

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**SANTA FE MPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD**  
**December 10, 2009**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Call to Order	Convened at 3:00	1
Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published	1
Approval of Minutes October 8 2009	Approved as submitted	1
A. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC	Discussion	2-3
B. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
1. 2010 Meeting Schedule	Approved	3
2. Rail Runner Service Update		
a. Las Soleras Station Study	Discussion	3-4
b. Zia Station Status	Discussion	4
3. Santa Fe Corridor Studies		
a. NM599 Interchanges - Phase B	Presentation	4-7
b. I-25 Corridor Study Update	Discussion	7
c. St. Francis Corridor Study Update	Discussion	7-8
4. Progress Report on the MTP		
a. 2010-2035 MTP Schedule	Discussion	8
b. Future Roads Network Update	Discussion	8
c. Future Bikeways Network Update	Discussion	8-9
d. MTP Sections Updates	Discussion	9
5. Santa Fe Area Transit Service Plan Update	Discussion	9-10
C. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD	None	10
D. MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF	Discussion	10
E. COMMUNICATIONS FROM NMDOT/FHWA	None	10
G. ADJOURN - Next Meeting - TBD	Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.	10

**MINUTES OF THE  
SANTA FE MPO  
TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD  
June 11, 2009**

**CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Transportation Policy board was called to order on the above date by Commissioner Mike Anaya at approximately 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**ROLL CALL**

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Commissioner Michael Anaya  
Councilor Miguel Chávez  
Mayor David Coss  
Councilor Matthew E. Ortiz  
Commissioner Liz Stefanics  
Mr. Max Valerio, DOT

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Councilman Robert Mora, Chair  
Commissioner Virginia Vigil

**STAFF PRESENT:**

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

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Commissioner Stefanics moved to approve the agenda as presented. Councilor Ortiz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 8, 2009**

**Commissioner Stefanics moved to approve the minutes of October 8, 2009 as presented. Mayor Coss seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## A. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. George Sanchez representing a group of homeowner associations on the south side of the City, said they had proposals for the I-25 corridor and had nice discussions at the public meeting. Councilor Ortiz indicated he would see if he could initiate efforts to get the extension of Governor Miles and the extension of Camino Carlos Rey off the project list.

He clarified that the associations did not want the extensions to continue. The DOT recommendation was a very low priority for that extension and the costs for both were negligible for the benefit received.

He thought in 2004 or 2005 Councilor Ortiz had recommended that it be taken off but it had not been done.

Councilor Ortiz thanked him for coming. He was referring to the 2006-65 City resolution that called for no further extension east or from Camino Carlos Rey where it dead ended.

Mr. Wilson handed out copies of the resolution [attached as Exhibit A].

Councilor Ortiz said he was talking about a public meeting where DOT affirmed that Governor Miles would not be extended east nor would Camino Carlos Rey be extended south. He asked staff to put on the agenda the formal adoption of the City's resolution if the MPO took official action on it. In 2006 some of these parcels had not been annexed but they were all now entirely within the city limits and he thought the resolution was binding. But to be consistent, he said he would put it on the next agenda for discussion and adoption.

Mayor Coss said they probably could not adopt the resolution at this meeting but it did say discussion and possible action on the agenda.

Mr. Tibbetts explained that what was decided in 2006 was that when the corridor study was finished, it would be presented to the TPB. The study was not yet completed. The resolution was just as he stated that it be presented to the TPB to take the extension of Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey off the MTP. The decision of the Board at that time was to wait until the completion of the study in February.

He said I-25 would be completed in February. NM599 and St. Francis would also be completed in February.

Councilor Ortiz thought the proper time to have the discussion was in February. He remembered the discussion - Paul Campos discussed it. He said he had not had time to review it and that was why it was removed from consideration at that time. But now, when the Board received the report it needed to be on the agenda. He agreed with staff.

Mr. Sanchez asked if it would have a public discussion then.

Councilor Ortiz agreed.

Mr. Sanchez urged the Board, as it was going through some of the planning that involved certain communities to involve those communities as stake holders. Developers were involved but the neighborhood associations would like the communities to be involved also. Because residents ended up feeling things were being done to them or rights being taken away. So to avoid opposition, they needed to be involved.

Commissioner Anaya thought that was a good point.

## **B. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION**

### **1. 2010 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Tibbetts said the 2010 meeting schedule was the packet. The middle column listed the TPB meetings. They were set for monthly because the MTP was due no later than June 20<sup>th</sup>. To have this extensive public involvement not only with the corridor studies but with MTP, the priorities were recommended by consultants and the Board would pick the ones to be in the MTP.

At the January meeting the agenda would include the election of officers and approval of the MTP. By June they might not have that much to bring forward and could go to bimonthly at that time.

**Councilor Chávez moved to approve the 2010 Meeting Schedule. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

### **2. Rail Runner Service Update**

#### **a. Las Soleras Station Study**

Mr. Tibbetts said they had Rail Runner updates, corridor updates and now MTP updates. The Las Soleras update was to let the Board know that commencing now, the Las Soleras study was in the TIP for \$500,000 to do the environmental assessment (EA) and station design. The process started with the EA through NMED and with Bohannon Huston through DOT and would take 3 months.

Commissioner Stefanics asked formal the study was in the entire process - moving forward with construction.

Mr. Tibbetts explained that when the station was approved last December by the TPB there were certain conditions put on it. One was to have the state complex being built there, roads being built, and a plan on the south side of I-25 for access to that station. And ultimately that MR COG would go through another EA and station design to comply with the safety in the median. It was another process to finalize the station. The construction wouldn't begin until all that was vetted.

Commissioner Stefanics asked at what point in the studies they would identify the connectivity.

Mr. Tibbetts said it would come up during this study because EA was part of meeting the conditions of TPB approval. He thought it would come back to the TPB to make sure all those conditions had been met and then proceed.

Commissioner Stefanics concluded that the conditions included all of those.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed they were pretty specific and he would say these things would come up during the process because there were lots of rumors going on. But as far as he could see, they were going forward as stated.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if the approval included all the conditions and if one was not met it would put it back on the table. Mr. Tibbetts agreed.

Commissioner Stefanics didn't know that all these things would be met.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed they didn't know now.

Councilor Ortiz clarified that those 3 conditions were specific to the motion and in the subsequent developer application in that approval too. Those three had to be met for the development and the station to proceed forward.

#### **b. Zia Station Status**

Mr. Tibbetts said at the last meeting, he mentioned they were meeting with the developer of Zia station to monitor the progress there. To clarify, it was in the City's decision to get the background work done. One issue they addressed was that it would be a drop-off type station; that was what was intended. They addressed the Mayor's Commission on Disability to determine what adequate access was. They said sidewalks that were ADA compliant would be sufficient.

Part of the issue was how closely it was tied to development approval. It would go through the City Development Review and be decided by the City Council. The hold up was on the ROW

### **3. Santa Fe Corridor Studies**

#### **a. NM599 Interchange Priority Study: Presentation of the Phase B Recommendations**

Mr. Wilson said they were expecting Dave Quintana from DOT and he was delayed. They had these corridor studies going on and they were now coming to a head. Ms. Darlene Walther would give a presentation on it. She had a power point prepared but technical difficulties precluded the use of screens.

Ms. Walther said they finished the Phase A study and did a draft of Phase B for review to determine the

preferred alternatives. Included in her presentation were traffic projections with the impact of various choices. She noted that signalizations would increase traffic accidents and the speed limit would have to be decreased to 35 mph. So if it was to operate as a bypass then signalized intersections would not work.

They looked at all alternatives. They moved the access bridge closer to I-25 for preventing turns. This was a more cost effective location. They could still have a sweeping right turn. It was the preferred location. She explained that the median would be closed there to eliminate left turns to reduce accidents and make the bypass completely access controlled.

Councilor Chávez noted the last accident there was a person coming from Denver. It had been problematic and a friend was T-boned last Christmas. So this has been one of those where transition from interstate was critical.

Ms. Walther said that Jaguar Drive was still an interchangeable location.

Councilor Chávez understood that figure 3 and figure 5 were alternates. He asked if one would replace the other.

Ms. Walther said they were seeing the frontage road alternative. There was no existing interchange there but land was preserved for one.

Councilor Chávez asked if they needed to do both. Ms. Walther agreed.

Councilor Ortiz asked if there was significance that a developer could construct the bridge out there.

Ms. Walther said this study was only looking at public funding for them. She explained that it was already an approved interchange location.

She said that in the study they next looked at frontage roads. They eliminated the frontage on the north side. It was owned by one developer who had a road through his property. The one on the east side was still an active alternative. The development was not completely planned yet. She clarified that this frontage road was on two sheets.

Fig 9 showed that they eliminated both frontage roads. Feedback from the Tierra Contenta Corporation was that the one on the east would adversely affect their development plans. The orange box shown was owned by DOT and Tierra Contenta gave access to it. The one on the north had an adverse grade and it was hard to even get access there. One that was closer to the Airport was not needed. She preferred the alternate at the Airport which would give extra circulation.

Councilor Ortiz asked if that was preferred to having an intersection at Caja del Rio.

Ms. Walther said they were still looking at an intersection there. Most of that frontage road existed except the piece across the river.

Councilor Chávez asked if in Fig 10 all of the intersections were grade separated.

Ms. Walther said she drew it with 599 over Airport but it would work the other way too.

Councilor Chávez asked if that was using the existing frontage road. Ms. Walther agreed but added that cost estimates didn't include the frontage road.

Ms. Walther said in Fig 13 the right of way was not preserved for an interchange there. There was an access point. She asked that they compare it to Fig 14 for the frontage road back to Caja del Rio. There was a large noise wall required at the mobile home park. It would cost as much as an interchange and provide less circulation.

Next was Ephraim Road - an existing right in right out intersection and had no traffic on it now. It was preserved for an interchange. They showed it just an overpass in 18 and 19 that extended the frontage road across in front of Unity church.

Mayor Coss asked where Ephraim Road went.

Ms. Walther said it just went across the road. It was open space for the City but there was just one private property there. Of the 3 alternatives to serve that area, the least expensive was the frontage road but they had input from City staff that they would like future access from the south at Buckman Road to that City property and school property. This was the lowest priority. It had no traffic but could become one in the future if development happened there.

Fig 20 was Camino de las Montoyas an interchange. It was 1/3 mil north of the existing intersection and if constructed, the intersection would be closed. They included a small piece of frontage road.

Fig 21 was the same interchange but instead of a frontage road would have an overpass. A frontage road was cheaper.

Councilor Ortiz excused himself from the meeting.

Ms. Walther said in 23 and 24, they looked at an interchange in between. They eliminated both of these alternatives. The frontage road on the west was mostly City open space. There was private property near Ridgetop Rd but development plans didn't have access to the frontage. It would also be very expensive because of a large hill there. The one on the south side they eliminated because it was essentially the same as the road to the Northwest Quadrant. They understood that connection would not be allowed so they eliminated it.

The table showed what was required. She reviewed the column titles. The three columns would be used in priority setting. Most of them had been EA cleared. But some work in the arroyos had medium effort. It didn't mean they could not be constructed. The last column was whether they were still being

considered or were eliminated.

Commissioner Anaya asked if she would be coming back with the priorities. Ms. Walther agreed.

Councilor Chávez said what he heard was that CR 70 seemed to be on the top priority for a variety of reasons.

Commissioner Anaya thanked her and said they looked forward to hearing the finished product.

Mayor Coss asked if she totaled up the table excluding the options.

Ms. Walther said she didn't but knew it was a lot.

Mr. Wilson said there were far more projects than they could afford so prioritizing was very important. That would be the fun part after the new year.

#### **b. I-25 Corridor Study Update**

Mr. Quintana reported. He said they had a public review meeting at Genoveva Chávez Community Center on the 3<sup>rd</sup> with about 60 members of the public there. Most were from Pueblos del Sol who were concerned about the extensions. And what the project management team was listing as projects for inclusion in MTP. He told them they would not include those two extensions. There were other comments.

The projects to include were interstate improvements at Cerrillos, St. Francis and Old Pecos Trail and the auxiliary lanes between off ramp/ on ramps. That would be done in conjunction with Richards if they went forward with Richards.

The report would be coming in February and he would then formally give their recommendations for the MTP.

Mayor Coss asked what the public response was on Richards.

Mr. Quintana said most were positive. Many didn't want it widened. But besides Jack Sullivan, most were in favor.

#### **c. St. Francis Drive Corridor Study Update**

Mr. Quintana said they planned a few more public meetings in January and February. The reason for them was the proposed median closures along St. Francis, especially north of San Mateo. Four more meetings would get those who would be affected by closures there. The report and presentation would be in February for that study. Some alternatives that would be moved forward looked at auxiliary lanes from the 599/285 interchange - the off ramp to the south that would be extended into town. Another was



changing the left hand exit at Guadalupe to a right hand exit. The auxiliary lane extension from St. Michael's Drive would be put back after widening of St. Francis. Also the elimination of the loop off St. Michael's to St. Francis and making it a left hand movement to the other off ramp. There was also a need to widen St. Francis south of St. Michael's. That was all the projects except for some ITS projects and intersection improvements that could be done.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if they were expected to vote in February or if that would just be a preliminary review.

Mr. Quintana said they still had until June to prioritize them.

#### **4. Progress Report on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan**

##### **a. 2010-2035 MTP Schedule**

Mr. Wilson noted that the last page of the packet had a schedule. This was essentially why they needed to meet monthly. They had to have the plan completed by June. It was mostly just prioritizing for the next MTP and meeting fiscal constraints. In January they would have two public meetings and take all the corridor study to get general feedback on improvements. As they moved along they would complete sections as they went. Then in March they would start prioritization and know the fiscal constraints better.

Then they would have to figure out the highest priorities. In April they hoped to finish it and go through the public review process and by May complete that and ask the Board to adopt the schedule. They had to get it to FHWA by the end of June. So this was just a rough outline. The Coordinating Committee would be making recommendations to the Board after their discussion and would try to involve the public as much as possible with web site, emails and public announcements.

##### **b. Future Roads Network Update**

Mr. Wilson said they would bring this to the Board next month. They met with City and County staff to see which projects from last MTP were still valid and working with the Sustainable Land Use staff to make sure they were incorporating all that needed to be done there and some developers' projects that might rise to that level. They would bring all the projects at the next meeting so the Board could see what was being considered.

##### **c. Future Bikeways Network Update**

Mr. Wilson said they hired Tim Rogers who had been with DOT and was very familiar with biking in Santa Fe. He was developing a very comprehensive system plan of the bikeways network.

Commissioner Stefanics said several meetings ago she had asked for the Board to look at what the

City, County and State had in place - a comparison of the ordinances and statutes.

Mr. Wilson said Mr. Rogers was working on that.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if he could bring a comparison chart on it. She had been waiting to see if they were in sync or not.

Mr. Wilson said it included project paving. He didn't think the State had a statute but was moving in that direction.

Commissioner Stefanics said the County had updated the ordinance after they got an email from the executive branch that if they didn't get in compliance they would be cut off from funds.

#### **d. MTP Sections Update**

Mr. Wilson said some projects were being developed through the corridor studies and some independently. MPO Staff had been to the Mayor's Committee on Disability to work together on those that didn't meet ADA requirements.

AARP had identified Santa Fe as a research site to identify pedestrians at intersections. They were using researchers and should have recommendations for funding.

There were additional sections they were working on and would report to the Board as they were ready.

#### **5. Santa Fe Area Transit Service Plan Update**

Mr. Wilson shared the report that the RPA undertook for transit to expand the transit GRT. The study was completed in September. Essentially this was the report and it was available on the web site.

Commissioner Stefanics added that they had a one page layout of the routes they thought would be covered by the GRT and could make it available. It took four months but do have agreement about it.

#### **C. MATTERS FROM THE SFMPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD**

None.

#### **D. MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF**

Mr. Tibbetts announced that he and Mr. Wilson would be in Las Cruces for a meeting of the 5 MPOs of

New Mexico. They would address the financial section on how to pay for all of this and would report back to the Board what they found out.

Mr. Wilson noted that Santa Fe Trails was hosting a conference and he had a few copies of the brochures for the Board members.

**E. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE NMDOT AND FHWA**

None.

**F. ADJOURNMENT – Next scheduled meeting to be determined**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Approved by:

---

Michael Anaya, Chair Pro Tem

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer