

SUMMARY INDEX
SANTA FE MPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
June 11, 2009

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Call to Order	Convened at 9:30	1
Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published	1
Approval of Minutes April 14, 2009	Approved as submitted	1-2
A. ACTION ITEMS		
1. FY 2010-13 TIP Amendment	Approved	2-4
2. FY 2009 Airport Road Safety Project	Included above	4
B. DISCUSSION ITEMS		
1. Santa Fe Studies Status		
b. St. Francis & New Mexico 599	Discussion	4-7
a. I-25 - Alternatives	Discussion	7-8
2. Update on Rail Runner Express	Discussion	8-9
3. Regional Transit Operations	Discussion	9-10
C. MATTERS FROM TPB	None	10
D. MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF	Discussion	10
E. COMMUNICATIONS FROM NMDOT/FHWA	None	10
F. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	10-11
G. ADJOURN - Next Meeting - Aug. 13, 2009	Adjourned at 11:15 a.m.	11

**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 Michael Anaya, Chair at approximately 9:30 a.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:

Councilor Robert Mora, Vice Chair
Councilor Miguel Chávez
Commissioner Liz Stefanics [arriving later]
Commissioner Virginia Vigil
Councilor Rosemary Romero
Mr. Lawrence Barrera, DOT

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Commissioner Michael Anaya, Chair
Mayor David Coss
Councilor Matthew E. Ortiz

STAFF PRESENT:

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Tibbetts said the only change staff wished to make to the agenda was that in section B 1, parts a and b be reversed.

Commissioner Vigil moved to approve the agenda as amended. Vice Chair Mora seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 14, 2009

Commissioner Vigil moved to approve the April 14, 2009 minutes as presented. Councilor Chávez seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority voice vote, with all voting yes except Councilor Romero, who abstained.

A. ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of FY 2010-13 SFMPO Amended Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Tibbetts said when the board met in April, they determined that the TIP document would have to be amended because of fiscal restraints in 2012 and 2013. Staff had since completed it from Fiscal Years 2010 to 2013. The projects that were listed in those years had funding already. He noted they had created an Outer year@ section. He said basically what they had done was move projects that didn't have complete funding to the Outer year@ section. It was basically a menu of projects that were in the wings, just waiting on funding. A change had been made to the projects in 2010, 12, and 13. He directed the Board to page two of the 2010 section, the project listed in red had been in 2009, had originally been funded at \$250,000. They had found additional funding and brought the amount of funding to \$750,000. They added an additional \$120,500 for ADA improvements on Airport Road. That project had been moved to FY2010 and might need more funding for other aspects, but the ADA improvements were funded.

Commissioner Stefanics arrived at this time.

Mr. Tibbetts said the other change they had made was in 2012 and 2011. He directed the Board members to page 3, for the 2011 section to the replacement and rehabilitation for the bridge at St. Francis Drive and I-25. Originally, \$7,455,000 of funding had been designated for that project. The TCC recommended that \$2.5 million be moved to continue Cerrillos to Camino Carlos Rey. Staff had a total of \$5 million to spread between projects in 2012 and 2013. They wanted to be able to fund the South Meadows project for 2012. They took the \$5 million and put \$2.5 million back into the St. Francis Bridge project and the other \$2.5 million went to the South Meadows project to try to get a win-win situation.

The other one in 2013, on page 5, was the continuation of the construction of the Rail Trail south of Rabbit Road. They hoped eventually to have a connection to the Community College. They had already designated \$100,000 to pave the Rail Trail to Rabbit Road, which could be done by that year. He said changes had been made to South Meadows, Cerrillos, and the Rail Trail.

Commissioner Vigil asked if he meant the Rail Runner would include the Community College as a stop.

Mr. Tibbetts explained that the Rail Trail was a bicycle/pedestrian trail.

Commissioner Vigil asked if they were making improvements to the existing trail.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed. He said they were intended as transportation corridors for alternative transportation and should be all-weather paved trails in the urban areas. He gave an example of a spur trail that had been paved with crusher fines and had failed.

Commissioner Vigil asked if the idea was to connect the spur trail to Rail Trail.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed. They were looking at a few different options to build the bicycle/pedestrian trails. He said their focus was on City trails, but since they were working with the County, expansions of other trails were being worked on as well. He said Mr. Wilson had been working with other groups. There was a task force set up to coordinate that effort so they could begin to fund some of the major trails.

Commissioner Vigil asked if this meant the TIP document had future prospective amendments to it. Mr. Tibbetts agreed.

Councilor Chávez said the projects should be better identified. In the project at the top of page five, an explanation was given of the intent of the project. In the comment box, to be clearer, they could add the comment, "designed to feature bike and pedestrian accessibility." He added that the note on urban requirements was more extensive than in rural areas. ADA requirements would have to go through that committee as well. He had a similar question on the bridge replacement for St. Francis and I-25 on page three. He asked how the design for the bridge replacement and a pedestrian crossing might be consolidated.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was one of the issues the presentation would address. The issue was very much pending the phase two process where they did any design changes and looked at crossings. On the St. Francis study there was nexus too, so the issue would definitely be brought up and more specifically addressed.

Councilor Chávez said he thought it made sense to combine those two projects in design and construction.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed that it did, and said they were trying to consider all modes of transportation.

Mr. Phil Gallegos from District 5 introduced himself to the Board. He understood the St. Francis pedestrian crossing was funded separately and the City of Santa Fe had the lead on it. He said they were designing it already, and it would occur before the bridge project. Funding for the bridge would be from federal bridge money that had been there for six or seven years because they had anticipated that those bridges would need major rehabilitation or replacement. They had \$7.5 million, so they could do some. Once the study was complete, they would have final recommendations, and could determine how much more money they might need. He said that to combine projects would delay the pedestrian bridge because it was his understanding that the City already had money for it.

Councilor Chávez asked if one project would be overstepping the other.

Mr. Gallegos said they could be independent. The design for the pedestrian bridge was a standalone project.

Mr. Tibbetts clarified that part of the study on the I-25 corridor was a bicycle/pedestrian crossing. He asked if that was what Councilor Chávez had been asking about.

Councilor Chávez said that was part of it. Multiple St. Francis crossings had been suggested. He said he thought it was all part of that mix.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was true to some extent. He said they were studying pedestrian access for both of those corridors.

Councilor Chávez asked how the pedestrian access and bridge project might relate.

Mr. Gallegos said it more pertained to the ongoing St. Francis study.

Councilor Chávez moved to approve the FY 2010-13 SFMPO Amended Transportation Improvement Program. Councilor Romero seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

B. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

1. Status of Santa Fe Studies (NMDOT)

b. St. Francis Drive Corridor and NM 599 (David Quintana NMDOT)

Mr. Tibbetts introduced Dave Quintana from NM DOT

Mr. Quintana said he was there to discuss and update the status of the NM 599 and St. Francis corridor studies. The St. Francis corridor study was in the process of completing the Phase A Draft Report, which would be presented to the MPO-TCC on July 25, and to the MPO-TPB in their August meeting. They had recently been compiling alternatives, which had been developed based on some public workshops that had been held. The 599 corridor study was on the same type of schedule. They were working development alternatives which they were preparing to present to the MPO-TCC that month, and would also come before the MPO-TPB in August. Public presentations would be done at the end of the Phase A Draft period. He said they would present their alternatives in August as well. He said the final draft Phase A Report was due July 15th. He asked if the Board had any questions.

Commissioner Vigil asked if Phase A was strictly for interchange recommendations.

Mr. Quintana said both Phase A and B were strictly for interchange improvements. He said they were also looking at system connectivity, and trying to incorporate the Access Priority Plan with other improvement projects.

Commissioner Vigil asked if they had included frontage road access to 599 in their discussions.

Mr. Quintana said they were looking at extending existing frontage roads. He gave one example, and said they would be providing additional access to the frontage road system.

Commissioner Vigil asked Mr. Quintana to distinguish between Phase A and Phase B.

Mr. Quintana said Phase A was a preliminary stage where they garnered public and stakeholder input and developed alternatives. He said they used a high-level quantitative analysis to dismiss certain alternatives, but only alternatives that were completely unviable were rejected in Phase A. At the end of Phase A, they narrowed to 3 or 4 types of alternatives. He explained that Phase B then studied those alternatives in a very in-depth way. He said once they had then determined which alternatives were most viable, they would look at environmental impacts.

Commissioner Vigil asked when the presentation of Phase B was scheduled.

Mr. Quintana said it was scheduled for January 15th.

Commissioner Vigil said she thought it was good time to bring in the Citizen=s Advisory Task Force. She said she knew there had been some disconnect, but had assumed the DOT would be responsible for contacting the Task Force. She said she had realized that it was one of the connections they needed to work closer on. She explained that some of the Homeowner=s Associations that participated in the Citizen=s Advisory Task Force were within the 599 corridor, and should be contacted. She said she believed that the County had contact information, and asked if someone could contact them to include them in the public part of the process.

Mr. Quintana agreed. He said he was sure some of them had already supplied their contact information, because they had more than 100 people who had given them contact information. He said he was unsure of who to contact at the County, but said he could make sure list was provided to the consultant. He said he had thought that the Citizen=s Advisory Task Force would be included in the public comment portion of the TCC meetings. He said that was part of the reason why there had been some difficulty with incorporating the CATF into the contract. He said that because of their legal obligations to include the public, they had felt there would have been too much exclusivity if they had only contacted homeowner=s associations. He said they would have to leave it open to all public, not just the CATF group.

Commissioner Vigil said she thought the alternative was to incorporate the task force into the process. She gave Mr. Quintana contact information for whom to speak to with the County. She said the goal was to let them know about all the processes involved. She said they tried to do as much outreach as possible. She said she did not think it was a weighted process at all. She thought they could be included without exclusivity, and thought it could all be worked out satisfactorily. She was glad it seemed like they could provide for that engagement. She said she hoped the DOT would provide a calendar, etc. so those who had the ability and desire to be engaged were able to do so.

Mr. Quintana agreed completely. He said if he could get the list that week he would let them know about the upcoming meeting. He said that was the best venue for which to get the information to them. He said he would move forward to make sure it happened.

Commissioner Vigil asked when the next meeting of the TCC was.

Mr. Tibbetts said it was on the 22nd. He added that the TCC meeting was not designed to be in lieu of a public process, but said he thought the workshops had been well organized and effective, but thought it had been more to just gather concerns and comments. He said he wanted to make sure he understood

correctly that there would be another public workshop at the end of Phase A that the members of the Task Force would be invited to, and another meeting to get direct input to the DOT and the consultants. He said if that was true, he thought it met the intent of the purpose of the CATF.

Mr. Quintana said he agreed.

Commissioner Vigil said the intent was to be inclusive. She said if they could move forward and be assured of more inclusiveness, she thought they were on the right track.

Mr. Quintana agreed.

Commissioner Vigil said she thought the input would be critical to the design of the project.

Mr. Quintana said he agreed totally. Once he received the contact list, he would contact them personally with information on how and when they could participate. He said there would be another workshop at the end of the summer.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if the photos the Board had been presented with represented some parts of the corridor that were under discussion.

Mr. Quintana said the pictures went more with the presentation regarding the I-25 corridor study. He said if she had a specific question about I-25 he might be able to answer it. Commissioner Stefanics asked about the possible interchange at Richard=s Avenue.

Mr. Quintana said the comments they had received were generally in favor of the interchange. He said it was one of the options at that time.

Councilor Romero said the intent in Phase A was to be more inclusive with the task force. She said she thought it needed to really be explained to the public why an alternative would not make the cut. She said she thought Phase A cuts needed to be explained in Phase A. She said she thought there should be a real dialogue. Workshops need more dialogue. It needs to be in Phase A. Some people=s ideas would be thrown out and they would want to know why. She thought that was the dialogue, and thought it would help the final suggestions make sense. She said it was an important aspect of moving forward. She said she was hoping the task force would really be utilized.

Mr. Quintana said the resolution did not apply to I-25, but was only for 599. He thought the public information process the consultant had utilized for the I-25 corridor process had been pretty good. Since January, they had held four different public meetings. He said they had been very inclusive, and explained the process of public involvement to the Board. They also had meeting summaries they could provide. He said he was pleased with their efforts.

Councilor Romero asked if the Board could get an email of the workshop summaries.

Mr. Quintana said he would email them to Mr. Tibbetts. He noted that the summaries were in the appendix of the I-25 Phase A report.

Mr. Tibbetts said he had not thought it was for distribution to the Board, and therefore had not made copies.

Mr. Quintana said he would get it all to Mr. Tibbetts.

Vice Chair Mora thanked Mr. Quintana.

a. I-25 Corridor: Review of Phase A Alternatives for Further Study (CH2MHILL)

Mr. Quintana introduced Dan Anderson and John Nitzel, from CH2M Hill, the consultants for the I-25 corridor study.

Mr. Anderson explained the need for improvements in the I-25 corridor, from NM 599 to NM 466 they had summarized through some public process. He presented directly from his slides, beginning with their study purpose and need. He explained that they had separated the public's needs into four main points. These points were safety, access, system connectivity, and travel demand. He showed a diagram of when and where the public was included in the process of determining the needs and possible solutions. He discussed the Study process in depth, noting that they had invited 14 homeowner's associations to participate in stakeholder working groups in a workshop with the stakeholders. He explained how they had narrowed their options based on pro and con feedback from those stakeholder working groups.

Mr. Anderson further explained the process of eliminating some of the alternatives. He informed the Board that the recommended improvement concepts or alternatives were not what they were proposing, but rather what they wanted to research further. The consultants had grouped the proposals into four categories. He went through them one by one. The first option, which had been strongly supported by the public the stakeholders, was to make improvements to existing interchanges. They considered adding diamonds with signalized ramp terminals, and diamonds with roundabouts at ramp terminals. He said tightened ramps would slow traffic, and might involve some adjustments to adjoining roads.

Commissioner Vigil asked what A1B@ was on the first page of maps.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Nitzel to explain the map.

Mr. Nitzel explained what the interchange looked like at that time, and said they had attempted, with 1B, to separate the two ramps and move them back.

Commissioner Vigil said she understood that 1A was just extension of what was already in existence.

Mr. Anderson agreed. He explained that the map showed four existing interchanges. In all cases, they had proposed that the ramps be extended and pulled back. The only change on 599 was the extension of the on ramps, and pulling them back, which would allow traffic more time to react to the signalized road there. The second concept was a new interchange at Richard's avenue. The map showed roundabouts because there were roundabouts already there. It made sense to continue with them. The third concept was to make new system connections. One that had been suggested was across I-25 between Richard's

and Cerrillos, or at Richards and St. Francis. They had also looked at improvements to the frontage road system. He said that presented a problem because the frontage roads, like Rabbit road, would have to be moved back or raised up to create an overpass there. At Camino Carlos Rey, the frontage road was already significantly higher, and would not need to be raised as much. It might be easier to connect at Camino Carlos Rey. Also, Camino Carlos Rey tied in with the southeast connector and Cerrillos. They proposed a more detailed analysis of Camino Carlos Rey.

Mr. Anderson said the connection on the other side, between Richards and Cerrillos, would require them to move the frontage road out or up. La Solaris had proposed a road called Road Runner Loop. It might work to connect with the new piece of frontage road. The last connection proposed was a further extension of the Governor Miles Road extension. The suggestion was to have it connect with Rodeo Park road, instead of Galisteo, which would connect to the commercial district to get rid of some residential traffic concerns.

Mr. Anderson said the last concept was to open new auxiliary lanes on I-25. He said a full-on widening of I-25 was not necessary. An auxiliary lane was an on-ramp lane extension, so by adding auxiliary lanes, they could add more capacity to the freeway, but major reconstructions would not be needed at each interchange. He asked if the Board had any questions.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if the next pub portion would be sometime in July or August

Mr. Anderson said it would be sometime in August or September. They had received significant input from the public, and had made minimal changes. The next public meeting would be at the beginning of Phase B, to look at evaluation criteria in more detail, to determine they would want the concepts to be more critically judged.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if they would have one meeting or a few. She said they would probably run into a diversity of opinions.

Mr. Anderson said that was true. He said the plan at that time was to hold two public meetings. One would be to introduce the concepts, the second would be to present all the information they had gathered to the public to get feedback, and then make a recommendation. The second meeting would help them prioritize their concepts as well.

Commissioner Vigil said she wanted to make a recommendation for connectivity. She said they could utilize county and city to get the word out. She gave Mr. Anderson a contact at the County to get meeting information out. She said if there was more outreach, more public would be at least informed and advised of their participation. She said it might affect where they could hold the meetings.

Mr. Anderson thanked Commissioner Vigil for her advice.

Vice Chair Mora thanked Mr. Anderson and Mr. Nitzel.

A. 2. Discussion and possible amendment to FY 2009 Airport Road Safety Project

Vice Chair Mora asked that they return to agenda item 1B, regarding Airport Road.

Mr. Tibbetts said they had combined it in the TIP discussion, but said there had been some new developments. The project had been on their TIP for at least two years. Airport Road had received funding for pavement rehabilitation. The Safety Project, a different project, would build medians. A third project was the Buckman diversion of water. Their discussions with the Water Division and Public Works had developed a tentative plan for the line to go along the center or side of Airport Road and tunnel under Cerrillos, to a main tank reservoir at the end of Richard=s. So there were three major things for Airport Road. He said the City and State had been coordinating the projects, and it was something that district five was interested in, too. He said they didn't want to have to change or redo things.

Councilor Chávez said he had heard about another project for Airport Road: an effluent line into the SW sector. He said if they were going to dig a trench and could put more than one line in it, they should do it. He said he thought the effluent line had been partially funded. He did not know the timeline, but asked if they could include it. Also, he wanted to know what the amendment would be to the Airport Road project or if it would be a series of amendments to the safety project.

Mr. Tibbetts said the cost of the safety project had been estimated at 2.5 million. The safety evaluation or panel from the DOT had awarded 750,000. Those positions were pretty well set. There was still a \$1.6 million shortfall on the safety improvements. He said the amendment would be to add to the safety project as more funding became available.

Councilor Chávez asked if the amendments would be for the dollar amount of the overall projects and the scope of the project.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed. He said it would be an amendment to make sure that continued.

Councilor Chávez asked if they needed to take action on this item.

Mr. Tibbetts said it had been taken care of in the first action item.

2. Update on NM Rail Runner Express (Staff)

Mr. Tibbetts explained to the public present that this was a regular agenda item, and were ongoing. He informed the Board that August 3rd was the expected completion date of the Rail Runner station at NM 599. He said he also wanted to bring up the fact that staff had approached the mid-region COG, or the operators of the train, regarding use of the local train that just sat in the station most of the day. He said the only local cost would be the cost of fuel because the staff was already on the clock, but just waited for the train to go back into service. Once the 599 train station opened, staff had asked if they could consider having a local route for the new station. He said they would formally approach the Board if it looked likely. He said he hoped staff could have an answer or a proposal by August.

Councilor Chávez said the thought of the Zia station had entered his mind too. He asked if they had ridership information, and asked that staff bring it back later. He asked if the shorter route would involve the

same number of cars.

Mr. Tibbetts said it could, and said delay time and ridership would be considered. He said they had received lots of positive feedback on it.

Councilor Chávez said he felt that with the new train station and the bicycle/pedestrian trails, they were very close to complete connectivity.

Commissioner Stefanics said the train issue of doing a short route had larger ramifications. She said the GRT had been promised in how it would be divided into the new transportation tax. Highway 14 had been in several discussions and was being studied for potential expansion of bus services. She said the RTD wished to coordinate more with the county on this. She said with the bus service on Highway 14, and the 599 train route coming in, the Board should have serious discussions with RTD to determine connections.

Councilor Chávez excused himself from the meeting at this time.

Commissioner Stefanics pointed out that there were many elderly and disabled persons in the area who had no transportation. She said she would be in favor of utilizing the additional train.

3. Regional Transit Operations (Santa Fe Trails, NCRTD and RPA)

None.

C. MATTERS FROM THE SFMPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD

None.

D. MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF

Mr. Tibbetts said staff was working on their long range metropolitan transportation plan. He said they would bring maps in August to show network expansion. He said they were working with the bikeways taskforce on pedestrian crossings and the like. He said they hoped to start to be able to show how their studies and task forces were pulling together.

E. COMMUNICATIONS FROM NMDOT AND FHWA

None.

F. OTHER MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

G. ADJOURNMENT - Next scheduled meeting August 13, 2009

Commissioner Vigil moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Barrera seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote and the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.

Approved by:

Robert Mora, Vice Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer