

**SUMMARY INDEX
SFMPPO-TCC MEETING
November 22, 2010**

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE(S)
ROLL CALL	Quorum Present	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved as presented	1-2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Nov 8, 2010	Approved as amended	2
1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. 2010-2013 TIP amendment	Approved as amended	2-3
b. State Rail Plan Development	Discussion	3-4
c. Bikeways Master Plan Outline	Discussion	4-6
3. MPO OFFICER REPORT	Discussion	7
4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS	Discussion	7
5. ADJOURNMENT - Next Meeting: TBD	Adjourned at 3:15 pm	8

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FÉ MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
November 22, 2010**

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Romero, Chair [arriving later]
Jon Bulthuis – Santa Fé Trails
Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5
Richard Macpherson for Reed Liming – City of Santa Fé
Jack Valencia for Josette Lucero - NCRTD [arriving later]
Eric Martinez – City of Santa Fé
Tamara Baer for Greg Smith – City of Santa Fé
Shelley Cobau for Jack Kolkmeier – Santa Fé County
Robert Martinez – Santa Fé County
Larry Samuel – Tesuque Pueblo
One Vacancy - RPA

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fé County

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Mr. Keith Wilson, MPO Planner
Mr. Tim Rogers, Consultant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Claude Morelli, NMDOT

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 8, 2010

Mr. Gallegos requested a change on page 4, 2nd to last paragraph to delete "quarterly."

Ms. Cobau moved to approve the minutes of November 8, 2010 as amended. Mr. Bulthuis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Romero 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 possible action on amendments to the FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review (Handout)

Mr. Wilson enumerated the amendments in the TIP to be released for public review, including:

1. Added Sheridan Street design to transit center on page 5.
2. On Page 8 - three projects that were completed were deleted from the plan.
3. On Page 9 - one amendment.

The schedule was to release it for public review starting November 24 and bring it back to the next TCC meeting. The next TCC meeting was scheduled for December 27th. (Monday) Almost no one indicated they could be present on that day.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if they could do this in January.

Mr. Wilson asked if they could do it on January 3rd. He explained it had to be one week before the TPB meeting and December 20th would be too soon.

There was general consensus for January 3rd.

Mr. Eric Martínez had some minor corrections. The control # on page 1 for Siler Road was G22S 7582. On page 3 - Airport Road - there was an amendment to increase by about \$200,000. Dave Catanach would have that correct number.

Mr. Wilson asked him to get the correct number to him by tomorrow and he would add it.

Mr. Eric Martínez went to page 8 under bridge replacement rehabilitation to the Acequia Trail. He was not sure if that was a replacement or rehabilitation. The Committee left it as it was.

Mr. Bulhuis moved to approve the TIP with the amendments provided by Mr. Eric Martínez for public review. Mr. Robert Martínez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Presentation of an Overview of the development of the State Rail Plan (PPT Handout)

Mr. Bill Craven presented the State Rail Plan and handed out a printed PPT [attached as Exhibit A].

He explained this was the first rail plan since 1996. He went through the slides of the PPT with brief comments. He said they needed to develop a rail plan in order to be eligible for FRA funding. There was a renewed federal emphasis on railroad investments and the state had refocused its rail planning effort subsequent to Rail Runner service to Santa Fé. It had a 20 year horizon and was now in the public review process phase. Next summer they would come back with a finished proposal and have formal public meetings in Albuquerque, Santa Fé and Las Cruces. In the meantime, the draft plan would be on the website. He said he would solicit comments from the TCC.

Mr. Robert Martínez asked what the latest acquisition date for ROW along the BNSF route to Raton would be.

Mr. Frank Sharpless said it would be next Fall.

Mr. Robert Martínez noted that there were roads in the ROW near Glorieta and the County had been working with BNSF management to decide what to do about the issue - whether to submit an application or not.

Mr. Sharpless thought it was premature to say what the new administration would do. It was taking lots of negotiation and things were going slowly.

Ms. Cobau noted that freight by railroad car was more expensive than truck right now. She felt our country had a lot to learn from other countries like Japan where the rail system was awesome - high speed.

Ms. Baer encouraged DOT to expand their vision to a multi-states vision.

Ms. Nicole de Jurenev said she kept reading that the Rail Runner was losing its funding.

Mr. Craven said one element would be expiring at the end of 2011 but they had not heard anything about it.

Mr. Bulthuis clarified that the funding was supported by the voters, choosing that their taxes go to that purpose. So he questioned how the new Governor would undertake an election to change it.

Mr. Sharpless added that the mid region voted a tax that had no sunset clause. It was raising \$8-12 million against \$25 million annual expenses.

Ms. Cobau asked if it would remain single track.

Mr. Craven said there were no plans for double tracks at present.

Ms. Baer asked if the Rail Runner was just part of the rail plan.

Mr. Craven said that state rail plans up to 1996 were only for freight. This was the first plan to include passenger travel. The Rail Runner came into existence using local funds so it did not need FRA approval. If it was being developed today they would lay it out in the Rail Plan.

Mr. Sharpless said they had done cost benefit analyses and determined that if they extended the system further, it would use the same technology.

Ms. de Jurenev asked if they had figures on additional revenues brought to Santa Fé.

Mr. Craven and Mr. Sharpless agreed that no such studies had been done. All they had was anecdotal information.

Mr. Eric Martinez asked if there were plans for different types of service to keep travel time efficient.

Mr. Craven said the Albuquerque workshop talked about express services but there was no specific plan for that.

Mr. Robert Martinez was concerned that Amtrak contribute their fair share for track maintenance.

Mr. Sharpless said the agreement was based on comparative rail movements. Amtrak and BNSF contributed about \$2 million per year.

Mr. Rogers asked how the rail plan could address other forms of travel like bike and pedestrian.

Mr. Craven said they could be listed but this plan would not develop funds for that purpose.

Mr. Valencia arrived at this time.

c. Presentation of an Outline for the Bikeways Master Plan (Handout)

Mr. Rogers presented the outline and provided a handout [attached as Exhibit B]. The UPWP tasks included developing a Bikeways MP. With the MTP finished, staff had more time for this project.

Mr. Rogers said he had been working on this project for about a year now. They were now getting ready to move full speed into it. He mentioned two resources he was using. The time line was ambitious and the outline was straightforward. A lot of groundwork was already laid.

Mr. Rogers went through the outline in the handout and made brief comments.

Ms. Cobau asked if they would include things like minimum designs for bike lanes, etc.

Mr. Rogers agreed. They would be asking entities to recognize the AASHTO guidelines. The City had those guidelines in place and he would ask the County to do so also.

Ms. Cobau asked about including a bicycle rental programs like in Denver. Mr. Rogers agreed they should work on that.

Mr. Valencia said they needed coordination of safety procedures for bicycle security so there was continuity. NCRTD had standardized their bike racks but they needed coordination with the Rail Runner, Park and Ride and other entities.

Ms. de Jurenev said she would like some continuity when bicycles were on streets. They didn't seem to follow the traffic laws and that was really dangerous. Often they don't wear reflective clothing.

Mr. Wilson said that issue was included in the outline.

Mr. Gallegos commented that in Tesuque Pueblo they were putting in the signs about the state law for bicyclists.

Chair Romero felt it was a matter of education. When they got ticketed was when behavior would change. Maybe enforcement could be included in the outline. Mr. Wilson agreed.

Mr. Rogers agreed it was difficult.

Ms. Cobau thought it would be good to have separation on streets like St. Francis and Cerrillos.

Mr. Rogers said it could be debated. Getting to Walmart required biking on Cerrillos. Bicyclists had the right to use the road.

Mr. Morelli said there were lots of bicyclists who didn't belong to the clubs. He asked how they would reach out to them.

Mr. Rogers said it was a great question and mentioned a few ways including events where they passed out flyers. He agreed they needed to get outside of the normal communication channels. He was also concerned about outreach to Spanish speakers.

Mr. Macpherson talked about requiring licenses. They got it integrated into public schools. He added that it would also be great to see more bike lanes for safe riding.

Mr. Rogers agreed and mentioned bike lanes on some city streets.

Mr. Robert Martinez had a concern designating bikeways on some old roads where no retrofit had been done like Old Santa Fé Trail.

Mr. Rogers said they had not made those classifications yet. But, unless prohibited, all streets were bikeways. By prioritizing improvements they were not making new classifications. They didn't actually designate roads to be bikeways.

He said Bike Santa Fé was getting involved in training for adults. But using a bike lane was not for children.

Mr. Wilson commented on the responsibility of the BTAC. They also wanted to have public input but it was a matter of getting to the people.

Mr. Morelli thought the public process in the schedule was tight.

Mr. Wilson thought they would have some in February. The mapping had already been done and they were trying to pull it all together.

Chair Romero asked if they could do a bicycle traffic count and figure out the best places.

Mr. Rogers said he had worked on pedestrian counts elsewhere. He was all for doing it but not sure how to make good future projections out of it.

Mr. Wilson agreed they should identify places where they could do those counts. That was something staff could develop and bring back to the TCC for input.

Mr. Rogers said those counts were often done by volunteers. Conceivably they could do modeling through the Santa Fé Complex.

Ms. de Jurenev asked if people could walk on bike trails. Mr. Rogers agreed.

Ms. de Jurenev pointed out that at Alto a sign said the trail was closed but it had no barrier.

Mr. Rogers said that sign meant it was a use at your own risk basis.

3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Tibbetts said they were reviewing their public participation plan (PPP) and doing some internal meetings with the DOT liaison to keep communication lines open.

Mr. Wilson said they were working on a new TIP and now were asking for projects. When they got a new PIF from DOT he would send it out.

Mr. Tibbetts said they had been working with the County in the SFCC District with their roads committee and a Task Force at SFCC regarding issues on the roadway network there.

Ms. de Jurenev asked when that would that happen.

Mr. Tibbetts wasn't sure since many people were going in their own directions.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Robert Martínez reported that the County hired an engineer to do traffic studies at SFCC and had proposed temporary entrance changes, including no left turn onto Richards, changes at College Heights, etc.

For the long term they were working for a roundabout at the entrance and for the SE connector going north to the NE connector. A lot of it was restriping. The SFCC bond recently passed.

Mr. Eric Martínez mentioned two projects that would start in the spring.

Mr. Robert Martínez said they received bids for Agua Fria phase 3 and would award bids next Tuesday to start paving in December. South Meadows should be done at the end of November.

Mr. Morelli said the Transportation Re-authorization would follow a likely six month extension of the current authorization. A new house committee would be appointed soon.

Also Mid Region adopted a policy to devote 20% of the entire budget to public transportation. It would be for infrastructure improvements, corridors, etc.

5. ADJOURN - Next TCC meeting: To Be Determined

Mr. Robert Martínez 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