

**Public Information Meeting
I-25 Santa Fe Corridor Study
Genoveva Chavez Community Center
December 3, 2009**

Meeting Attendees:

Sixty stakeholders attended the meeting:

No.	Name
1	Carolyn Agard
2	Tom Agard
3	Dewey Bullard
4	Kimberly C.
5	Kevin Chapman
6	Mary Beth Chapman
7	Lynn Christiansen
8	Steve Coca
9	Linda Cole
10	Wayne Darnell
11	Harold Fagor
12	Alexis Girard
13	Barbara Goede
14	Anna Hansen
15	Diana Hardy
16	Kathryn Holladay
17	Marlies Hoksberger
18	JoAnne Jaeger
19	Andrew Jandacek
20	Will Karp
21	Peter Krusko
22	Greg Kulka
23	Joyce Lathrop
24	Jerry Lawlor
25	Dale Lettenberger
26	Jean Liska
27	Andy S. Loegs
28	Joseph Lopez
29	Manuel R. Lujan
30	Lynette MacGillivary
31	Don Martinez
32	C. Dave Mc Quarie
33	Diana Monroe
34	Katherine Mortimer
35	Celeste Newbrook
36	Dustin Offerman
37	Lien-Shin Wang Offermann
38	Councilor Matthew Ortiz
39	Jim Plewa
40	Leroy Quintana
41	Sandra Quintana
42	Armando Ramirez
43	Ken Reese
44	H.L. Robbins
45	Thomas Romero

46	Rosemary Rowell
47	W. Salomon
48	George Sanchez
49	Mela Sanchez
50	Sherry Sanchez
51	Debbie Seif
52	James Siebert
53	Gale Simonson
54	P. Stephenson
55	Jack Sullivan
56	Rusty Tambascio
57	Councilor Ronald Trujillo
58	Teresa Trujillo
59	Keith D. Walter
60	Kitty Wolfe

Project team representatives at the meeting included the following individuals:

- Dan Andersen, CH2M HILL
- Rochelle Byars, NMDOT
- Greg Heitmann, FHWA
- Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates
- Ross Lujan, CH2M HILL
- David J. Martinez, NMDOT
- John Nitzel, CH2M HILL
- David Quintana, NMDOT
- John Romero, City of Santa Fe
- Mark Tibbetts, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Keith Wilson, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

Presentation

David Quintana introduced the project and project team. Ross Lujan and Dan Andersen discussed the study process, alternatives, ranking of alternatives, and recommendations.

Discussion Session

The following is a summary of the questions and comments presented at the meeting. NMDOT project team responses presented at the meeting are shown in italics.

On the four you are not recommending, is that a function of too much traffic for too little traffic. Could that change with a better economy or more political interest?

This is just a recommendation from us. It is ultimately the transportation policy board to decide what lines go on the map. That is where the final decision will be made. But the transportation board could keep it alive.

Where do we go as a body of dissenters?

Their meetings are public meetings. The policy board meets bi-monthly. That is where you voice your concerns.

How many times have they overridden your recommendations?

This is the first time we have done this (a NMDOT corridor study forwarding recommendations to the Metropolitan Planning Organization [MPO] policy board). After this study, the ball is in their court. I assume they would take our recommendations to heart, but I can't be sure.

I am definitely opposed to Camino Carlos Rey. Our input may not be valid. Why are we opposing things if this may happen anyway?

It was the past public input that put these at the bottom of the priority lists. That is why it was not included in the list of recommendations.

It seems ambivalent.

You need to talk to your elected officials. You need to lobby them.

This is just the process for projects to be built in Santa Fe. The reason they were considered because they did meet the purpose at need at some level. At this point, these projects will not be recommended for inclusion the transportation plan.

Thank you to Marron and NMDOT to their response on the south side of Santa Fe. They pay attention to the public outcry. We have two councilors here tonight. We need to give them feedback. The process is somewhat broken in Santa Fe. There are some developers steering this process. We need our government to pay attention to the people in these neighborhoods. We have a voice. Use it.

How can we find out about future meetings? Can we be kept in the loop?

I am Keith Wilson with the Santa Fe MPO. These are recommendations that will go to the transportation policy board as part of Metropolitan Transportation Plan. With respect to meetings of policy board, they meet on December 10. This project will be presented in February. We will have meetings in January as part of our plan outreach. Every month from January to June, the policy board will meet. The meetings are on web site santafemmo.org. You can e-mail me at kpwilson@ci.santa-fe.nm.us.

If you want to attend MPO meetings, they are held in middle of day. You may want to suggest that they hold meetings for people who work. The Rail Runner crossing was not discussed much. It does not make sense and assumes a station at Las Soleras and connects to Dinosaur Trail a private road. It is a blight on the landscape for people in the area. In terms of Richards, that is also problematic. The idea is to get several different access points to community college. We are missing context sensitive design. Richards Avenue would have to be enlarged to 4 lanes and become more dangerous, more stressful to drive, and more like Airport Road. Widening to 4 lanes would take away the buffer zones. Oshara has already intruded on the buffer zone. It will also take property and have other negative impacts by widening to 4 lanes. Who will pay for it? The county and city taxpayers would have to pay it. If you look at your evaluation factors, the half moons and full moons are nice way to look at it intuitively. I assigned numbers to the symbols. There is the same number of positive points for Governor Miles and Richards. I am not recommending the Governor Miles Extension, but Richards is not a slam-dunk. In hopes of moving traffic off of Richards Avenue, the Rail Runner station was put on NM 599. Access to St Francis needs to be discussed. That would also provide access to the community college district and also provide relief to Richards Avenue. I don't think the interchange is a slam-dunk. If you consider impacts, people will be sorry.

I have a couple of concerns about Richards Avenue. What traffic will flow on Governor Miles? Governor Miles is really busy? I don't understand how you will take on traffic. The roundabout on Richards is really small, and the bike lane ends at the rotary. It is a dangerous situation. I have seen roundabouts proposed at Richards. I think roundabouts are negative. How would bikes cross that intersection?

Adding an interchange at Richards takes some of the traffic off of Governor Miles because it allows some of the traffic onto the interstate and off of Governor Miles.

I would be interested in seeing those studies.

We looked at safety carefully. None of the other interchanges have sidewalks or bike lanes. On Richards, we plan to add sidewalks and bike lanes. Bicycles can merge in with the traffic on roundabouts, and we can make the roundabout so bicycles can move around traffic. Skills bicyclists like it, but kids and unskilled cyclists would be of concern.

You would have to walk across the lanes with the bikes where the vehicles enter the roundabout.

You have to carefully locate the crossing point so vehicles and pedestrians can see each other. It has to be designed carefully. That may not be the configuration of the interchange. The study just recommends an interchange or no interchange, and it could change significantly.

I agree in that I don't support the overpass at Las Soleras. It is not needed. I do support the interchange at Richards. If there are roundabouts, there needs to be another roundabout at Richards. Roundabouts have a lower fatality than signals. The Oshara roundabout works for bicycles and pedestrians. I don't support 4 lanes on Richards, but I support the interchange. I don't understand the need for realignment of Richards at I-25. Consider a design with a rail station to make more multi-modal. The overpass at Beckner doesn't seem to have any reason. You can cross at Richards. The community college is designed as small roadways. The northeast connector will be the next road and will relieve traffic on Richards. On St. Francis going south, I would like to see a better connection with Rabbit Road so the whole area is integrated with Richards.

We are showing roundabouts to preserve right-of-way. If we didn't reconstruct the interchange, the ramps would be outside of the right-of-way. This study is not looking at whether Richards should be 4 lanes. We were trying to look at alternatives that might allow us to not widen Richards. That is why we looked at two crossings such as Governor Miles. The crossings do not help relieve traffic on Richards. Those additional crossings did not relieve traffic enough on Richards. If it needs 4 lanes, it will be determined in another study. Once everything is fully developed there could be a lot of cars on Richards.

On your I-25 auxiliary lanes, will they go inside or outside of I-25?

They will be a continuation of the ramps.

Why are using old maps, such as Governor Miles Extension, because the Rail Runner should appear on your maps? There is no feasibility because of the Rail Runner. Your map does not show the Rail Runner coming under the highway and walls and abutments. You are not making a recommendation for this. As long as this is on the table, my house is worthless. No one has considered the impact on neighborhoods. I cannot put my house on market since you may tear my house down in four years. We would like some affirmation that this will not happen.

My name is Matthew Ortiz. Resolution 2006-65 says it is city policy that Governor Miles does not extend eastward and Camino Carlos Rey does not extend southward. I will present a resolution that it is city policy. I had to go to the MPO and present the resolution in 2006. It is city policy that the two roads will not be extended. Why this did not show up in this discussion befuddles me. Why it was not part of this study astounds me. We are to formally present it. We said clearly that this is not going to happen. We have annexed I-25 into the city. If it is in the city limits, it is for the city to determine. It is our policy and will continue to be our policy. At the MPO, I will reintroduce the resolution. The MPO has no business telling us what to decide since it is in the city.

I have the resolution here. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) can only be amended by the MPO. It is because of this resolution that prompted it not to be included in MTP. It still has to go through the MPO policy board. In 2006, the county commissioners decided that we had to wait for this study. We are not trying to force extensions down people's throats. The MPO ultimately decides transportation plans in the city.

I am going to thank both of you gentlemen (councilors) right away. If they take that side of my property, it eliminates my well, shop, and greenhouse. I will be watching for that meeting next week.

I would like to thank Mr. Ortiz for speaking. If Governor Miles and Carlos Rey go through, it will affect several subdivisions. They currently have drag racing on Governor Miles in middle of night. More traffic will bring more traffic in neighborhood. I don't see how Richards could be put in without widening road. The roundabout would need to be redesigned. It is a policy in Santa Fe that you guys make mistakes that cost money, and we throw money at it to correct. On Old Pecos Trail, that will impact the whole area. There is bicycle traffic on Old Pecos and that bike traffic blocks car traffic. With regard to the Rail Runner, Governor Richardson said the reason for Rail Runner is to prevent widening of I-25. You are proposing to widen I-25. People do not have integrity on their follow-through. A serious look has to be taken at people in these areas. Go to Mr. Garcia and see where his house sits. Take all these people's concerns into consideration.

Let me see if I can explain Old Pecos interchange better. Traffic going on I-25 to Albuquerque would exit here. Now you have to cross lanes of traffic, and it is dangerous. We are proposing that if you want to turn left on Rodeo, you come on this leg, and them stop. You would get in a dedicated left turn pocket. You would not cross multiple lanes of traffic.

My comments have been covered. Will notes be available?

Yes, on NMDOT and MPO web site. If a comment is really important, then you need to provide a written comment.

I don't have much to add. If you want to see copy of resolution and MPO minutes, e-mail me at mortizlaw@msn.com. I don't think the MPO can decide this. I think Richards will need more discussion. I appreciate that the NMDOT has to move to evaluate environmental impacts. Those of us who live near I-25 were given promises with respect to sight, visual, and noise impacts that were not followed through. So to add lanes on I-25, it will not be acceptable in terms of sight, visual, and noise impacts. The state has annexed I-25 into the city limits. It is my belief that the state will have to conform to local policy and procedures along I-25.

When we do environmental analysis, part of that process is to do a noise study. If and when I-25 auxiliary lanes come into the picture, the environmental analysis will consider noise barriers.

I want to comment on Richards Avenue. I am representing Santa Fe Community College (SFCC). The governing board of SFCC passed a resolution endorsing the Richards Avenue interchange and Richards Avenue as a site for a transit stop rather than Las Soleras. I think the Richards design tends to raise the cost by realigning I-25 than if you bought more right-of-way. I have \$40 million for that interchange. I doubt it would take \$20 million to build a diamond at that location. In your factors, you give a big negative to cost. If the cost were lower, it could rise in priority. I think it is important not to have a high cost figure drive your priority. By moving the lanes in towards the center, you eliminate policy decision for the median such as a rail transit stop. I think there is a study going on. The issue of the transit stop location has not yet been finalized. We at the college are now addressing how to get people from NM 599 and other parts of the city to the school. There are not any transportation modes other than city buses, which extend time to get to the college by an hour. Your design should not limit the policy options for the MPO. I have attended all the county transportation plan meetings. There are a lot of options for south of I-25 such as the southeast connector that would affect traffic. People should not rush to judgment on a 4-lane Richards until all of the studies have come together. The 4 lanes have not been bourn out by factual study. We are very concerned about bicycle and pedestrian safety on Richards. The roundabout at church was build off-spec and made smaller and that is why it doesn't work well. The Oshara roundabout does work well. We are trying to encourage alternate forms of transportation. There is a great deal of support for these improvements that would affect the community college district.

In Phase A and B, we heard people didn't want signals at the ramps. This is just a concept but keeps free flow.

My only question is cost.

You already heard Councilor Ortiz. We have been on top of this. I will make sure that it is on the web site and in the paper. The meetings are open to everyone. I want to thank you all for being here. Regarding the third lane on I-25, promises were made by the NMDOT and were not kept. I want the promises kept. Should Richards be built, what will the impact be on St. Francis Drive? I would see timing of the lights on St. Francis. It doesn't function as well as it should. Contact your county commissioners and city councilors.

The auxiliary lanes, the reason they would be recommended. If Richards goes up, a lot of traffic will go up. That is why they are shown. Traffic was getting on to St. Francis from Zia and now it will go on I-25.

The Rail Runner has already impacted neighborhoods. Timing traffic on St. Francis will get things better.

I live in Pueblos del Sol. I appreciate having two councilors here to discuss impacts. I can see the Rail Runner go by from my kitchen. Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles should not be on the table. We have paid our dues from noise and pollution from I-25 and Rail Runner. I think we were sold a bill of goods on the decibel increase from Rail Runner. I don't recall the discussion of air pollution from Rail Runner. I am concerned about the auxiliary lanes. What are the noise impacts of the lanes?

That is part of the next phase when a project moves forward.

That is too late.

We have just identified projects.

I am concerned about air quality. It is far more of a concern than we were lead to believe. I am concerned about the auxiliary lanes and want to see Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey kept off the table.

The projects can die in the next phase. Stop and start traffic also causes pollution. The freeway has free flow and can have less air emissions than local streets. The air quality analysis will be done.

I see positive and negative effects of the Richards interchange. I am in favor of the interchange but not the roundabouts. I don't agree with cars and cyclists merging and competing for space. Get rid of the roundabouts, and we can create bike lanes. Roundabouts – they should go.

Thank you councilors for this meeting. The NM 599 meeting will be on December 10 in councilor chambers (Santa Fe).

The cost/benefit ratio is critical in deciding. What is the span of costs from Gov Miles and the number 1 (ranked) project?

We are still looking at it. We are making some adjustments. We will put those costs in our report. Once the report is posted on web site, we will send out an e-mail blast so you can look at costs.

It would cost a lot of money without much benefit for low ranking projects.

They would cost \$20-40 million.

Could a developer put in money and skew that ratio?

I imagine that would be a possibility. It is also the neighborhood disruption and lack of public support. It doesn't carry enough traffic to offset negatives.

Is it a state project?

There is no money, but if there were, it would be federal.

Is the auxiliary lane a frontage road or attached to the freeway?

It would be attached to the freeway. It would be a ramp-to-ramp connection. It is just a stripe.

If you do those lanes, because that is a change to existing I-25 corridor, will there be a buffer wall installed? Could that be addressed?

That would be considered in the environmental process.

Written Comments

Comment 1: Carolyn DeChaine (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

Thank you for your e-mail and regular mail. Unfortunately I am not going to be able to make it on the 5th (meeting changed from November 5th to December 3rd), but I still support lowering the speed limit on I-25 between Santa Fe and Albuquerque. I also support any changes that will make it harder for drivers to cross the median or to enter going the wrong way.

Comment 2: Stephen Bing (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

We would oppose any extension of Camino Carlos Rey. There has already been an increase in traffic over the last 5 years, and it has made a quite neighborhood noisier and more polluted. A new interchange seems unnecessary as one can get to I-25 in 10 minutes anyway.

Comment 3: Christine Dennelly (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

Thank you for this information. I looked at the extension web-site. I and many of my neighbors are not in favor of the extension of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles Road. It will have a major negative impact on the families in this neighborhood. Thanks again for receiving input.

Comment 4: Eugene Tomlinson (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

The neighborhoods in your area are raising concerns about the NMDOT I-25 Corridor Study. My neighbors in Las Estancias, those in Via Cab and the folks in the County area between us and the I-25 Corridor have continually been asked to submit their input to Eric Johnson and the NMDOT staff. We have not been able to get across to this study team that two of their proposed ideas are not feasible and not required.

It is our impression that they are telling the city of Santa Fe and the County of Santa Fe how to control traffic on streets and roads that are not directly State controlled (so designated by State Route numbers) and thus are extending their study beyond the I-25 Corridor. Specifically, we are concerned about their continued suggestion, despite our objections, to the I-25 Crossing at Camino Carlos Rey and the extending of Governor Miles to connect to Yucca and cut through to Rodeo via Galisteo Rd. We believe that the city has on its books correspondence that states that Governor Miles will never be extended beyond its present east end. We also object to the crossing at Camino Carlos Rey since it would add additional traffic through our subdivisions and not provide access to Cerrillos Rd without cutting through other long established neighborhoods. It would also be an eyesore to the area (The Rail Runner station between the I-25 lanes is an example of function without thought to its ugly appearance to the area.)

We have suggested that there are four or five avenues that already exist from the south of the I-25 Corridor from Old Pecos Trail on the east to I-599 on the west and are State or Federal right-of-ways. These roads can be improved and connected south of Rabbit Road and north of Rancho Viejo and the Community College, if the land is selected and set aside, to provide a Boulevard that would connect these north south access roads in the area and provide adequate traffic lanes for the increased development to the south of the I-25 Corridor without disrupting the established neighborhoods and subdivisions north of the Corridor.

Gentlemen, we need your support in removing the Crossing at Camino Carlos Rey and the extension to the east of Gov. Miles from this study. Can we ask that you appear and provide your input to Eric Johnson and to the NMDOT Staff?

(My rather long, but I would hope sufficiently descriptive, report to Eric Johnson and the NMDOT Staff, et. al. is again attached for your consideration.)

To: Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates
CC: David Quintana, NMDOT
Gerard Martinez, NMDOT
Stephen Ulibarri, Santa Fe County

April 21, 2009
Revised Aug. 20, 2009

Mayor David Coss, City of Santa Fe
Mathew Ortiz, Councillor, City of Santa Fe
Ron Trujillo, Councillor, City of Santa Fe

From: Gene Tomlinson, President
Las Estancias Neighborhood Association

Subject: I-25, Major Santa Fe Corridors Improvement Study

Reference: The New Mexican, Thursday, April 16, 2009 (Meeting Notice April 21, '09)

We have been here before, gentlemen. The subdivisions that are established and hoping that no more traffic will be diverted into their streets have spoken. I hope this time you are listening, (this is input to your May 5th meeting.)

Traffic planning by outside firms is a necessary part of planning, but they do not take into consideration the real world that exists, nor the impact that such traffic planning will have on the present residence of the City. They may well give NMDOT some good planning information, but it will lack the intimate knowledge from those of us who live here.

It is about time that Santa Fe – city, county and NMDOT really develop a master plan. It is obvious that any earlier studies fell short of the impending and future growth to the overall area. As a result, subdivisions were and are being built that obstruct good traffic flow. The south side of the City of Santa Fe is full of examples of such poor future planning.

As examples: Yucca goes from the College of Santa Fe to just south of Rodeo and can not correct to St. Michaels. Camino Carlos Rey, now improved from Gov. Miles to Zia runs into a neighborhood just north of Zia (not able to directly connect to Cerrillos Rd.) and Gov Miles seems to be headed eastward into more homes. Richards stops at the county fair grounds (though with a bridge it could go on to Cerrillos Rd. and further north, but would require displacement of some homes).

Cutting through established neighborhoods with added traffic is a safety hazard as well as an increase in traffic noise. It also invites an increase in crime and neighborhood vandalism.

Bridges over the I-25/Rail Runner from any of the north-south streets to get to Rabbit Rd or beyond (south) is an expensive, eye-sore that takes away from the open look of the area while just pushing traffic where it was never envisioned, i.e. into established subdivisions, both north and south of the I-25 corridor. In short the bridge idea should be taken off the table.

So what would be a better, more plausible solution to traffic flow from south of I-25 and the growing development in that area of the county and the established City of Santa Fe?

Also, how can we improve our busy corridors to handle the increased traffic that was never properly planned for in earlier studies and the now completed road projects?

First: A second ring road around greater Santa Fe is possible, if we are not to late in getting it in place. From Old Pecos Trail on the east to 599 Relief Route on the west and south of the I-25 corridor a major road can be provided to move the increased traffic that will develop in the county area from such developments as Rancho Viejo and others that are and will be planned. (I would refer you to Kansas City, KS planning and ring road development.)

Old Pecos Trail, St. Francis, Richards, Cerrillos Rd., and 599/14 can all connect to this major southern (east-west) portion of an outer ring road. The east side of the ring is Old Pecos Trail. The west side is 599. The east side would feed into town and have to go into Paseo de Peralto on the east and north to St. Francis, but it does now. People living or traveling to the south of the interstate would have five north-south roads to choose from plus the outer ring road, i.e. 5 established roads in less than 15 miles which should be most adequate for any new development.

See attached purple lines on the NMDOT map.

This would use the present north-south roads as connectors to the southern outer ring road and provide for increased traffic from the southern county development without disturbing established south side Santa Fe city neighborhoods.

Second: All the north-south corridors need to be improved to handle traffic in a safe and efficient manner. Old Pecos Trail may have to be widened south of I-25, and at the least good right turn lanes completed so as not to impede traffic flow, north or south.

St. Francis (with better traffic light control) needs right turn lanes at some intersections to improve traffic flow. The overpass at St. Michaels needs to be widened another lane on the north bound side to allow for safe entrance for merging traffic. The southbound entrance from St. Michaels needs to have an improved entrance lane. This may require the purchase of property along the right of way. St. Francis up to Cordova Rd. is fairly clear of obstructions and driveways that impede traffic flow, but north of Cordova Rd. up to Agua Fria, the road is too narrow and the traffic flow is impeded by the cross streets of the old city neighborhoods and businesses. This is an area that perhaps only time can improve with proper city planning and future re-development. The result is that northbound traffic will have congestion, as it does now, from Cordova to just north of Paseo de Peralto. Note: Through truck traffic, like the hay haulers, should be required to use the 599 Relief Route.

Cerrillos Rd. is a disaster and a black eye to the City of Santa Fe. Tourists and New Mexico residents entering Santa Fe by Cerrillos Rd. and even we who live here realize that this is a Mexican Border town street that though improved in recent years, does not do the City Different any favors. Future planning and careful redevelopment may improve it, but a traffic study will not solve the eye sore problem or the narrowing corridor north of St. Michaels.

The 599 Bypass is, at present, a clean acceptable way around Santa Fe, or for many, a better way into the city from the north then trying to enter from any of the already over crowded southern corridors, particularly during morning and evening rush hours.

So, lets get going on an outer ring road that does not impact older subdivisions, improve our existing north-south corridors including an I-25 interchange at Richards and a widening of Richards to support the major flow of traffic from an interchange with the interstate – both south of the interchange and north to at least Cerrioss (bridge the arroyo and go north). The interchange has been talked to death – build it and improve the traffic flow now.

Third: Gerard Martinez will remember that the Las Estancias Neighborhood Association requested that the NMDOT consider improving the noise and light abatement from the I-25 corridor after the Rail Runner was completed. The area at the end of Galisteo (atop of and north of the railroad) needs a wall (not the present wire fence) to reduce the light and noise pollution from the interstate into our sub division. This wall should be a part of the beautification of all southern corridor entrances into Santa Fe. Other south side subdivisions also will need to be included in this beautification and light/noise abatement project.

Old Pecos Trail is reasonably open and a nice entrance into our City Different. So is the 599 Relief Route. Cerrillos Rd. is not congested up to Rodeo/Airport Rd and with some beautification can be acceptable. St Francis needs the most work to reduce the noise/light pollution from the I-25 Corridor and much needs to be done to make St Francis a beautiful entrance into the City Different. The Richard's interchange can be developed with beautification included.

This is the State Capital, Gentlemen. The 84/285 (Taos Highway) to the north of Santa Fe is much improved and a fine example of what we now need to do to the southern entrances to our city. A study is needed and then construction of noise and light abatement walls, etc. that also welcome visitor and residence to this City Different. We have talked to NMDOT about this in the past. **Let's get it done.**

I, for one, see the overall traffic pattern of Greater Santa Fe as a large wigwam or tepee. The bottom is the outer (southern part) of a new ring road. The poles of the wigwam are the north-south arteries that already exist. Paseo de Peralto is a circle at the top of the wigwam around its opening, and encompasses the downtown of the City Different. The cross roads like Cordova, St. Michaels, and Rodeo Rd. and Gov. Miles are patterns of the art that decorates the wigwam. This is how I see our City Different.

If further expansion into the County are contemplated, and it's obvious that it is, then that is outside of the City Different and has to be considered as separate communities in the County that should be self sufficient and not dependent on the City of Santa Fe. **Future growth in the county will happen and must be looked at as separated from the City not an extension of it.** So a traffic plan should look at how these new developments can interface with I-25 and with the established north-south arteries, but not be included in the future City of Santa Fe traffic plan (for daily use of these arteries for workers in and out of the city.) Light rail to support the Rail Runner and bus service can be developed from these new developments to relieve traffic and the limited parking in our City Different. (Reference to Portland, OR light rail system) We must remember that Tourism is our second most important business; let us not discourage it by limiting access to the City or ample parking to our guests. We need to be aware of where our tax dollars come from and not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

We do not need more direct entrances into Santa Fe that disturb the established neighborhoods and flood our residential streets with through traffic. We **do** need to improve our existing corridors and clean up and beautify our entrances into the City Different from the I-25 Interstate. We need to provide a wide and easily accessible outer ring road south of the I-25 interstate (in the County of Santa Fe), and we need to do these projects now.

Comment 5: Teresa Trujillo (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

Gentlemen: I am requesting that Camino Carlos Rey NOT be made into a main artery off I-25 to connect with Cerrillos Road. There are many children living in this neighborhood; there is a city park on Camino Carlos Rey between Zia and Siringo (many children and families use this park); the traffic is already very heavy because both Zia and Rodeo, which intersect Camino Carlos Rey are main arteries to the shopping on Zafarano, Sam's Club, etc. Rodeo Plaza is also a magnet for traffic; there have already been several fatalities close to the Camino Carlos Rey intersections, which is why there was significant city street construction on Rodeo to slow down the traffic. Moreover, the bike path, which intersects Camino Carlos Rey, has many many pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the day. Camino Carlos Rey is a two lane street; it simply cannot handle any more traffic. Camino Carlos Rey is also used heavily by all living in the Rodeo / Zia area who are accessing Home Depot, Walmart, and other shopping on Cerrillos. I am a user of Camino Carlos Rey and am very aware of the existing situation.

It is a huge safety issue if Camino Carlos Rey receives any more traffic. I live off of Rodeo and Yucca and my little grandson lives on Artesano (which intersects Camino Carlos Rey), therefore, I am in that area daily at different times throughout the day. I am concerned about his safety and the safety of everyone else affected.

I plan on being at the meeting at GCCC on Thursday. Please forward this input to any else that is receiving input.

Comment 6: Councilor Matthew Ortiz (comment received before December 3rd meeting)

To all:

I've attached an electronic version of what I intend to present to the D.O.T. tonight.

Councilor Trujillo and I introduced and passed a resolution in 2006 that specifically states the policy of the city with respect to both Camino Carlos Rey and Gov. Miles Road.

I then had this resolution presented to the regional planning authority. I have attached the minutes of that meeting so that you all can see that it was (former) county commissioners Campos and Sullivan who would not consider adopting this resolution. At the time, the portion east of Gov. Miles Road was outside the city limits.

Since then, the city has annexed that portion of property. Thus, given the resolution passed, it is my opinion that the state has to abide by the CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL policy that there be no further extension of either Camino Carlos Rey or Gov. Miles roads.

Regards,

Comment 7: Julie Lutzelschwab

I was unable to attend tonight's meeting. My comments are:

I am OPPOSED TO EXTENDING GOVERNOR MILES. City Councilor Matthew Ortiz has also stated the city DOES NOT plan to extend Gov Miles in their master plan (see email below). The Galisteo/Rodeo and Galisteo/Zia and Zia/St Francis intersections cannot handle 100s of additional cars each day. This extension if it connects to Yucca could also funnel more traffic through residential neighborhoods (e.g. Las Estancias) shortcutting to Rodeo/Galisteo and through traffic is not desirable by the Las Estancias neighborhood.

I am supportive of reducing the speed limit to 65 mph on I-25 in the study area.

I feel it is imperative to implement an engine/jake brake prohibition ordinance along this section of I-25.

Comment 8: Celeste Newbrook

The study at this phase shows thoughtful attention to the environmental and visual factors so important in planning in Santa Fe, "The City Different."

Thank you!

Comment 9: anonymous

Make the Richards interchange a higher priority and connect through El Dorado on Richards or St. Francis (most trips from Eldorado are to Santa Fe, not Albuquerque)

Comment 10: R. Rowell

I do not want Gov. Miles Extension chosen.

Comment 11: anonymous

I vehemently oppose the overcrossing or undercrossing at Camino Carlos Rey. It would significantly increase traffic near Pueblo del Sol (where I live) and the noise level. I do not think the Richards Interchange makes sense, but not the addition of 2 new lanes. We can't afford this as taxpayers.

Comment 12: Peter Krusko

My name is Peter Krusko and a homeowner at 2601 Via Berrenda, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505. I attended the NMDOT Public Meeting, December 3, 2009, concerning the Interstate 25 Corridor Study: NM 599 to NM 466.

I am opposed to auxiliary lanes on I-25, the Governor Miles Extension, Camino Carlos Rey Undercrossing, and the Rail Runner Loop Over-crossing. These concepts if completed would determinately affect the long established family neighborhoods of which I am a resident. The increased traffic, noise, and pollution caused by the construction and implementation of these proposals would completely and utterly change the character and quality of life that these neighborhoods have brought to the peace and well being of its residents.

Comment 13: Don Martinez

As president of the Pueblos Del Sol Owners Association, located at Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles Road, our community feels that the New Richards Interchange should be your highest priority and completed/funded first. Secondly, next priority would be the Governor Miles Road Extension; this would ease the traffic load on Rodeo Road as well as Zia Road. By having these parallel roads to I-25 would also help NMDOT obtain funding from the US Government. Finally, the Camino Carlos Rey Under-Crossing should be your lowest priority or completed last. Not that we are in favor of the project, but we don't see how any traffic would be aided.

Comment 14: Manuel R. Lujan

My name is Manuel R. Lujan. I attended the meeting noted on this e-mail regarding the I-25 Corridor Study. I am primarily addressing my comments to the "New Richards Interchange" proposal. You have my comments from the August 20, 2009 presentation and for the sake of brevity I am submitting the following comments as an addition to those I outlined on my electronic correspondence (9-03-09) to Ross Lujan and you on this topic.

Governor Miles appears to be a choice of a means to get in and out to places off of Richards Avenue such as SF Community College, the 5 churches, the 3 schools, Rancho Viejo, Nava Ade' and new developments...and I think an interchange would alleviate this problem...and for this reason I am not

conceptually opposed to an interchange there. I do support an overpass at Las Soleras, and I do support streamlining the overpass at Beckner with access to and from the SF Community College and Richards Avenue from there. There should be some connectivity at Rabbit Road point in order to give the whole area on Richards Avenue relief from that point. There should also be a study on the impact of neighborhoods.

Richards Avenue is too narrow in my estimation to handle an interchange as a two lane road and I believe increased traffic will be worse. I live off of Richards Avenue, and it is difficult in the mornings and evenings to get out of the area because of traffic. I notice that there was not a consideration on these points brought up at the last meeting. The analogy is one of a plugged up artery waiting for bypass surgery waiting to happen.

I believe that streamlining I 25 is not needed, which is probably where the major cost of the proposal is. A diamond interchange would suffice and would probably be affordable. It probably would not take any or less right-of-way thus making it less expensive. There would not be a need for more roundabouts. We already have two which are too small. The large trucks and city bus vehicles are too large, and they tend to go over them. There is a artifact on the Oshara one, and I don't know how long it will take for it be taken down from them. There would be 4 of these roundabouts and one on Dinosaur Trail Road where a resident was in the process of following up on that point.

Comment 15: Andris and Rosalind S. Sildegs

We the undersigned as homeowners residing in the Park Plaza Development (SW quadrant of Rodeo Road & Camino Carlos Rey intersection) do adamantly object to the proposed extension of Camino Carlos Rey to cross Interstate I-25 for the following reasons:

1. I-25 has been a natural barrier between communities to the north and south of it. These communities have been developed with this fact in mind and the quality of life of each is dependent on this barrier as it exists. Both north and south communities will be disrupted by the incursion of traffic that the crossover (or underpass) will generate. Likewise, the increase of traffic on the existing Camino Carlos Rey will split communities east and west of it creating the potential of promoting barrios in lieu of a homogenous community as it exists today. This repeats the mistakes of the 1950s/60s when traffic planners had such a negative impact on social structures of communities.

As a side issue communities south of I-25 would be better served by:

- (a) Extending Hwy 599 to connect with I-25 east of Lamy as an I-25 by-pass.
 - (b) Improving I-25 interchanges at Richards Road and Saint Francis Drive as you have proposed.
 - (c) Extending both Richards Road and Saint Francis Drive south to interchange at this suggested by-pass.
2. Currently noise generated by vehicular traffic on Rodeo/Zia Roads can be heard through the Park Plaza Development. Likewise traffic on I-25 can also be heard. To increase traffic on Camino Carlos Rey with a crossover (or underpass) will just add to the problem.
 3. The Park Plaza Development is served by only one (1) main street (i.e. Plaza Blanca) which serpentine through the development providing the only exists at Rodeo Road and Camino Carlos Rey. We have many elderly residents who are reluctant to enter or cross Rodeo Road because of the heavy traffic on it. Most currently choose Camino Carlos Rey as the exit out of the

development. With the increase of anticipated traffic on Camino Carlos Rey their mobility becomes more hazardous and in many cases isolates them to remain in the development because of their fear of traffic.

4. Increase of traffic on Camino Carlos Rey due to the construction of an I-25 overpass (or underpass) will add to the congestion at Carlos Rey/Rodeo intersection traffic light. This congestion and related traffic delay at the light will encourage drivers to shortcut from Rodeo to Carlos Rey via Plaza Blanca thereby impacting our community even more than mentioned above.
5. Increase of Camino Carlos Rey traffic traveling north past Rode/Zia Roads will impact use of two (2) public parks/playgrounds and impede the use of the Arroyo Chamisa Recreation Trail north of Zia Road.
6. The construction of Camino Carlos Rey crossover (or underpass) encourages future development of it as an I-25 interchange thereby exacerbating reasons for our objection even more.
7. Not only will the increase of traffic due to Camino Carlos Rey I-25 crossover (or underpass) affect our quality of life but we anticipate that it will also create a financial hardship on us by impacting property values. For all the reasons mentioned above we anticipate that housing values will fall because our community will be less desirable to live in. With loss of property values due to the current economy, the overdevelopment of Camino Carlos Rey just adds to our burden.

We sincerely appreciate your effort in presenting the study and the many hours it has taken to come up with all the proposals and evaluations. We also realize the questions and consideration raised by your study had to be asked regardless of outcome.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our objections. We hope that you will consider the social issues presented and expand your study beyond the traffic planning discipline.