
Eric Martinez – City of Santa Fé  
Robert Martínez – Santa Fé County  
Tamara Baer for Greg Smith – City of Santa Fé (arriving later)

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Jon Bulthuis – Santa Fé Trails  
Reed Liming – City of Santa Fé  
Vacancy - Tesuque Pueblo  
Vacancy - RPA

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Mr. Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer  
Mr. Keith Wilson, MPO Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Claude Morelli, NMDOT

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Robert Martínez moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Eric Martínez seconded the

**motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 25, 2011**

**Ms. Baer moved to approve the minutes of April 25, 2011 as presented. Mr. Eric Martinez 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 possible action on amendments to the FFY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review**
- b. Review and possible action on amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review**

Mr. Wilson said TPB approved these on May 12. Now they were being put into the STIP cycle so it needed to be approved at the July TPB in order to get into the STIP schedule. Right now they needed to release it for public review and bring it back on June 27 and then to the TPB.

Mr. Tibbetts arrived.

Mr. Wilson handed out a spreadsheet on the changes to 2010-2013 from the shifting of money. The DOT was taking remaining funds for the Cerritos Road interchange and what was left in target funds to make up the costs for the 599/62 interchange.

Mr. Gallegos said there would be an out of cycle STIP amendment in July for the federal FY closeout.

Mr. Wilson explained the changes to the interchange schedule that moved to FY 2012. It was the same for Las Soleras station. That station was contingent on the state office building being located there.

Ms. Baer asked about the Rail Runner Phase II.

Chair Romero said that was just changes in funding schedule.

Mr. Robert Martinez asked if the developer had put up the bond on Jaguar.

Mr. Gallegos didn't think so.

Ms. Baer said they ran into utilities located in the row and decided to lengthen the bridge instead of moving the utilities.

Mr. Gallegos said the development didn't want to move ahead until the City approved it.

Mr. Robert Martinez was concerned that he had sufficient funding.

Mr. Gallegos said it required a 3-party agreement of developer, City and DOT.

Mr. Wilson said for the new TIP he just did the summary table - moving those projects into 2012. They needed to concur with the amendments.

Mr. Robert Martinez asked about the PIFs that were submitted in March.

Mr. Wilson said they created Appendix A that had the list of those projects that didn't get funded. If and when more funding comes available, they would be open for consideration. The MPO could accept PIFs at any time.

Mr. Eric Martinez asked if this needed to be approved for public review.

Mr. Wilson said it did and it was now to move the projects to the amendment cycle.

**Mr. Valencia moved to approve the amendments to the FFY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review. Mr. Eric Martinez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous.**

**Mr. Valencia moved to approve the amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review. Mr. Eric Martinez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**c. Presentation of the proposed design for the NM599/CR62 Interchange**

Mr. Gallegos showed the power point on the interchange project. It was condensed from the one shown to TPB. CR 62 ranked as the highest priority. They would use a diamond interchange with roundabouts over NM599 within existing ROW. 599 would be lowered 10-12 feet to accommodate the overpass with proper slopes. The drainage design would work. It would be bid in October with a notice to proceed in December. Construction would start in the spring of 2012 and have substantial completion in fall. To see it, go to [www.nmshld.state.nm.us/](http://www.nmshld.state.nm.us/) - click on NMDOT projects, scroll to District 5 and click on NM599.

Ms. Baer asked if the drainage was piped. Mr. Gallegos said it was not.

Mr. Jandáček asked about sight lines.

Mr. Gallegos said the design meets requirements for sight lines at 15-20 maximum mph. He said it had been fast tracked and DOT could provide him a set of plans.

Mr. Robert Martínez asked for the plans to be forwarded to him and he would distribute them.

Ms. Cobau asked how far back the grade change would start.

Mr. Gallegos said it was to be 1/4 mile.

Chair Romero asked who would be responsible for the overpass.

Mr. Gallegos said the NMDOT would be and the lighting agreement would be with the County.

Chair Romero said this was in the phase 2 annexation to the City. It would happen in about a year.

Mr. Gallegos said the DOT should do the agreement with the City.

Mr. Robert Martínez noted that it was specified with LED lights.

Mr. Gallegos said they needed to talk about the specs. Ramps and roundabouts would be lighted.

Chair Romero asked about detours.

Mr. Gallegos clarified that they would build the ramps first and then detour to connect the ramps so they could maintain traffic.

Ms. Cobau wondered how long two lanes would handle the traffic. What was the TIA?

Mr. Gallegos said they used a 20-year horizon. There wouldn't be sidewalks but space available for them. They would need the TIAs for it. The development would have to be designed for expansion with paved shoulders.

Ms. Baer asked what was in the middle of the roundabout.

Mr. Gallegos said it could be landscaped in the future. It was not paved.

Ms. Baer asked who was designing the bridge.

Mr. Gallegos said it was On-Call Bridge Consultants. It would be beautiful. They were trying to

incorporate some type of art work and would consult with TPB. Bill Hutchinson was the consultant. There was a lot of area for art work.

Mr. Jandéček announced that this morning they opened South Meadows and it has 8' wide shoulders like this one would have. The County facility was an excellent bicycle route. He was concerned about accommodating bikes on the roundabout.

Mr. Gallegos said they were the same as around the country. They could ride or dismount. They should be fine for experienced cyclists. They had a brochure on how to drive roundabouts and do public outreach to bicycle community. The roundabouts didn't have any special design for bikes. The design would allow for future pedestrian facilities.

Chair Romero said the City code required sidewalks. The bridge must have them and along the route.

Mr. Gallegos thought they would most likely have to do a sidewalk on one side only and have a bicycle lane on the other. This design eliminates needed space for left turns.

Chair Romero said the City stands on multi-modal and has for the last 5 years.

Mr. Gallegos thought it would be a deal breaker. They would have to add a 10' width. He said he would take that back to the team.

Mr. Valencia commented that no one raised a red flag at Council or Commission meetings last week.

Mr. Gallegos thought it could be added on later.

Mr. Wilson asked if they could do cantilevers. Mr. Gallegos hoped so.

Mr. Gallegos said they were very far along in the bridge design and had focused on this being a County facility. They could end up with no STIP with the sidewalk requirement there.

Ms. Baer was aware of a commercial development on the southwest corner and a 200 apartment complex that would go up nearby.

Mr. Gallegos said there were no sidewalks at the roundabouts. He preferred to come back with pedestrian facilities later. The specs were to design it so that sidewalks about be added later. The thought the project could be done later as an enhancement for pedestrian compliance.

Mr. Tibbetts asked if they should shift funds from the Cerrillos Road project and be placed here.

Mr. Gallegos agreed to talk with the project engineers.

Ms. Baer thought they could do a redesign in less than a month

Mr. Gallegos said if they couldn't do it now, then it couldn't be in the 2012 TIP. They only had 3 months to do it. Extra closeout money would come here for this project but if not, they would lose that money.

Chair Romero wanted it on the record that the City should be consulted as early as possible to avoid this kind of situation.

#### **d. Discussion on additional Federal Planning Funding and amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program**

Mr. Tibbetts said they had an additional \$84,000 with \$16,000 local match and considered using it for additional transit studies. \$60,000 was designated for it in the budget. It depended on the scope. They were looking at strategic changes and funding for public transit. Nothing was set yet. He would bring to TPB in July and to TCC at the end of June.

Mr. Eric Martinez asked how the study came out.

Mr. Tibbetts knew it was underfunded. Several people said \$200,000 was the minimum required. They were open for options, however.

Mr. Eric Martinez asked about a pedestrian plan.

Mr. Tibbetts said that probably won't work but they had to put it someplace.

Mr. Wilson said they had funds for consultant services.

Mr. Wilson thought it would be a long process. After it was updated, they would get new census data.

Mr. Tibbetts thought it would take a couple of years to get a decent model. Nothing was hard and fast on it. They would get TCC approval first before amending the UPWP, perhaps at the July meeting.

Mr. Valencia said since the GRT came through, there needed to be a comprehensive inclusion of all the parties involved to have a seamless plan. There was a lot of provincialism out there.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed and with the price of gas, people were looking for alternatives. It would enhance the pedestrian plan because transit users were pedestrians.

### **3. MPO OFFICER REPORT**

Mr. Tibbetts said staff was working now on tax delineation software. They paid for it in 2007 and used the US census based information for MPOs. The information was tied to the census data. The architecture was based on 2006-2008. They had been handing out portions of the safety plan. There was only \$60

million available for the whole country. The proposal was due by 27<sup>th</sup> so they only had a week to do it.

Mr. Robert Martinez was told the projects were to be shovel ready.

Mr. Gallegos said the criteria said "built within a year." So there was a little bit of time. They were looking at things that were already developed or could be developed quickly.

Mr. Tibbetts said the Capital City Design grants were another possibility. They send a design team to each city and then use it as a model. It was not money but a team of people who come to assess plans.

There would be a meeting at 4:00 with the County regarding impact around SFCC roads network. This was for the NE and SE connector.

Mr. Wilson said they were updating the bikeways map, expanding out from city. They were also moving along with the Bicycle MP and putting together a review team composed of city and county.

MPO Staff had been asked to help with Zia Station public meetings. They had a conceptual plan for parking and sidewalks and were awaiting city approval. It went through Public Works and now to Finance.

Mr. Tibbetts announced the MPO got the self-certification from DOT.

#### 4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

There were no communications from TCC members.

#### 5. ADJOURN - Next TCC Meeting - Monday, June 27, 2011

Mr. Valencia moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gallegos seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer