

SUMMARY INDEX
SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
December 7, 2009

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	Accepted as published	2
d. Approval of Minutes		
Aug 24, 2009	Postponed to next meeting	2
Oct 26 2009	Postponed to next meeting	2
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. Santa Fe Corridor Studies	Discussion	2-5
b. Metro Transportation Plan	Discussion	5-7
c. Rail Runner Service Update	Discussion	8-10
d. Santa Fe Area Transit Service Plan	Discussion	10-11
MPO OFFICER REPORT	Report by Mark Tibbetts	11
TCC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS	Discussion	11-12
ADJOURN - Next Meeting: Jan. 25, 2009	Adjourned at 3:16 p.m.	12

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FE MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, December 7, 2009**

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 Nambé Room, Community Convention Center, 201 West Marcy Street, 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
Phil Gallegos – NMDOT District 5
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fe County
Reed Liming – City of Santa Fe
Robert Martínez – Santa Fe County
Greg Smith – City of Santa Fe

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jack Kolkmeyer – Santa Fe County
Josette Lucero – NCRD
Chris Ortega – City of Santa Fe
Larry Samuel – Tesuque Pueblo

STAFF PRESENT

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

OTHERS PRESENT

David Quintana – NMDOT
Claude Morelli - NMDOT
Jeanette Walther - Bohannon - Huston
Merritt Brown - developer at Zia Station

John Mahoney - Las Soleras
Karl Sommer - Las Soleras
Carlos Magno - FHWA
Robert Fijol - FHWA
Lisa ?? - Mayor's Committee on Disability

c. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

That agenda was accepted as presented.

d. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 24, 2009 & OCTOBER 26, 2009

Approval of minutes was postponed.

1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS:

a. Santa Fe Corridor Studies

1) NM599 Interchange Priority Study: Presentation of the Phase B Recommendations

Ms. Jeanette Walther from Bohannon/Huston reported completion of the Phase A study and for Phase B they completed their draft report. She shared copies and reviewed a powerpoint with the Committee.

There was a public perception that signals reduced accidents but they had accidents at the light intersections. Their plan looked at the safety issues and they would develop a prioritization plan. Then after the TCC review, they would take it to the TPB on Thursday and have another public information meeting after the draft report was approved. They had to be finished by February.

Mr. Liming excused himself from the meeting.

Ms. Walther explained that they did two forecastings with the model. Scenario 1 was with the speed at 65 mph. Scenario 4 showed a decrease in traffic on 599 but increases in other corridors. Scenario 1 showed increases on 599 and decreases on the other corridors. Because it was a relief route, they didn't want 599 signalized.

The rest of the PPT was of various intersections on the relief route for which she briefly explained the

alternatives available. They decided to recommend elimination of the frontage road at Jaguar. The developer would be building a road there more within his property. She pointed out the difficulties of the northern frontage from Jaguar to Airport.

Mr. Smith noted in Figure 8 that the City received an application and the Palisades developers might not want that access. They discussed a new access location to their property, Tierra Contenta and other development in the area. They were suggesting in an application to be filed that the frontage road would be too close to that intersection.

Mr. Romero understood their access would be that frontage road. If they decided to build a frontage road tomorrow, this was where they would put it. So the access off Jaguar would be the frontage road.

Ms. Walther said they had indicated they would probably cut across there at some point.

The following were her comments on each figure in the powerpoint presentation.

Fig 9 - TC asked us to eliminate frontage on the east side. They have platted it all for development. They already have an access road. A frontage there would also impact the business on the right side.

Fig 10 = Airport Road interchange. She showed the potential trail location to the north.

Fig 12 = frontage road across Santa Fe River.

Fig 13 = frontage from CR 61 to Caja del Rio.

Fig 15 = CR 62 - no change

Fig 16 - CR 70 - no change.

Fig 17 = Ephraim interchange - would require some ROW on the side and also looked at small frontage road from las Montoyas back to Ephraim. There was not much dev planned for north side - (Santa Fe Open Space would need access).

She pointed out some Santa Fe Public School property down near Buckman that they would like southern access to. An interchange could be built there because it was publicly owned property.

Mr. Romero thought the purchase of the property there would be as expensive as building a frontage road there.

Mr. Smith thought the plat for the subdivision might be at its expiration date and noted that it had not been recorded yet. He was curious about the neighborhood project. Regarding the naming of streets - before construction, they would need a different name for it. At some point there was probably an alternate road to Alameda. Everything else blocked the connection.

The other issue was the number of access points. He pointed out that there could be another

development in Santa Fe Estates on the north side of 599 and that needed to be analyzed.

Ms. Walther agreed.

There was discussion on not tying the overpass at Las Montoyas into the Northwest Quadrant development.

Mr. Smith thought the decision would need a special majority to do it.

Mr. Wilson commented that prior to the motion, there was discussion to make that a condition in the motion but when the motion was made, he didn't make that as part of the motion. There were discussions with Lee Depietro and Kelley Brennan about it.

As it stood now there was no connection. If they wanted it, they would have to come back for an amendment. It would require a 2/3 Council majority.

Mr. Smith said the City Council would vote on the final order on Wednesday so the Committee needed to make sure of it.

Mr. Romero said that was the way he understood it. If they started building this interchange tomorrow, it would be built like this without a connection.

Mr. Smith said there was generic access to Santa Fe Estates at Ridgetop and another from 599 further down. It was required to have two ways to access the development.

Ms. Walther showed a summary of their work that included right of way requirements, construction costs, relations required, safety improvements, removal of traffic from adjacent locations, existing intersections, level of service and environmental impacts.

Mr. Romero commented that there were some intersections that required immediate relief.

Mr. Tibbetts arrived at this time.

Mr. Wilson said that of all the studies, this was the one they were looking at definitive recommendations for. It was useful to put a line above those that were not essential in the next 20 years.

Mr. Romero agreed they just needed some to pick from.

Ms. Walther said CR62 had most advantages; 70 also had some of the same traffic and safety concerns; then the extension of the route over Santa Fe River. They still needed to finish the analysis of signalized intersections. There were actually more accidents at signalized intersections but unsignalized accidents were almost 100% injury accidents. The disadvantage of signals was that usually accident rates increased until people got used to them. They were concerned about the CR 62 intersection because traffic would increase there and South Meadows would increase.

Mr. Smith concluded that there was no clear answer on safety advantages.

Mr. Wilson said when she finalized the priorities he could distribute it and they would consider it at the January meeting.

2) I-25 Corridor Study: Update

Mr. Quintana reported that they just had a public meeting last Thursday that was well attended. HOAs were opposed to extensions at Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles. DOT decided not to recommend them to TPB. So the TPB resolution of 2006 eliminated them.

But moving forward on all interchange improvements, Richards and I-25 auxiliary lanes were recommended to the MPO. There was currently no funding for Richards and St. Francis interchanges.

3) St. Francis Drive Corridor Study: Update

Mr. Quintana said they planned to report on St. Francis to the TCC next month and TPB in February. Final recommendations for St. Francis were expected in March. They met with Eric Wrage last week on access points to eliminate on St. Francis Drive and would have public meetings on the impact of those closings in Feb with probably 3-4 meetings at locations to be determined later. They were primarily for those who would be directly affected.

That final report was also due in March with final recommendations for MPO.

b. Progress Report on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

1) 2010-2046 MTP Schedule

Mr. Wilson said they were working through it. He distributed the timeline for completion (exhibit). It was a lot of work. He reviewed the matrix. It showed their agenda for today and hoped the TCC would agree to two meetings in January.

He reported they were currently doing all the mapping that would have public meetings in late January so he want to update the TCC first in early January to make sure it all made sense. Then the 2nd meeting would be on I-25 and St. Francis presentations with about an hour for each one.

Then in Feb it would go to TCC with feedback from public meetings and completion of the draft report. Then in February they would have a clear idea on fiscal constraints for the MTP, like Cerrillos Road and the CR 62 extension. They would start in February and finish in March.

At the March meeting he hoped to have a complete MTP to recommend to the TPB for a 30 day review

and at the April TCC would share the feedback from public meetings report. Hopefully by May the TCC could approve recommendations to the TPB. The drop dead date for getting to FHWA was the end of June so this would give them time to work out problems.

He asked that they meet on January 11th when staff would present what they would take to the public.

Mr. Morelli asked if they were getting help on this work and if Mr. Rogers was on board.

Mr. Wilson said they were trying to get consultants on board. But felt pretty comfortable on everything. They were folding in the information from the corridor studies and the material Mr. Rogers was working on for bikeways. They could not complete the pedestrian final yet and there were transit issues.

Mr. Morelli asked if they might have two meetings in June if they ran into trouble.

Mr. Wilson said either then or a second meeting in May. Most of the controversy was around the I-25 corridor study. The biggest challenge was that they would have \$300 million worth of projects. That would be the biggest challenge because there wouldn't be enough money.

Mr. Morelli said the UPWP would have to be approved at that same time.

Mr. Wilson agreed there was some overlap there. Hopefully they would have a good discussion on it.

Mr. Morelli added that there was talk about another stimulus package but he didn't want a repeat of last year's process.

2) Future Roads Network Update

Mr. Wilson noted that at the last meeting they went through the bulk of this. They met with City staff to resolve the issues with it and Mr. Jandáček would be doing a sustainable plan report.

Mr. Jandáček provided a handout on it. He said they were working on what would be funded through CIP. These two maps would be included in the County's Sustainable Land Use Development Plan. They had been working with MPO staff and consultants to develop it. They started with the ARTF from 1999.

Map 40 was the future road improvements listed and categorized. Essentially they were in the College District with just a couple outside of it. They held onto Road A (#18) which was subject to the outcome of the 599 corridor study. Figure 12 showed the extended frontage road on 599, if that was preferred - and Road A would drop off the list.

In some they had approved master plans (off of NM14). Some of the smaller neighborhood roads were mapped out and the rest would be developer driven. Some were essential for connectivity. But unless they had a chance to run through public meetings, they were just for discussion. There was a connection for El Dorado to NM14. A higher priority was the SE Connector (#23) and the Avenida del Sur extension.

One area they were very concerned about was the Level of Service on NM14 anticipated by 2020 because modeling suggests a level of "D" there.

Map 45 showed the completed network and it didn't include smaller neighborhood roads.

They had future roadways through 2020 and 2020-2035 and those recommended for alignment. Others were for study, some for improvements and one road closure. They were now developing the priorities for funding.

He explained that this was the first time the County had developed a functional classification for its road system and wanted to make sure they were consistent with what was being proposed for the MTP with principal arterials, minor arterials and collector roads. They had not fleshed out what they were doing with CIP yet.

He invited comments and explained that they had several drafts and some things still needed to be hammered out.

3) Future Bikeways Network Update

Mr. Wilson apologized that he didn't bring copies for everyone. Tim Rogers developed a comprehensive look at them and could make extra copies available via the website. Mr. Rogers had been meeting with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Study Group and the City BTAC. He also worked closely with COLTPAC staff. Then in January he would prioritize them. So they would have overall maps and recommendations for prioritizing them. Mr. Rogers' work had been great.

4) MTP Section Updates

Mr. Wilson said this involved ADA considerations. Where sidewalks were deficient and other issues. They hoped to get things from that in the Transition plan.

Mr. Tibbetts noted that AARP had been doing a study and all intersections with signal timing.

Ms. Lisa from the Mayor's Commission on Disability said she would keep bugging them about it.

Mr. Wilson said he was meeting with City and County folks for identifying the intersections they needed to focus on. And also ITS to focus on recommendations for the MTP. Next summer they would update the ITS (smart signals) and in July or August should get into that process. It depended on the size of the projects. So those were some of the things they were working on for the MTP.

Mr. Tibbetts added that on the financial section, they were in contact with the El Paso MPO who were giving them help with ideas on the financial section. They needed to focus on it because they received

some issues related to last MTP from the FHWA.

c. Rail Runner Service Update

1) Las Soleras Station Study

Mr. Tibbetts thanked the representatives from Las Soleras and Zia for their attendance. He said that in their TIP they were to have an environmental assessment done for the Las Soleras station and that was in negotiation for a contract with Bohannon-Huston. The meetings were not yet set up but staff would participate in the study. It would likely start as soon as they finished the contract.

Mr. Mahoney said the contract was an MOU between DOT, MRCOG and Las Soleras. So it was a three-way deal. Legal was finished with it and the contract with Bohannon-Huston was signed to make sure they had all the background on it.

Mr. Tibbetts asked how long it would take.

Mr. Mahoney said it would be 3-4 months.

Mr. Tibbetts commented that the amount of data on the 599 station with its pedestrian bridge would be limited. That station opened in August so it would be a little shy of a year. That was one concern.

Mr. Mahoney said the issue for Las Soleras was that the station needed to serve the public need.

2) Zia Station Status

Mr. Tibbetts said that they were getting questions on when it would be operative. Mr. Brown was here. There was an issue on the final agreements between DOT and developers.

Mr. Brown said it was basically just ROW exchanges to get completed. They were not in disagreement. There were some condemnations to be done. Hopefully that would all be resolved soon so it could proceed.

Mr. Tibbetts asked if the MP review would occur in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Brown agreed. They just had to stop for the legal clearance. Hopefully right after the first of the year it would happen.

Mr. Smith asked if there was an interim agreement on when the property was developed.

Mr. Brown said no. They agreed that the plan was first submitted to the City. They could start talking about temporary access to that station any day. Hopefully the right of way would be all cleared up and they

could move ahead.

Mr. Smith said he needed to get his department involved so he would talk with Tamara Baer about it.

Mr. Wilson said they met a few months ago with City staff. And now wondered what they could do to help open the access to the station. If they could get sidewalks along Zia Road from Galisteo to St. Francis that would link into the bike trail. Eventually the sidewalks would get ripped up for something more substantial. It was never envisioned as a park and ride.

Mr. Sommer said with Beckner Road Equities they talked that the MOU was practically in place and Soleras was already writing serious checks. He asked what the item was on the TPB agenda.

Mr. Tibbetts said it was just an update. It was ongoing information reporting. There was no thought of reconsideration. There had been push back from FHWA on the need for a station but nothing that indicated any response was needed from TPB.

He said DOT's position was that the role of FHWA was granting access to meet standards. If there was any impact to health or safety, it would require some kind of acceptance of 810 approval. Other than that, there was no role.

At this point, the burden was on the development meeting the conditions the MPO stated in December last year. There was nothing changing. The study needed to happen. Right now they didn't want to make it any issue for action.

Mr. Sommer said he had answered his question and it was reassuring.

Mr. Tibbetts said they could discuss the FHWA. He invited them to that meeting and they declined. It went through enough of a comprehensive analysis. It was premature to make any assumptions now.

FHWA was not going to be at the TPB meeting so they wouldn't be taking any action on it. It was an ongoing issue with many factors involved.

Mr. Bulthuis asked about the timeline. It sounded like the doors were opening but he wondered when.

Mr. Tibbetts said they had the preliminary meeting and were told by Public Works that it would be through the Council to direct staff to initiate a transition plan to get access to the station. Staff decided to talk directly with Mr. Brown about it. They were at a point where it could begin now. They had contacted four Councilors now (because it was at a dividing line) to work out how to proceed and address the fears of the neighborhood and the delays of train schedule. They were just waiting for City approval now.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if he would bring it.

Mr. Wilson explained that it was no longer a TPB issue so they would just go to City Council. They

would talk with Park & Ride as well. A whole of conversations needed to happen in the next few months.

Mr. Romero thought a resolution from Council was needed to open it.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed but they wanted to answer the neighborhood concerns. If they saw a lot of parking happening, they could restrict it. He added that it had to go through Public Works.

Mr. Romero said he wanted to be prepared so if there was a station study done for this station, it would be important to say there was a study.

Mr. Tibbetts said there was a study done in June through December.

Mr. Romero asked to get a copy as it would help to get the sidewalks in. He said he didn't know how to answer all the questions that kept coming in.

Mr. Wilson suggested it would be good to convene those players and have them report again. MPO staff were just trying to facilitate it since it came through MPO originally.

Mr. Smith noted that it had already been through neighborhood notification.

Mr. Wilson agreed they didn't want to circumvent any city processes.

Mr. Smith thought such a meeting would help City staff be able to field the public's questions.

Mr. Bulthuis said the distinction between station function and the independent development and the timing were very important to avoid confusion. He said Mr. Brown had done a lot with the neighbors already.

Mr. Brown said the big question was who was holding what up. He said they were not holding stuff up and they would prefer to have their plan out there in the public view. They didn't want the development approval tied to the opening of the station.

d. Santa Fe Area Transit Service Plan Update

Mr. Bulthuis reported. He said he and Mr. Jandáček had been in the trenches on this. The Board approved the Regional Transit Plan at their November meeting. Also the RPA adopted components for implementation. So right now they were in a transitional phase with RPA. They had spent their funds for this year but RPA would have to determine how to spend it for next year.

He agreed to forward the report by email for the MPO web site. He also agreed to send the official letter on projects of the RPA that were currently approved.

Mr. Jandáček commented that at the last NCRTD meeting their board adopted this service plan so they would be continuing the services on this list and tracking the GRT revenues to know how much was

coming in.

Mr. Wilson asked if the economy had affected the revenue.

Mr. Bulthuis said they budgeted only 3/4 of the current year and that helped and they also had a 10% cushion. It was pretty close to what they projected.

Mr. Bulthuis wondered what would happen to this process if the RPA ceased to exist. No one knew where they would be moving next. It was something for TCC and TPB to consider.

Mr. Wilson asked if there was reluctance to have the MPO fulfill that role.

Mr. Bulthuis said there were some who wanted the RPA to continue and others who would favor MPO to handle it. They would have to see what was decided.

Mr. Romero asked what their boundaries were.

Mr. Jandáček said it was county wide now.

Mr. Bulthuis said 80% of their trips came in the MPO area. Chimayo and Pojoaque wouldn't but the rest would.

Mr. Smith noted that 90% of the role of RPA was land development according to City uses.

Mr. Tibbetts said the whole idea was not to see their formal role but more informal to resolve the edge type issues.

Mr. Bulthuis said they had transit and COLTPAC and beyond that there was discretionary prioritization. If they were not doing it, someone had to pick up that ball.

Mr. Jandáček noted that the RPA Board was established by statute as manager of GRT funds. So if that changed there would have to be amendments to that language.

Mr. Tibbetts said the GRT disbursement was written in for RTD creation. But the transit planning was better suited to MPO. The rest was in flux. The issue of land use and GRT distribution still needed to be worked out. That was a yearly distribution and could be done through an MOU.

3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Tibbetts said their big issue was the timeline and getting these things completed.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Bulhuis announced that the City and Santa Fe Trails were hosting the Southwest Transit Association Conference (covering 8 states). Some high level officials were coming in. Feb 8-10 - Rail Runner would be actively involved and do a demo and technical tour. It would be at the Santa Fe Community Convention Center and was open to the public but there were registration costs.

Mr. Mahoney was interested.

Mr. Smith said it should be coordinated with QICP people. Mr. Bulhuis didn't know but thought so.

Mr. Wilson agreed to put it on his web site.

5. ADJOURN – Next TCC meeting: Monday January 25, 2009

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

The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Approved by:

John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer