

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**August 23, 2010**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
INTRODUCTIONS		
a. Call to Order	Convened at 1:30	1
b. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
c. Approval of Agenda	Accepted as published	1
d. Approval of Minutes – August 2 2010	Approved	2
1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. 2010-2035 MTP Draft	Discussion	2-6
3. MPO OFFICER REPORT	Discussion	7
4. TCC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS	Discussion	7
5. ADJOURN - Next Meeting: Sept 27, 2010	Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.	7-8

**MINUTES OF THE  
SANTA FE MPO  
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, August 23, 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 1:30 p.m., on the above date in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, 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 [arriving later]  
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fe County  
Reed Liming – City of Santa Fe  
Eric Martínez – City of Santa Fe  
Larry Samuel – Tesuque Pueblo  
Greg Smith – City of Santa Fe

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Shelley Cobau for Jack Kolkmeier – Santa Fe County  
Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5  
Robert Martínez – Santa Fe County  
Jack Valencia for Josette Lucero – NCRTD  
One Vacancy - RPA

**STAFF PRESENT**

Mark Tibbetts – MPO Officer

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Claude Morelli - NMDOT  
Ken Vellon  
Fred Pearson

**c. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Mr. Jandáček moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Martínez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

d. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM August 2, 2010**

Mr. Smith moved to approve the minutes of August 2, 2010 as presented. Mr. Samuel 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. **Presentation of review draft of the 2010-2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan**

Mr. Tibbetts presented the draft MTP for the Committee and explained that this version was updated last Thursday afternoon. A new version would be coming out tomorrow and would be on the web no later than Wednesday and sent as a PDF document to each member.

It was about a 4mb file in PDF format. It was getting closer to what it would ultimately look like. Changed to 12 point and adding more photos today. The graphics would help break up the massive verbiage. They added an executive summary that was more like a preface. They talked about using it for the opinion page as notification of the public meetings now scheduled for September 14 at the downtown library and September 16 at SFCC. He was looking for one more location – the Nancy Rodriguez Center at 599.

It would be made available next Monday (30) and presented to TPB on September 9<sup>th</sup> – (the night of Zozobra) for a total of four public meetings. They sent out notices to all HOAs and made it available to them, as well.

They did get some comments already from the outreach effort so far. Not much of it was in substance but mostly emphasizing bicycle and pedestrian safety and one neighborhood asking for a cul de sac to not allow through traffic.

It had not changed much since the last meeting but had added emphasis on finances in Chapter 7 (page 135). It emphasized fiscal constraints and as well as higher construction costs and increases in revenue from federal funding sources.

They projected no change in project costs until 2014 and from then on have increased costs of 4% each year. More than likely demand would go up for supplies.

The fiscal constraint plan was on page 142. He presented this to the TPB and thought it included the matrix that was done like a Consumer Reports ranking. It was on page 120. These were based on the various fields (listed). The legend was on page 117.

These were just roadway projects so it would have a similar matrix for bikeways and transit priorities.

The scores came out a little different than in June.

Mr. Gallegos said NMDOT put CR 62 @ 599 as their top project.

Mr. Jandáček wondered if anything would be included to explain what the ranking reasoning was and a disclaimer that just because a project was down the list it still might be recommended in the final ranking.

Mr. Tibbetts said this was just ranking based on the numeric scoring but any of the 27 projects could be funded. This was consistent with the plan. This was objective and not politically based. They were only showing fiscal constraint up until 2020. They were guessing on costs and projecting it seven years beyond the TIP seemed reasonable. So they would put that language in here. They didn't have any assurance of funding but the list needed to help inform the next TIP and having it out to 2020 would help do that.

This version tried to meet the various criteria. They met with various people to take comments and clarify it as much as possible. They did receive comments on the trail. The Transit Section included rail.

Mr. Bulthuis arrived at this time.

Mr. Tibbetts said those were the changes since the last TCC meeting.

Chair Romero noted this ranking seemed to differ a lot from the DOT rankings.

Mr. Tibbetts explained the way they did it was if there was an identified safety issue or a major safety issue it was a priority.

St. Francis was a major freight corridor and the most principal arterial in SF. The NE Connector, on the other hand was a 7 and ranked 19<sup>th</sup> because it didn't have identified crash data. This matrix showed consistency with the plan.

Mr. Liming suggested that should be made clear in the plan.

Mr. Bulthuis agreed.

Mr. Liming felt it was a little tricky to have this in here and have to explain why this was the ranking.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed. This was a recommendation from staff and at the next level was a recommendation from TCC.

Mr. Liming asked if he was asking the TCC to score this separately.

Mr. Tibbetts said if the TCC wanted to move a project up, staff would have to review it and have a rationale for that.

This wouldn't be presented until September 27<sup>th</sup> to TCC. Any workshop before the 27<sup>th</sup> was fine. They would present the public comments by the 24<sup>th</sup>.

He noted there was nothing specific called out in the St. Francis/Cerrillos Road intersection. The merge

southbound onto St. Francis was ranked ... The estimate was about \$1 million.

Chair Romero asked where the justification on time frame was presented.

Mr. Tibbetts said the choices were less than 5 years or 5-10 years. He briefly explained the factors in them.

Chair Romero asked if next time, they should all have their red lines. If it had an overall ranking and then they didn't follow it, he wondered what the purpose was.

Mr. Liming commented that no matter how much they tried objectively to set up a system, it just didn't work completely.

Chair Romero said it could be a lot of fine tooth arguing. He asked if they could be put in tiers instead of individual rankings.

Mr. Tibbetts said this arrangement was about consistent with the plan. In the time frames, they could use tiers and make it more inclusive. The real ranking would take place in the TIP.

Mr. Jandáček agreed with Chair Romero about tiers but there also needed to be a clearer explanation of the rankings. There probably needed to be some documentation on why they were ranked as they were. Also, these criteria were not equally rated. Funding would take precedence over the rest.

Mr. Tibbetts said they tried to make them all equal at this point. When they saw anomalies that wouldn't complete they could choose a different order. This showed that they were trying to achieve some of them. The public needed to see the higher ranking projects.

Chair Romero thought this was a very good first attempt. Any ranking done should be useable. Cerrillos Road construction was pretty fair. It could be phased.

Mr. Tibbetts said it was not planned to be phased.

Mr. Jandáček asked about removing costs from this list if the project showed a different purpose.

Mr. Tibbetts clarified that because it might have lower reading on others that it balanced it out.

Chair Romero thought it was more likely that higher priced projects would be dinged.

Mr. Martinez suggested maybe they shouldn't call it a priorities list. Maybe they should take a step back and look at it that way. He felt the committee's individual review needed to disregard cost.

Mr. Liming felt they were going through so many mental gymnastics here and staff had done a lot of work on it.

Mr. Tibbetts said they had to get to a certain point. The cost column was to help guide the process. The Guadalupe Bridge was on the list and he asked if it included the merge lanes or just the bridge.

Mr. Liming agreed that it needed to be clear in the plan what they were working for. Assuming the public was going to read it he asked where the public should be directed.

Chair Romero asked what purpose the priority ranking served if they were not going to use it. Maybe the criterion to choose CR 62 over St. Francis might mean that there was a factor they were not considering.

Mr. Liming thought the TCC should put on the rankings based on the money available under fiscal constraint.

Mr. Tibbetts thought it was professional judgment and he might point it out on a narrative.

Mr. Morelli said DOT didn't write this plan but he asked for an executive summary on the key issues and how the plan would address those issues. He suggested it be about ten pages long. That was what DOT was hoping to see.

Mr. Tibbetts asked how one would decide which one was safer. They were anticipating more conflicts at CR 62. They knew CR 62 was high on the list and if they had to change the MTP that was fine. What actually got built depended on several circumstances. But they didn't want to have to change the plan constantly.

Chair Romero said that was why he mentally reshuffled these. The scales were very black and white. Maybe they needed a scale of 0-5.

Mr. Tibbetts said the only negative effect was on Richard's Avenue.

Mr. Martinez said considering fiscal constraint, the top project might not even be on there. Maybe it should just identify which projects would have the greatest effect.

Mr. Tibbetts clarified that the Consumer Report would be for the public. Just to be transparent, he thought they should provide the explanation.

Mr. Liming asked how many were within fiscal constraints of the top ten.

Mr. Tibbetts thought maybe the top eleven all were.

Chair Romero recommended getting rid of the numbers and just use the Consumer Reports symbols. He thought that would help.

Mr. Liming agreed and it also would give folks a chance to not get hung up on the rankings and the TCC could discuss what was in and what dropped out.

Chair Romero agreed.

Mr. Liming thought if they used a tier it would be easier.

Mr. Tibbetts said the TCC had a chance on what finally would go in the TIP.

Mr. Morelli suggested if they did tiers, then just put them in alphabetically and the cost would show what was in the top tier and the time frame.

Mr. Tibbetts said what they put in on the time frame was very similar to this list. Those urgently needed should be in the top ten.

Mr. Morelli asked if they were you going to combine this table with the fiscal constraints.

Mr. Tibbetts said they would pull the most urgent from this list (top ten).

There seemed to be a consensus that it should not be a numerical sequence.

Mr. Martinez said it wouldn't pigeonhole the TCC into a ranking for fiscal constraints.

Mr. Tibbetts said the MPO had been led to believe they would get \$400,000 for bicycles and trails. There could be funds available for transit so we could do Tier One bike ways, Tier One transit and Tier One roadways. There was also \$5 million at the Railyard. It was in the development stages at least for design.

Mr. Bulthuis noted that the financial amounts varied from table to table.

Mr. Tibbetts explained they were using 2010 funds for those projects but from 2014 on, those projections were for 2014.

Mr. Morelli asked if they were midpoint values.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed. The actual costs would be less or more, depending on when they were put on the TIP. They rewrote that section last week and made sure that was on it.

Mr. Pearson commented that Mr. Martinez came up with a solution he had in mind. The ranking numbers implied more conflict so he was going to suggest eliminating the scoring column but this sounded good.

Mr. Tibbetts summarized that they would show for public review the Consumer Report matter and the list would be consistent with fiscal constraint. The TCC wouldn't meet again until Sept 27<sup>th</sup> at the end of public review and then would start working on it. He agreed to have it posted by Wednesday.

Mr. Morelli referred to a table on page 101 and asked that it have the 2010 shown on top. Mr. Tibbetts agreed.

Mr. Tibbetts asked Mr. Bulthuis for the costs for transit centers. Mr. Bulthuis agreed to give them.

Mr. Liming asked about the table on page 99ff.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was the result of the corridor studies and he would check on those again.

Mr. Morelli and Mr. Liming suggested entitling the table "state corridor results."

### 3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Tibbetts said they had the public meetings scheduled. The next was September 9 at TPB and it was released at the web site. The meeting on September 14 would be at the downtown library and on the 16<sup>th</sup> at SFCC. Another location on September 15 or 19 would be at the Rodriguez Center. They would be open houses.

Mr. Pearson noted that the financial section said something about the illustrative project list but he didn't find that list.

Mr. Tibbetts said it was the three tiers by project years.

Mr. Liming noted it was on page 148.

Mr. Tibbetts said they were still viable projects and could move up but they were large expensive projects. Rabbit Road was more expensive because of the requirement for on/off auxiliary lanes at St. Francis. That would act as an access road and if it didn't go through Oshara, more people would use it.

### 4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Martinez commented regarding the I-25 replacement of bridges. Comparing the bridge ratings, they were close – in the high 80's. If they could be wrapped up in one package, it would be better.

Mr. Jandáček said the County met this morning to discuss the MOU the County had with NMDOT and looking at how the cost of the NE connector might be paid for. The NE Connector was shown as a developer led project but it would actually be a public funded project. The connection between Rabbit Road and Richards would also be a public agency project. It was turned over to the bank. The County most likely would not be able to discuss it but would request to meet with the DOT Engineer on it.

Mr. Tibbetts said the MOA was to build that frontage road according to frontage road standards. That would have to be discussed and look for federal funds.

Chair Romero asked if that would be an amendment after adoption of this MTP.


Mr. Tibbetts said not necessarily. It was in the list of priority projects. There was some urgency of need, dependent on SFCC enrollments. That would be a TIP discussion.

### 5. ADJOURN – Next TCC Meeting: September 27, 2010

Mr. Samuel moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Liming 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