

MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FE MPO
TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD

Santa Fe, New Mexico

October 16, 2007

A scheduled meeting of the MPO Transportation Policy Board was called to order by Commissioner Jack Sullivan on this date at approximately 9 a.m. at the County Commission Chambers, 105 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A quorum was present as follows:

Members Present:

Commissioner Jack Sullivan, Chair
Councilor Miguel Chávez, Vice-Chair
Mayor David Coss
Councilor Matthew Ortiz
Commissioner Virginia Vigil
Commissioner Michael Anaya

Members Absent:

None.

Others Present:

Lucas Cruse, MPO Senior Planner
Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Robert Ortiz, Deputy Secretary, NMDOT
Muffet Foy Cuddy, NMDOT
Leroy Garcia, NMDOT
Ricardo Campos, NMDOT
Germaine Chapelle, General Counsel, NMDOT
Christopher Ortiz, MR COG
Senator Phil Griego
House Speaker Ben Luján
Chris Blewett, MR COG
Secretary Rhonda Faught
Edgar Jones
Gabriel Taylor, Stenographer

These minutes are transcribed verbatim at the instruction of Commissioner Sullivan.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair Sullivan I do not have the Agenda, are there any comments or questions by staff?

Councilor Ortíz Mr. Chair, on the action I have two, which is the City of Santa Fe's Resolution regarding Rail Runner Project. Last night at Finance committee, I actually had a discussion with Secretary Faught, along with most of the City Staff. At that time, in the process of the meeting, I went ahead and postponed this item on our City Council Agenda for the first Finance Committee Meeting in November, so we're not going to be hearing this on the City side until November.

And so it would be my recommendation that we move item two off of this Agenda for a couple of reasons. One, because I think we have a public process that's at least in place, we've got a public meeting with the City scheduled for October 23rd, and then the Department of Transportation said that they were going to do their own public hearing on the 30th.

So given those two meetings, given the comments that are going to come out of those public meetings my hope is that resolution can be heard after those public meetings. So I'd move that off the Agenda.

Chair Sullivan Okay, so then would you like to save that until the next meeting, on the eighth?

Councilor Ortíz Yes I would like to table it until our next meeting.

Chair Sullivan Okay. So then in the approval of the Agenda-

Councilor Ortíz I move for approval as amended.

Chair Sullivan Motion.

Commissioner Vigil Second.

Chair Sullivan Amended and seconded for the approval of a table of item B.2. until the November 8th meeting. Any More discussion? All in favor say aye.

Chair Sullivan Aye

Vice-Chair Chávez Aye

Mayor Coss Aye

Councilor Ortíz Aye

Commissioner Vigil Aye

Commissioner Anaya Aye

Chair Sullivan Opposed? The motion carries.

Approval of August 16, 2007 Minutes:

Chair Sullivan We have minutes of August 16. Are there any corrections or additions?

Councilor Ortíz Move for approval.

Commissioner Vigil I'll second.

Chair Sullivan Motion by Councilor Ortíz. Seconded by Commissioner Vigil. Discussion? Those in favor say aye.

Chair Sullivan Aye

Vice-Chair Chávez Aye

Councilor Ortíz Aye

Commissioner Vigil Aye

Commissioner Anaya Aye

Mayor Coss Abstain.

Chair Sullivan - Abstain by Mayor Coss. Motion carries, five in favor one abstention.

A. Information Items:

Chair Sullivan Alright, we have two basic categories of items on the agenda today. One are information items, which includes several updates, and discussion by policy board from the New Mexico DOT, and the Regional Council of Governments. And then we have a couple of action items under item B, with some discussion as well. And then a few announcements from staff concerning a workshop in November.

1. Update from NMDOT/ MRCOG regarding Rail Runner Phase II:

I. Issues including: traffic impacts, safety, noise

Chair Sullivan So let's begin then. Do we have a representative who would like to start the

update from the DOT? I see we have Secretary Ortíz here. Maybe you would like to introduce those who are here this morning.

Dep. Secretary Ortíz Mr. Chairman, good morning. There is some [inaudible, coughing] introduce those for you today. We have -

Mr. Bransford Pete Bransford.

[a side conversation, away from microphone and inaudible.]

Dep. Sec Ortíz This morning we have our Secretary Rhonda Faught, and we have most of my staff. Members of our staff are here to, more than anything else, project our faces to you, so we can sound like we're communicating clearly and respond to any questions that you have.

Next to Secretary Faught we have Muffet Foy Cuddy. She is our planner for [inaudible] infrastructure and planning.

We have Leroy Garcia. Behind me we have [inaudible] to introduce the Board. He is the [inaudible] of Transit. [inaudible] programs and infrastructures.

In our second row, we have our General Counsel, Ms. Chappelle.

Christopher Blewett from Council of Governments, who is our agent in the operation of the Railrunner.

We have some staff in back, some people you know. [inaudible - two names].

We are present here today. [inaudible] have enough people.

This morning,

Unknown: If I could throw this under introductions, I have six people in the house here in the audience. Senator Griego... Would either of you like to come up and say a few brief words?

Senator Griego I'll just wait for the presentation.

Unknown Okay. Senator, I just wanted to thank you for being here. Sorry for the interruption.

No, I'm sorry [inaudible] for myself.

Chris Blewett All right. This morning, we would like to take the opportunity to make a presentation to you that we have prepared for August-October meetings. We provide a picture of what this project is all about. If you can indulge us with that,

we are going to get started with that..

Commissioner Sullivan How long to you anticipate that?

Mr. Blewett It's about twenty five minutes.

Commissioner Sullivan Could you compress it, if it is at all possible? I mean we have seen a lot of this a couple of times before. I think there will be questions as we go along.

Mr. Blewett [inaudible] Fifteen minutes?

Commissioner Sullivan Yeah. If you can compress the general [inaudible] because I think that we ... a number of the Board members will have questions that they would like to get in... if that's possible.

Mr. Blewett [inaudible]

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Did you get the [inaudible]? And I see a variation in it. And if you want, someone can snap the light switches in the back to turn these lights out.

Unknown Thank you Mr. Chairman, I don't know where that came from.

Mr. Blewett I'll try to be as brief as possible. I would like to address a few of the issues that were in the resolution, and hopefully, show you some material you haven't seen before.

Someone else Chris, if you want to borrow Commissioner Anaya's microphone.

Mr. Blewett Sure. Okay. Thank you.

Just real briefly, I think most of you are familiar with the general purpose we associated with this project. It really has to do with conditions in the I-25 corridor between Albuquerque and Santa Fe. One of the primary purposes of this rail is to provide a transportation alternative to auto travel in this corridor. One that is not affected by accidents and incidents of I-25 and weather and some of the things that affect this corridor. Its very strategic in the sense that I-25 is the only real transportation option right now connecting Albuquerque and Santa Fe.

In that last statement providing real mobility really has to do more with what we are looking at. In terms of traffic in the long term in this corridor is getting worse and worse and worse from an auto perspective.

The Journal did a poll in August of 2006 amongst registered voters statewide and this project has a great deal of public support in the Albuquerque metro area; about 69% of those polled support the project. Only 26% oppose. As you go

further north in the state, the support gets even greater. About 70% and only 16% oppose.

The elephants in the living room, as we refer to them; things that are deriving and provide some more context for the project; affordable housing... I think most of you are familiar with the situation here, particularly in Santa Fe. A lot of jobs that people have that are at wages that make it difficult for them to afford housing, has exported labor as a result. [inaudible] This is kind of interesting.

When we looked at trip markets both in Albuquerque and Santa Fe corridor we look at what's eating up their peak hour capacity, it is these longer distance trips. And we've done some analysis of these markets and if you break down trips by trip length during the peak hours, 20% of those longer distance trips consume half of the capacity so those are the ones that are killing everybody.

The other 80% of the trips consume the other half of the capacity and these are exactly the trip markets that this thing is designed for.

The equipment we will use is brand new. It will be thoroughly tested before it is put into use in this corridor. The locomotives are diesel-electric. We are proposing three or four car sets. These diesel locomotives use bio diesel. And they are EPA tier one compliant. The manufacturer sells a lot of these in California. And that is one of the reason why they have worked so hard on the emissions piece of the locomotive..Because they wanted to produce a locomotive that could be used in California.

There are a hundred and forty seats in these cars. And, of course, all cars equipped with bicycle storage compartments.

Passenger stations, and I'll talk a little more about this later, will be provided at the south Capital Complex and the Santa Fe Railyard. Other stations are under consideration. We have said in the environmental assessment the train service will consist of 14 to 18 trains per day. That is 709 in and 709 out, depending on how you look at it.

We are working on new transit connections in this area that can be put in place to serve markets that are currently missed.

Woman

[inaudible question].

Mr. Blewett

This piece from Bernalillo to Santa Fe really has three different segments. Just briefly, this first segment from Bernalillo to the Waldo Cutoff I will refer to as the BNSF segment; this middle segment which is in red is 18 miles long. I will refer to that as the middle segment. And then the last three and a half miles I will refer to as the Santa Fe Southern piece.

Mr. Blewett

The first piece is pretty straightforward. It is Class Four track. We can run about 79 miles an hour on it. It is in very good shape. We'll use that existing track with minor improvements. That's the sidings and the signal system.

The middle piece, which consists of 18 miles of new track. There are two ranches this will go through for about seven miles. And then eleven miles of the I-25 median. We will use continuous welded rail on concrete ties and a sophisticated signal system. We are planning on running about 80 miles an hour over most of this middle piece.

There will be an area between I-25 and the rail for necessary emergency crossovers that are necessary. There are two passing sides in this section. There is plenty of room in here.

This is actually a cross section of the I-10 freeway in Los Angeles. Within about 186 feet there they've got general purpose lanes in each direction, plus an HOV lane in each direction and there are two railroad tracks running down the middle. At the narrowest point in this corridor, there's about 400 feet of right of way. So you can put two of those in there. Not that you would want to do that.

The middle piece really starts where the track diverges from the existing lowland. That's right here. From there it will make its way up the hill. This is kind of the terrain out there. This is the finger of the Waldo Canyon that it will traverse. The tracks will go over Waldo Canyon Road and then underneath Straight Street.

It is important to point out that in this 18 miles, there are no at grade crossings. It will then jump into the median of I-25 between the rest area and the Cañada de Santa Fe Pass. And that will cross Bonanza Creek or Alamo Creek, depending on the reference point.

And at this point, it will continue in the median for the next eleven miles of La Cienega, the overpass will be rebuilt because the train will pass underneath it.

And then, as it approaches 599, the tracks will go over 599 as the interstate does today. And then over Richards Avenue and then connects underneath the southbound lanes of I-25 onto the Santa Fe Southern.

This last 3.7 miles will primarily follow the Santa Fe Southern alignment with what it [inaudible] talks about.

Again, it will be continuous welded rail with concrete ties. Same signal system. Train speeds will be 35 miles an hour maximum. That's primarily a noise mitigation issue. There are some trail improvements planned in this area. Signal interconnects with traffic signals where there are conflicts with the track crossing and intersections in proximity.

Mr. Blewett

There will be one passing side in this area between Second Street and Cordova. And the new alignment in the vicinity of Zia. Of course there will be gates and signals at all ten crossings within this section.

I just want to point out for the most part we are following almost exactly the existing Santa Fe Southern alignment. This section in here, in Zia Road, will swing it a little bit to the east so that its closer to St. Francis, it will go behind or east of the pumice plant that is currently being demolished.

That was done for two reasons: one, to eliminate a conflict with the cars backing up on the track passing Zia and also to move that [inaudible] a little further away from adjacent neighborhoods. And these are just photos of what that Santa Fe Southern track looks like, coming in Santa Fe and then out by Alta Vista. I won't spend a lot of time on this.

I just want you to know that we had this detailed now, if people want to see it. How we treat each intersection so that it can be a quiet cell. It is a combination of gates and signals in most cases and medians in some cases its for flood gates in some of these intersections.

We have up to seven gates and there is detail available on this deviation in alignment. The existing track goes right through here. This is Zia Road right here. And the new proposed line that would come right up here along St. Francis as would the trail.

Before it uses both existing railroad bridges, the trail will connect back to the planned trail alignment that works on the north side of Zia. It kind of does the same thing. It crosses Zia Road right here at St. Francis.

Again, the current alignment is over here. In our key analysis showed that cars are backed up on that track which is not a desirable situation. So this intersection, these gates and a crossing signals will be interconnected with the traffic signal here so that traffic can be cleared out of this intersection before these gates go down. So we can avoid cars backing up on the tracks.

And then, of course, the alignment continues on. It connects up with the existing Santa Fe Southern alignment and there is a photo there. Just to the north of the Arroyo Chamiso the trail will be re-routed. Here it is on the east side of the track and it will continue on the east side of the tracks.

So it can actually cross at St. Francis intersections. It crosses right here and several people pointed out to us that it is kind of a problem for trail users because they don't have a protected crossing.

Mr. Blewett

I won't go over each of these. I want to get to probably the intersection that is foremost on a lot of people's minds, which is Cerrillos and St. Francis. This is St. Francis Drive; this is Cerrillos. Today the tracks cross at a diagonal. We will stay on that existing alignment. There have been lots of concerns expressed that that train is passing through this intersection, it will be gated at all throughlets.

Mr. Blewett

We have staggered some of the left turn lanes to increase the queue storage so, for example, this is west bound Cerrillos and there will be a small median in between the left turn lanes and the through and right lanes so that we can put gates here and gates here. This allows this queue ... this left turn storage area to stay about the same length as it is today.

This free ride will continue to be a free ride, as will this one. And, of course, the rest of the movements when it tries to go through here, will have to stop. Half of them are stopped all the time anyway because this is a four-way signal. This signal will be interconnected again, with the gates.

The total length of this intersection is about eighty-six seconds. Twenty two of that is actually to clear this intersection of traffic before the gates go down. That's a safety measure. We don't want cars to back up on the track or in the track area when the train comes through here.

Very quickly, we have done a pretty extensive assessment of project impacts. One of the reasons we chose this alternative was because it uses existing transportation corridors. We have done pretty extensive traffic analysis that we'd be happy to get in in the meantime. We did look at all of these intersections.

We have been looking at queues and total delay, plus a worst case analysis. In the sense that it did not assume anyone would change modes and we assumed the maximum gates down conditions and things like that.

We did identify the gates down conditions at all these crossings. And keep in mind, for the most part, these delays will be experienced about once per half hour worst case, in terms of the frequencies of train service.

The biggest issues are at Cerrillos, Zia and St. Francis. We've pretty much mitigated Zia Road by moving the alignment and interconnecting the signals as well as Cerrillos and St. Francis. But that delay is unavoidable as long as trains cross that track. We are assessing whether or not preemption and interconnect is needed at Siringo and Fifth Street.

When you look at overall intersection level of service, which is ... what is typically done to assess the performance at an intersection, the level of service at these intersections don't change. That's primarily because the frequency of the rail service, once every half hour, does not severely impact the intersection in the

course of an hour.

When you look at this from the driver's perspective, it's ... and one of the reasons why there hasn't been a lot of complaints about gates down in Albuquerque is because of how most people travel. The average journey to work there is about 21 minutes. If you look at your chances at actually getting a passing train... I mean hitting a crossing where the gates are down is relatively small because of the frequency of service. If you do, and it causes you delay by 50 seconds. In most cases, because of the signal density in this corridor, all it's really doing is spreading out the delay.

Your traffic queue is waiting for you at St. Francis Drive or on St. Francis Drive.

We have committed the resources for the implementation of the new signal fund plan. After the service goes into place, and it's primarily because most of the traffic that's on St. Francis during the peak hour... at least 50% of it is coming from out of town.

[inaudible] capture.

And this ought to create additional opportunities to get these side streets some more green time during the peak hours people change modes. The noise issue, we've done a lot of analysis. This is something we are going to work on and try to communicate better and drill down into with people who live along the tracks. This is difficult to see. We're going to make some more detailed maps so people can look at their house and look at where this impact line is and we will discuss further all the things we can do.

We have eliminated the train horn noise and a lot of the residual noise because of the continuous welded rail, clickety clack, what's left is the locomotive noise. And there has been a lot of work done on that in terms of its duration and its impact at 79 miles an hour. It is very short. But even at 30 gate lines, that duration of the noise event only lasts twenty seconds.

One thing I wanted to mention, there are other things we are going to do related to safety. And we've done this on the Albuquerque phase with this local emergency response training. Before you start service, this is an exercise we did where you practice train evacuation, familiarize everybody with the equipment. We'll do a lot of that.

We'll update our communication plan, identify bus bridges, in the event of some kind of service problem, and operation life saver, of course, is something that... It's a national program. We are bringing to the schools here, civic groups, and the general public.

Mr. Blewett

I'm going to conclude with a little discussion about the station issue. We know that another issue that is of concern, there are only two identified in the environmental assessment. There is a process in place to kind of sort through the others. The Department has the resources to build one more.

And we don't want to circumvent the process that's in place because there are lots of different ideas under consideration but it seems, based on the analysis, that we've already done, if we are going to put one more out here, at least in the short term, that station would beat New Mexico 599 for the following reasons.

It's an ideal place to connect park and ride, Santa Fe Trails, it provides a very, very, very good intersect for traffic coming in on South 14 and even North 599. Anybody that's going from Santa Fe to Albuquerque, if you are not in the central City, has to go through this point to get to Albuquerque. So it's a great intersect for those trips.

We are happy to do the additional analysis, environmental and otherwise, to get this thing in place. And we'd like to know today whether or not the MPO would be interested in pursuing that. To really kind of settle this station issue in the short term.

We do have another public meeting scheduled October 30th and the City of Santa Fe has also scheduled one for October 23rd. We are committed to keeping this going as I have said a hundred times. I don't think the public meetings ever stop. They don't stop even after each start of service..

And, Mr. Chairman, that's all I have.

Commissioner Sullivan Thank you Chris. Could someone turn the lights on for us in the back?

We have a lot of the extra keeps here this morning so maybe we could take hands on it and start some questions.

Let me start with one and then we will just sort of go around and let everyone have a chance at one. And then we will go around again and have a chance at two.

I have one on ... and some of these issues are later on in our agenda but, regarding these stations and so forth but... On noise, in this particular one, in the County, in your input synopsis, which I understand is the document used as a backup for the farm team, and the document that indicates what the responses of the DOT are to public comments at hearings. In looking through that I see that it indicates that there will be no noise mitigation measures taken on the project.

And I've also looked at the chart of the noise readings that you took ... this was in your presentation... and my question is, I did not see anywhere in the

environmental assessment any mention or discussion of the Santa Fe County Noise Ordinance. Have you looked into how your noise measurements will affect the County Noise Ordinance.

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman, yes we have. And I think if we need to discuss it, we really looked at noise in the County really more as a consequence of the noise that's already on I-25. And of course our analyses showed that the noise on I-25 is more significant than the train... was not added. [inaudible] will be the serious gate here.

I asked him to look at both the City and the County ordinance and he told me he did and did not believe that our noise analysis that we'd done would suggest that that ordinance... that we'd exceeded anything in that ordinance. That being said, I'd be happy to get any of the others and myself and whoever from the County and we can kind of walk through the analysis relative to the ordinance so that we can make sure that we didn't miss anything. If there is holes in our analysis, we can take care of those.

Commissioner Sullivan

I don't want to get into all of the [inaudible] possibilities. But what I'm concerned about is the analysis that you pointed out that we will be looking at here in the City, speeds of up to 38 miles an hour. In the County, speeds of 79 miles an hour, basically. Noise levels going from around 60 decibels up to around 91 and so I just wanted to mention a thing in the sixty and seventies, about any noise levels.

So I just wanted to let you know the County ordinance for daytime noise levels is 70 decibels in major centers and travel service areas. It's 70 decibels or ten [inaudible] whichever is less. So it could be fifty; ten over 50 would give you 60, or it could be 70. In all other areas, it is 55 decibels with ten decibels above the [inaudible] which ever is greater. So you could go up to 65.

So in looking at noise levels of a 192 decibels, I see that there are going to be a number of areas where we exceed the County Noise Ordinance. And the question is now Does the project... Does the state/federal project supercede County ordinances. Do we arm wrestle over this? Or do we mitigate this? And if so, where do we mitigate it?

Because it's pretty clear to me from your studies that we won't be meeting County Noise Ordinance. We could, perhaps, [inaudible] this otherwise somehow. But at 91 decibels, there are very few places in the County that are levels of 80 decibels except maybe in the median of I-25. And with County ordinance, you measure at the property [inaudible]. It is how you measure it so we would be measuring at the right of way line. I think that's where we would measure it to check for compliance with the ordinance.

So at the first glance... and our staff hasn't had any interaction with DOT Staff on this, but at first glance it appears that there are significant levels of County noise.

So that was a question. So you are going to go back and perhaps get us a response on that?

Mr. Blewett Yes, Mr. Chair. But before we do that, we would like to sit down with your staff and talk through where you normally measure these [inaudible] from so that we can compare our analysis to the ordinance, if that's okay with you.

Commissioner Sullivan City ordinance. Okay.

Let's go around. Mayor Coss and then Councilor Chávez.

Mayor Coss I have just one question. Trying to look at the map, when the train comes in to Santa Fe County, how much.... What is the length of the train with the either initial force ... It looks to me like it goes into the median of I-25 sharply or right as the train comes into Santa Fe County. How many miles of track are there that are not either inside the City limits where it is going 35 miles an hour, or its in the median of I-25 corridor? What is the length of track that is not covered by that? Where Commissioner Sullivan's noise concern might be the most significant?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman. Mayor. It is about seven miles from where current ... where the tracks leave the current alignment to the median of I-25. And again, that is seven miles. It is through two ranches.

Mayor Coss So does it go by houses? [inaudible]

Mr. Blewett There's no [inaudible] backyard in Santa Fe. It doesn't affect backyards and there are no houses back there. There's cows.

Mayor Coss It's something to just follow up because it is not quite accurate to say there is no noise mitigation. There's welded steel tracks. There's concrete ties. And there's 35 miles per hour speed limit. And the question is, should there be more mitigation? There is some mitigation in the City limits.

Commissioner Sullivan Just a clarification with the Mayor. I was reading verbatim from the synopsis. The synopsis says there is no noise mitigation. So. You know that there's quiet zones and there's methods of noise reduction but I think the [inaudible] mitigation [inaudible] fiscally. Fiscal structures that mitigate all that and it says quote: NMDOT does not intend to mitigate traffic noise as part of the proposed rail project. End quote. Just trying to get clarification.

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman. That's traffic noise. Other than what we can do in terms of people switching modes.

Commissioner Sullivan Councilor Chávez

Councilor Chávez Yeah. I want to thank the Department of Transportation and MR COG for being here this morning. I think the presentation, again, was enlightening, even though I have seen it a couple of times.

But I would like to ask staff, though, ... Would we... In the presentation earlier, I heard that you are committed to continuing the public comment portion. The City has committed to an additional meeting. I think this is good. It's always been part of the process.

My question is, what would staff be willing and able to do as far as incorporating all of this public comment into the environmental assessment so that we don't have to duplicate that survey with a third or fourth, whenever you would call any kind of engineer. I'm trusting myself in how confident staff has expertise to do this environmental assessment. If we take a public comment and we are serious about needs and we incorporate that into the public ... into the environmental assessment.

I'm questioning the need for that additional survey. I guess there would be a contract though, for an engineer. So could staff incorporate all of this public comment into the environmental assessment that is being done?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman. Councilor. What we were planning to do is that we're getting additional public comment. We've already completed an environmental assessment for the lane itself until it gets to the City limits near St. Francis. But then that portion that will be incorporated into the environmental document at that point or those comments. Any other comments that have been made up to this point on the environmental portion for the middle section have been incorporated into the environmental assessment.

But the thing is that we are going to take a step further to get that word out about how those are being addressed. And we talked last night about getting the mailing addresses and so forth of those that are near [inaudible] the track. And to mail that, instead of just doing it for the public comment and so forth. And also to mail out [inaudible] to tell the people how we are actually addressing comments that are in the environmental portion of the decision, as well.

Commissioner Sullivan So then the environmental assessment will be for station locations

Secretary Faught There will be, Mr. Chairman, Councilor... We do have for the station locations there will have to be additional environmental clearances and also for the portion that I mentioned.

Councilor Chávez Okay, so then it does seem doable for you to incorporate all of the public comments as we move forward into whatever environmental assessment

document you'll be working on.

Secretary Faught

Yes.

Councilor Chávez

And would that be just a natural course of doing business for you? Or is that something you would be specific in direction to do that?

Secretary Faught

Mr. Chairman, Councilor, It is something we would do normally. Obviously when we're in Santa Fe and this area, people are more interested, more public involvement would be required than what we normally would do. So we have committed to is doing that public involvement.

Councilor Chávez

Okay. So that's on record again. And then you will incorporate that into all future documents.

Secretary Faught

Yes.

Councilor Chávez

Okay. I guess the only other comment I would make now is that, as an MPO member and also as the City's representative on the North Central Regional Transportation District, even though we don't have population numbers now, this might seem like the type [inaudible] solutions.

We're asking though, if we don't provide the full options of transportation be it pedestrian, bicycle, automobile, [inaudible] a certain classification that includes buses and trains. [inaudible] It kind of even would be more complicated to provide that full array of options to people [inaudible] planning. And I think that when we fail that plan, we fail everything else.

And so, I'm pretty well convinced that the project has gone through public comment. It didn't get the [inaudible] out back. I'm convinced that staff will continue to do the work that needs to be done. I think that some of the mitigation has been addressed. We will continue to work on that. But I hope that we will move this project forward. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Sullivan

Thank you. Commissioner Anaya, any questions?

Commissioner Anaya

[inaudible] [laughter]. I'll ride a horse any day of the week. I don't own one but I'll ride one. Chairman, I have a couple of questions and that's regarding the County road crossing. You said that the train was going to go over the overpass so we don't have to worry about gates?

Commissioner Sullivan

That's correct.

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, Waldo Canyon Road, which is a County road. In order to make that grade there, that road is going to pass underneath the railroad

tracks. So it will not be at grade, so gates are not necessary. There is no potential for conflict. That is also true at Straight Street, which is the other road in that area. And so the only place where there will be at-grade crossings is within the City limits. In the County they are all grade separated.

Commissioner Anaya Okay. And then you mentioned emergency crossing. I know our chief had some concerns with crossing from south-bound to north-bound. How are we going to take care of that.

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, part of the work that is going on right now is what we call a design filled project. And part of that is... it's a fluid process, but we are looking at where emergency crossovers would make sense. Typically, you want them in areas where interchanges are spaces too far away and there are pretty much two locations in I-25 where that's the case. It's between St. Francis and Cerrillos and again between 599 and La Cienega. And that's where we are looking at. At locating ... [inaudible]

And we're also looking at the idea of maybe locating some kind of interstate access off the frontage roads as well. But part of that process, we will bring in County emergency responders and State Police in so that we can look at these locations and make sure they work for them.

Commissioner Anaya Including them [inaudible].

Mr. Blewett Absolutely.

Commissioner Sullivan Commissioner, one follow up to your question on the crossings. Chris, are there no at-grade crossings [inaudible] public roads? Or is that true for any private road as well?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman, there are no at-grade crossings period.

Commissioner Sullivan On page one where private roads...

Mr. Blewett That's correct. And there are none.

Commissioner Anaya You mentioned the track going down the center of the highway or in between the median. Had you thought about moving that track over, just in case we need to put in another one in the future?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, yeah, it is offset. I mean the whole design is based on the idea that you would want to leave room for that future possibility of adding a second track. You have to earn an awful lot of service before you need something like that. And in the interim we will have these passing sidings where trains can pass each other.

Mr. Blewett But the whole design is based on the idea that there should be room for a second track at whatever point in time that might become needed.

Commissioner Anaya I was a little confused about the track that you were... Once you get into the City limits and the track goes from out of the median into the other tracks, are we building a new track next to the one that is already existing?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, in most cases we are going to be right on top of the existing alignment. We'll tear out the old track and put new track in place, about where it is today. There are a few places where the new track will be slightly offset from the old alignment but in those cases, the old track will be scrapped.

And of course, that one place where there is kind of a new alignment near Zia so that the crossing occurs right at St. Francis and Zia, that's kind of all new territory that slightly offsets [inaudible] of the existing alignment.

Commissioner Anaya Thanks, Chris.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Commissioner Vigil?

Commissioner Vigil Thank you. I just really want to take a moment to really applaud the Department of Transportation. This is such a magnificent endeavor. And it's been on the fast track from the onset. And I'm sure the challenges you've had have been horrendous. I start thinking about the easement challenge that you had with this and that, in itself, was mind-boggling. And I appreciate your willingness to work with Local Governments.

There was a time in New Mexico when state and Local Governments didn't work as well. This is a new time and I'm glad that we're here and we're working through a lot of issues that concern us. And at this [inaudible], Secretary Faught, this will go to you. Because we need permanent ... a lot of permanence about how this is going to be funded. And I guess my concern would be you know, I [inaudible] and we've had some responses.

And then we had [inaudible] questions about why are we in this public process. Perhaps you could identify how this is going to be budgeted and what is going to be funded. I have my own sense of this as being at the very end of the road for the funding to actually be enterprised by [inaudible] and enterprised is the goal. But how will we get there?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, are you talking about the operations of the train?

Commissioner Vigil Yes. Well, and initially, do we have the funding for the infrastructure?

Secretary Faught

Let me start at the beginning and then get to the operations. Early on, in 2004, we had identified that we would spend 318 million out of bond proceeds. And 75 million in federal funds. That adds up to 393 million dollars. That was in 2004, three and a half years ago, early 2004.

Since then the federal funds have not come through. And so what we're doing is that we're making that up with our severance tax bonds that we have received little over 24 million dollars in severance tax bonds.

We also have, when we borrowed the money, we got a premium on those funds, in other words we got a bonus for it. Because our bonds were in such good status. And so, we're going to be utilizing the premiums from those bonds that don't come off of the bond proceeds.

For the road portion of the programs and also some of the interest earnings off of those bonds, they're all interest earnings so we get that difference. We actually now have ... it's about four hundred million dollar project. Which means 7 million dollars for [inaudible] four hundred million. This is from three and a half years ago. But we also [inaudible] twenty five million dollars.

Also in the same working from the bond proceeds and interest earnings that is set aside in case of overruns and so forth. And also for station locations, if we need additional money and so forth.

So that has already been budgeted. Only 318 million... I wanted to make this very clear, 318 million is what we anticipate out of bond proceeds in early 2004 that's still 318 [inaudible] proceeds. No other bond proceeds are being used for the train. And we have enough money for construction of the train and the rolling stock.

The operation of the train right now is eighty percent being funded from what we call [inaudible] quality funds. In the Albuquerque urban area and two million dollars out of this ten million dollar project ... I mean, this ten million dollar annual operating cost is coming from Fairfax and also from money we get from being a separate running freight trains on that portion of the lines.

When we get into Santa Fe that operating cost will go up to eighteen to twenty million dollars, depending on the amount of service that we provide.

Our federal funds will expire in 2009 and so we are also looking at getting some additional federal funds [inaudible] might be able to get a little bit. That's certainly not to offset all twenty million.

If you read the paper this morning, the Governor has made a commitment to use state funds and [inaudible] making an announcement on that.

Commissioner Vigil

I just want to make sure that if there is any expectation that Local Government needs to stand up and say that we note that up front and that this is a project that working cooperatively in the future, that its part of the vision. Its [inaudible] both City and County... you know about it. It's something they will work with you on but it is something that is not anticipated. And we can go forth, each one of us looking at what our future [inaudible].

The other question I had... and I have had this question throughout the MPO process, which I must again say I appreciate, because I have heard a lot of input be given through the metropolitan Transportation Policy Board. And I have appreciated that opportunity.

When you do look at station sites, one of the issues that I brought up earlier was safety for parking, safety for riding, safety for general safety issues is I guess what I was saying. And I assume that with two locations that we currently have, perhaps it's not going to be as high a safety issue. I don't know how those crossover... But we are going to look at some of the rural areas that we may be interfacing with.

Probably the first question I would have: Are the safety issues different for different stations? And if they are, are they addressed independent from those other stations?

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, there are a number of things that we do already at stations to address safety issues. Obviously, biking is one of them. But getting on your bike is not maybe as important [inaudible] We have bike ports at all of our stations that are monitored the whole time. So this is in play. The cameras cover parking lots, they cover the platforms. We have a public address system that is to be in use and controlled from a central location.

The other thing we have at all stations is one of these emergency call boxes, so if somebody's having a problem they simply push a button and they get the 9-1-1 operator. And we would do the same thing with stations here in Santa Fe. And that seems to have worked pretty well.

Commissioner Vigil

This [inaudible] that you're running... what are the safety issues that have occurred there other than the crossings I'm talking about the station sites

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman and Commissioner, we've been running service for over a year now and we've had very few problems. We have had a couple of the trips and falls, people [inaudible] platforms. That's going to happen anytime you have a large number of people using anything. That's pretty much it. There have been a couple of issues with people on the train that were a little disorderly, but the other thing that we've done certainly in the Albuquerque area is coordinate with local law

enforcement [inaudible] when we have a problem that would remove people from the train if they're not behaving. But it's been pretty [inaudible].

Commissioner Vigil Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sullivan Councilor Ortíz?

Councilor Ortíz Yes thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you for your leadership in bringing forward this resolution. Until he brought this resolution forward, some of the answers... some of the questions that we had were not being answered. So I appreciate some of the Department of Transportation.

Again, thank you for [inaudible] stepping up to the plate in this community for an extra public process because I think that's important for all of our constituents to understand what those issues are, to understand what answers are being given by the state so I appreciate that.

On the noise issues, it's my understanding from just looking at this chart... this is the chart that was in your presentation and comes out of your environmental assessment. It seems to me that the faster a train goes, the sharper the sound but it's in a more compact time frame. Is that right?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman, Councilor, that's correct.

Councilor Ortíz Okay, and so slower a train goes the longer that potential passing will be?

Mr. Blewett That's correct.

Councilor Ortíz Okay. And in terms of the meetings that you're going to have, you don't have a noise person here. You're going to have your noise person at the public meetings who can explain to the public how these tests were conducted. Essentially you were conducting based upon the ambient or existing noise conditions, and that was your baseline. And then you tested to see how the train affected it going above that?

Mr. Blewett Mr. Chairman and Councilor that is correct. And the other thing we are going to do is [inaudible] the more detailed maps so people can see where... you know, the distance from this [inaudible] is also another really important [inaudible] need to do a better job of communicating where those lines are, and we will do that.

Councilor Ortíz Great. And the other question that you need to be prepared for, because you came to me and I didn't have an answer for my constituent. The state is not going to mitigation on your projects before them. They approved 599 and rebuilt 285 going up to Pojoaque. They essentially rebuilt what was existing there, but as part of that particular project, they did a series of noise mitigation walls.

And so the question came to me. What's the difference between this particular project and the project that was done on [inaudible]. So please [inaudible] answer that. Please have your noise expert be able to explain what's the difference between what happened on north versus what's going on now. Again, you're in the same corridor, you're basically doing the same ... you're putting something in the same transportation corridor and yet it seems to be... there's a difference between what was done on north versus what's being proposed here. So be prepared for that question, okay?

On traffic and safety issues, the first time that we've heard about this new realignment on Zia road was when you presented it last night. When I talked to City Staff, City Staff also hadn't been aware of it. Are you committed, as part of this process, not just to listening to the public but also getting through the design... when you get the actual design documents presenting them to the City traffic people to go through the City traffic studies' analysis?

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman and Councilor, yes. We've already met with them several times, in fact. Some of your City Staff are in Albuquerque this week looking at will those intersections work, and what's their interconnect [inaudible] proposed for Zia.

I'm going to actually be riding with them on the train on Friday. We will do a full plan review with them. They've already been communicating [inaudible] and everything with the engineers we have working on this project. And actually the realignment of Zia... one of the reasons that was put on the technical was a result of some discussions we had early on about this queue situation, you know, the current situation with... and that was a direct result of communications that we've had with City Staff.

So I think if you talk to Robert Romero, I've had several conversations with him over the last week trying to get his staff... find out again what's going on in Albuquerque so they have a better sense of how these things were, in that at looking at what we're proposing to do and working with them. Because the other important part of this is making sure we don't mess up the progression that's already in place. That's why we've committed... you know, if we have to make new timing adjustments and things like that, we'll provide the resources to do that.

Councilor Ortiz

Great. Well, that commitment... the commitment of resources, is important because, in particular, in talking with the head of engineering, Chris Ortega, yesterday, the intersection of Zia and St. Francis is already failing it's [inaudible] rest of staff.

And by moving the alignment into that particular corridor, in terms of the progression sequencing that you were talking about with regard to that intersection, the thumbnail impression that I was getting yesterday was that if you're taking those... if you're taking that alignment and putting it in there, you're

creating problems on an intersection that's already failing. So we're going to be looking to the state to improving those conditions.

We're not looking at just have the existing conditions get worse just by a small fraction, we're looking for some improvement in these particular intersections. The intersection of Rodeo Road where the train crosses and where there's a downstairs train coming in, that intersection's at a [inaudible] category now. And so those kinds of efforts, the efforts you've got for floodgates and all those other things, they could have detrimental impact on some of the traffic areas.

And what we're looking for is not just the response "well, we're not going to change the status quo too much, and so we want to see it go through." We're actually looking for improving the... for help. Especially when, again, until yesterday, until today when we actually saw certain rough-drawn designs, this board really no idea, in fact we've seen the design for any of these proposals and that's really what we're looking for.

We're looking for the State's commitment that they're going to not just interface with City Staff, but actually submit to the kind of analysis that any other project would have to go through. And get those traffic comments. Get those engineering comments, and incorporate them into the design. Is that something that the State is willing to consider?

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman, and Councilor, I think that we are certainly committed to going through the process. I think at some point, if you're looking for an actual substantial improvement to how these intersections operate, you would be talking about doing things that ... [inaudible] get to the point of talking about grade separations and things like that.

And that's probably a whole other story, but I think [inaudible] part of the "whooping" that flows you there is compensating for this gates down time, and I'm pretty confident we can get there.

But I don't think we can substantially improve the performance in these intersections as part of this project. But maybe there is a way... I think the only way you can do that is really start looking at really dramatic kinds of projects that ... you know, grade separations and things like that. Was that what you had in mind?

Councilor Ortíz

No, I can tell you that I have really nothing, right, I'm not an engineer here, I wasn't smart enough. So I can tell you though, that the City a process, where you submit a design, it goes through a review, it goes through a [inaudible], it goes through an analysis. And that kind of process, especially for those intersections that are coming through the City, are important. My particular concern for those intersections where I think this project is going to impact it, and impact it moderately to severely, is the Rodeo Road intersection and Zia Road intersection.

I can tell you, without having seen what's been proposed by the state for the transportation complex on the old Highway Department property. I can tell you just from experience, I'm a life-long Santa Fean, that the Pacheco Street and Alta Vista intersection is terrible now. It's going to be worse if that's gonna be the site for the train station. And those kinds of design questions... questions that anyone would have if you've ever driven in the streets of Santa Fe, it's for the engineers to determine. [inaudible] What is going to be the solutions?

And what I'm asking is, is the State willing to go through not just interaction, but not just a willingness to address the issue, but actually go through a Design Review Analysis by the City and the County, or by sort of peer reviewing the area that would allow for the kinds of comments and suggestions that could then be incorporated into the project.

That's the question we have, because in [inaudible], because of the nature of this project, is that the design and therefore the construction and therefore the operation, that this is gonna happen. And there is really no input along the way. We are just going to do this, and get it done, and then we're going to deal with the consequences after it's done. And that's the kind of project, at least in Santa Fe, it's not the way we do things.

And so, I thought I heard from the secretary last night, a commitment to a more extensive public process, a public process that, as Councilor Chávez says, where you get the public comments, you actually incorporate those public comments into the assessment. That's really what we're looking for, that's really what I'm looking for on a Technical. Are we going to be able to have input on engineering on this project as it crosses all the City streets?

Secretary Faught

Mr. Chairman, Councilor, the answer to that question is that while we're not going through a [inaudible] process, we're certainly working with your staffs to...for a cooperative process. And not something that would be independent without their input. And I think that that's really what you're looking for. The thing is, is that one of the reasons for moving the track closer to Santa Fe at Zia Road, was actually sort of cooperation and coordination with your staff.

And well, by putting the track closer to St. Francis at that location, means that you don't have that gap in between... so you're stopping traffic back here for the train, and then stopping it up here for St. Francis. Putting those together means you stop it once, and stop... and the progression continues. And the lights are going to be synchronized so that it would happen when there would be stop conditions at Zia Road anyway. So it wouldn't be adding to it.

So we were working with your staff to do that. So I don't want you to think that we're doing this a vacuum. We're doing it cooperatively and coordinating there.

And if we need to do more to that we would be glad to do that.

Councilor Ortiz

Alright. That's really what I'm looking for. Is a commitment to do more than what's been done before. Because I know that there has been constant communication between the Railrunner Staff and some of the MPO Staff and some of the City Staff.

But really what we're looking for, now that it's getting close, is the kind of commitment where if we're getting comments, then our concern is that those concerns are going to get incorporated into the design. And what we'd really like to see, I think, is the design. We'd like to see some schematics.

You graciously, when we first met a couple of weeks ago, you gave us the maps. I see now that those maps have been... you know there's design elements now in those maps, and those...that's the first time I've seen them.

And so it would be nice to get those and to get that in the hands of people who are, again, smart enough, and will understand [inaudible] our engineers and our Public Works Staff. Because they're the ones that are going to have to sign off ultimately on the safety issues.

They're the ones, along with your staff, who are going to have to explain to the public what it's going to mean to say that you're going to synchronize the lights at Zia and St. Francis. What does it mean when you say that you're going to have to do something on Siringo Road? What is it going to mean when and if you finally decide on your complex and what it's going to look like in terms of the parking situation and how that impacts Alta Vista and Pacheco Street.

And those are the kind of questions that I think need to be answered and addressed. And I think that the department has gone a long way. That's all.

Commissioner Sullivan

Thank you Councilor. We'll run around again here and see what additional questions we have. I wanted to ask about, either secretary or Mr. Blewett, have you been in touch with the Santa Fe Office of Emergency Responders?

Mr. Blewett

Mr. Chairman, no, I don't believe we have yet. I know that as part of this design build piece, we're planning on hosting a meeting with all emergency responders. Again, to look at emergency access, and to start talking about what kinds of training things we need to do as well.

Commissioner Sullivan

Okay. Because I had some concerns. I was contacted by Mr. Martin Vigil, who is the director of the City/ County Office of Emergency Managers, who indicated that they had not had any input on these issues. Some of which Commissioner Anaya just brought up having to do with crossing to the north-and south-bound lanes, and dealing with heavy lifting equipment, agreements for heavy-lifting equipment and

derailments, Highway waste, Highway spills, and [inaudible]. So be prepared. They list twenty items that are concerns of theirs, and I'd be glad to provide that to you.

The other question I have for the secretary was in the input synopsis, and this may be...this is kind of a segue into the next A. 1. ii on the agenda there where we're talking about Federal compliance process: Alignment EA/FONSI and location study, in the input synopsis, it states "in response to concerns expressed by local elected officials, the NMDOT agreed to defer selection of stations to the City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County except for the station located at Alta Vista Street and the Santa Fe Railrunner."

So my question is, what's the process there? I know the City got [inaudible] locations in general. The County has had a variety of concepts from our planners, but really hasn't been a part of the process for the new station location issue. And that's my concern, in fact in our packet it says that... this is a summary from Santa Fe County Land Use and [inaudible] what some of those concerns are particularly regarding station location, and in particular recommending a station location [inaudible] from staff, which they don't feel that's been heard.

So is that sentence still out I guess is my first question, and then what's the process? I see in your slide show here today that you're [inaudible] for some guidance with 599. Is that [inaudible] secretary?

Secretary Faught

Mr. Chairman, we are fully open to allowing the City and County to identify where the locations of the stations are. We're responsible for the future. We're responsible for future growth and you would know better where it would work best in your plans. [inaudible] did say that we felt today that the 599 intersection would be a good location.

And we're recommending that you take action on...we would start [inaudible] processes needed at the 599 station. If you don't want to do that, we won't do it. If you would like to proceed with it then we would like you to go ahead today, so we can get going on that.

As far as Richards Avenue, we're not proposing that, we just felt that that's going to be up to the City and County, well actually that's in the County, so ... to come up and identify any future station locations that you need or that you want in addition to the two we already have, and perhaps the 599 locations.

Commissioner Sullivan

And I recall your slide show [inaudible] you had essentially enough money maybe for one station, maybe two, but one... and then [inaudible] car [inaudible] last week. And what seems to make sense to me, [inaudible] that's what the probe theory is in [inaudible] district 14, tens of thousands that we project our there [inaudible]. So we're free then I think to pursue a County process. We don't have

that on the agenda per se, but we could certainly put that issue on the next agenda. But I can give you my personal reaction, and that is that I think that's a good location for a station. I know you've got plans in that area, and you would then need also to go through the environmental process for that, would you not?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, that is correct. We'll need to go through an environmental process that would identify the traffic, and all the things that have been raised concerns for the locations of the stations in town.

Commissioner Sullivan And then you also indicated in your presentation to the City, that you would attempt to make that parallel with the course of the train as well. I mean, you'll have the station completed by the end of next year as well as the train itself.

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, that's our preference, yes.

Commissioner Sullivan That's what I thought. Okay. Well, again I would try [inaudible] assess the occurrence of that. I just wanted to [inaudible].

Senator Griego Mr. Chairman

Commissioner Sullivan Oh, there's the Senator.

Senator Griego Yeah, the Speaker and I have to leave the meeting, but the Speaker and I would like to make a comment.

Commissioner Sullivan Well, good. Come on up both of you. We [inaudible] until the sun goes down [laughter] so we're glad to hear it. [inaudible]. I'm here [inaudible] in support of... and asking you, respectfully asking your support for the Railrunner. [inaudible] Governor Richardson has mitigated almost 588 dollars for the [inaudible]. You know, we work real hard. We make sure that Railrunner would include into Santa Fe.

I respectfully...respect the Local Governments and the recommendation of [inaudible] of your constituents and certainly our constituents. Just like...let me just say I [inaudible] with the comments that were made by Councilor Chávez. And let me just state if we just visualize that we have had this Railrunner in place, the portion that's going to happen in I-25 might not have ever happened.

Because I would imagine that if you have this Railrunner running from Santa Fe to Albuquerque, and the only reason to get off [inaudible] airport, [inaudible] of us are going to be taking that Railrunner, and [inaudible] the case, so I think that like any other [inaudible]. And I think that when we do that, of course we have to listen... make every effort to [inaudible] responsible.

I think that's why we have [inaudible] that we address a lot of the things that we

have to address. So I respectfully, again, ask you to work... and you know we've been working with... there's... I've had questions from [inaudible] also, and the Department of Transportation has worked perfectly hard making sure that all those concerns are addressed.

You know we are at the last step of this reality here. And hopefully any [inaudible] that happen, [inaudible] that you have going on, any place is just a [inaudible]. So hopefully, you know, we can move along, and make this [inaudible] as soon as possible, and recognizing some of the things you said about the Department [inaudible] make commitments to try to meet you half way sort of [inaudible]. I think this is...we all have to work together. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sullivan Thank you Mr. Speaker. And thank you for your leadership in all of the Highway transportation issues that affect this, your service as a representative for us up there at the round house.

Speaker Luján Thank you.

Commissioner Sullivan Senator?

Senator Griego Mostly just concur with speakers. [inaudible]. Mr. Chairman, I concur with what the speaker said, and you know, we work very hard with the Department of Transportation to get here this morning. You know, we have been working on this project for a long, long time.

I've been the left stage member now twelve years, and this is a new, innovative project that the Governor had. And we here, members of the Santa Fe Delegation are committed to the completion of this project, and we work very diligently to make sure that all the concerns, not only the concerns of the City of Santa Fe, and the County of Santa Fe, but all the different counties and cities that we have affected with this Railrunner.

That their concerns have been met in order to make sure that we are in compliance not only with Local Government sources, [inaudible] and fulfilling all the federal guidelines we need to fill. [inaudible] environmental practices, and all the stuff that Councilor Ortíz was was talking about.

We're committed to working with Local Government to make sure that we take the necessary steps that the constituency that we both represent because... Mr. Sullivan, again, you and I represent some of the same constituents in the areas that we represent in the County... and the Speaker... also with the City of Santa Fe.

And so we want to make absolutely sure that we meet the concerns of Local Government, and that we are in partnership, one-on-one, making sure that we get

the project completed.

The delays that [inaudible] the cost of delivering the oil, the cost of steel and cement, and materials that have just increased the cost of the project to a point now that when we, as members of the [inaudible] are now working with DOT to make sure that we can meet those needs.

And...Commissioner, we will keep Local Government informed. Commissioner Vigil was concerned about, you know [inaudible] Local Government is going to have to step up to the plate. We want to work with Local Government to make sure that the State covers the brunt of the expenses of all of this. That's in order to make sure that the constituents receive a product that is going to be positive for Local Government, and for the State of New Mexico. And so we want to work together.

Again, Commissioner, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to be seen here. And yeah, I was to congratulate the members of the DOT how hard they have worked to meet not only the needs of Local Government in the counties and cities that they have come through, but also in working with the Legislature and the [inaudible] to make sure that we're getting to the point that we need to get to in order to make this a complete and total great project for the [inaudible] . Thank you very much. Commissioners, thank you

Commissioner Sullivan Thank you, Senator, and again, also thanks to you for your support for all of our City and County projects here in Santa Fe. And, I just wanted to finish up my comments and we'll run around one more time and see if anyone... additional comments and then we'll move on.

The staff comments from County, are [inaudible] talking about... their comments are relative [inaudible] to serve other County residents. The least desirable station location for the County [inaudible] is Richards Avenue. That's [inaudible] eliminated from [inaudible] at this point for station locations is 599 and I-25 or in the City, Cerrillos Road and I-25.

So I guess what I'd like to do is at least give your staff and Secretary some informal direction. If we were to take a station poll, a straw poll here, do we have any problems.... and I think we need to put this on the next agenda [inaudible] separate question. Do we have any problems with this [inaudible] the 599 location as, at least an initial station location. Councilor Chávez.

Councilor Chávez Mr. Chairman, personally I think that's out of sequence. I think that we're fully aware that this is a possible station location and that we are going to do a series of public meetings that this has to be dealt with in a separate environmental assessment. I personally don't think that... this isn't even on the Agenda. We're off-topic a little bit. We're under informational items. [inaudible] DOT staff. Do

something that [inaudible] do. That's my comment.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Other comments? Councilor Ortíz.

Councilor Ortíz Well, Mr. Chair I will tell you ... I've been very clear with this, and I am adamantly opposed to the Richards Avenue train station. [inaudible] health problems. You've got health problems [inaudible]. And the Richards Avenue creates a whole host of other issues.

I think the 599 option works the best. Without seeing, as Councilor Chávez said, any of the stuff at any of the items that we're supposed at public process, 599 works the best because it is the most undeveloped [inaudible]. So [inaudible] impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods, if you will, [inaudible].

So conceptually, without seeing the what the design looks like, without seeing what the assessment is, without hearing the public meetings, I can say that for 599 absolutely over the Richards Avenue. But again, we don't have that process. It's that process that shows this particular alignment. So you know, just having a straw poll, that would be my comment.

But you know, as an aside, though, both of our [inaudible] what [inaudible] on this project? Is this the anticipation of the [inaudible] going through the City approval process, or have there been actual delays that the Department of Transportation is somehow telling the Delegation that they have experienced as a result of this process? What is that?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, [inaudible] aside as delays to this particular project [inaudible] about delays to the project, because seeing the future increase in construction costs, most often [inaudible]. And so he just wants to keep it on schedule. [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Commissioner Vigil?

Commissioner Vigil I can only imagine your challenge if you're in constituency-based comments here, and are trying to balance that with moving the project forward. I actually would prefer to honor what your representing to us today. Learn what the public process has to say.

I don't view the 599 [inaudible] intersection or Richards as either or. [inaudible] the public process, it possibly could be both. I don't know. I don't think we have sufficient information and I also don't think we've represented to you that, you know, some of us have had staff input.

I've also heard you say you've been working closely with our staffs on this. It's really good for us as local elected officials to hear from our staff because we do go out on limbs with these. I'd like, before we make a decision, to go forth with the

staff input on these sites. And have your staff and engineers work with ours and have them to be able to present to us what your discussions were, where the designs are going, what are the safety issues, what are the things that we brought up.

I don't [inaudible] I know that part of your request today was if you're ready to have us move forward. I would agree with Councilor Chávez, it's not on the Agenda. We can't take action on that. But we can take action in terms of moving forward in the appropriate manner.

Commissioner Sullivan Mayor Coss?

Mayor Coss Well this is [inaudible] there's a requirement that says the County [inaudible] Richards Avenue. And I would tend to defer to the 599 site, but I think we do have to have that...at least a public hearing on that...a public process on that.

But I don't want to put the State in the position of, you know, they're letting us tell them where the stations should be and we're not ready to tell them yet so therefore they're EA can't be complete.

We've put them in that [inaudible] of if they tell us the map is [inaudible] local government, we're not going to tell them so their EA process is complete. I don't think that's fair or good for the process. Just as...just where we've been with RPA [inaudible] planning, I would say Richards would have a direct impact on the vicinity.

And all that development of the college district that comes and hits Romeo is a big issue for the City. [inaudible] to Cerrillos to continue to be a problem area, and I'm not ready to say... tell all people in [inaudible] we're going to punch Richards through Cerrillos road.

So, for me, if you left Richards alone, I'm fine. 599 seems like the great one, but I really do think that those are outside of our quote unquote *presumed* City limits, and our County land use decisions to be made. I just don't want that decision making process to be used as an excuse to hold up the construction process.

Commissioner Sullivan Thank you. I think you got some guidance there. No necessarily unanimous. But let me make a suggestion. When you conduct your meeting on the 30th, and when the City conducts it's...I think on the 23rd, [inaudible] let's bring those issues up. Station location. And see what additional comments the people have. And let's put it on the agenda for the next MPO meeting, and if we're ready to act, then that will be fortuitous for the DOT because you could wrap that into your assessment procedures.

If we're not, then we're not, but at least you've set yourself deadlines to at least

address the issues formally. When [inaudible]. Okay... but...then do we have any questions for the DOT? [inaudible]

Commissioner Anaya Sure. Chairman, I met with Mark and he was telling me that we are working on sites. We've got the nine that we're looking at? Oh, these are the sites? Okay, so [inaudible] ...

Commissioner Sullivan Yeah, we've been looking at sites, but I think the problems from the staff's viewpoint, [inaudible] on the County side, is that it's just what the role of this so-called Technical Coordinating Committee is. That there's this group of staff that are looking at these sites and...the County has attended some of these meetings, but we only have two staff on the MPO.

And so the jargon these individuals on this Technical Coordinating Committee are employees of DOT. So...not quite sure that that's the role the DOT should be in, in terms of selecting these sites, particularly in lieu of what Secretary and I just talked about, the County having the role to select it's sites in the County, and then the City had their role to select it's sites in the City.

So some concerns about just who speaks for this Technical Coordinating Committee, who speaks for the County, who speaks for the City? I think elected officials in the County speak for the County, elected officials in the City speak for the City. I think.

So they have...and these studies have been mandated now for some time, but...you can see from the staff [inaudible], Richards Avenue is the top one and the other two could be either Cerrillos or 599. [inaudible] that would be Cerrillos and 599 and then the next one up would be Richards. And then once you pass that you're in the City.

The next three circuits are all in the City. So there [inaudible] just start. And I know the City has been looking at hiring a consultant with funds that the DOT has...or financed...[inaudible]. If we can come through with some agreement at least on the County sites. Now, whether you want to fight over whether there's supposed to be one in the City and one in the County, and which one is the *one* would be a whole other issue, but in terms of looking at where the one for the County is, I think [inaudible] that one.

Other questions for [inaudible]?

Secretary Faught Going through this process isn't closing the door for future opportunities for a station. It's just that once we get all the way to Santa Fe, [inaudible] for the Railrunner are going to be put in to the roads for [inaudible].

And so we're trying to...if there's going to be a station location...a station identified

[inaudible] put in this file and won't go away. And that's what we're trying to do. If, for some reason, there is no station identified, that doesn't close the door. We'll just have to look for a different funding source.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Thanks, Secretary. That's a really important piece of information. [inaudible]. So, it's kind of, the money [inaudible] we're not using towards the City of Santa Fe as needed, but it's for station [inaudible] for the intersections?

Secretary Faught Correct. We're aiming it for the center, or [inaudible] that are needed as a part of the Railrunner. For the City to be safe, for it to...the minimum requirements that we need to meet in order to get into the City of Santa Fe will be part our [inaudible] is already considered part of the Railrunner costs. [inaudible] Stations we can identify [inaudible] two stations, and try to include that in the cost of this part at this point in time. If not, we'll just identify the [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan I think Councilor Chávez has a question.

Councilor Chávez Well, having said that, then it makes no sense to me to eliminate any possible station location, even though one of us may not like that station location. But it works for the project, if it works for the future you need to keep that on the list of possible locations. Not to eliminate it now.

Because we start to affect that process. If we decide now that 599 is better than Richards, then we circumvent the public process, we circumvent any work we're doing on it. So I think that's [inaudible], and if it's a package deal and we can fund more than one station location in this, I think that it would be in our best interest to do that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Sullivan Councilor Ortíz?

Councilor Ortíz Mr. Chair I actually heard the opposite. I heard that...you have the money now to put up a station. You're going to defer the decision that we have to make a station. If you don't build a station, that money will be used to mitigate some of the impacts that have been identified.

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, Councilor, we're paid to mitigate impacts as we identify them in the ways that we can as part of the costs.

Councilor Ortíz You have sufficient budget to mitigate impacts that have been identified in a general sense but have not been designed for or [inaudible]?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, Councilor Ortíz, what I worry about, talking in general terms, is that something may come up that I didn't see, or think about. But the thing is is I, for instance, you brought up something about noise earlier, and noise walls have to be able to reduce the decibel level of a certain number of decibels before it will

even be considered as an opportunity. The [inaudible] think that a noise wall will reduce the noise because they want a noise wall and it won't reduce it enough that we consider a noise wall.

So I was just using that as an example. Not necessarily as...that that's what has happened, but that may be an issue...we certainly see that often. So what we're saying is that we've budgeted 425 million dollars for a potential to increase costs, for a potential of a station. [inaudible] if there's going to be more than one station. Right now I think we [inaudible] one station. Is that right? Unless [inaudible].

Mr. Blewett [inaudible]

Secretary Faught Okay. I just wanted to make sure, because I have a staff to, and sometimes I'll say things that I'll say "oh, I shouldn't have said that." so...The thing is is that....So what I'm saying is that any monies that are left over as a result, will go into [inaudible] program projects. So we have an opportunity to get a station, or possibly more than one station, as long as it can go through this process.

But once the train gets into Santa Fe, and is completed, any left over monies of that 420 million that's budgeted go into offsetting costs or some high construction prices or [inaudible].

Unknown [inaudible], [laughter]

Councilor Ortiz Of the 425 million, are some of those budgets to do some of the [inaudible] needed down in Bernalillo County? Or is it just 425 [inaudible]... is that 425 include the stuff that's going on in Bernalillo, or is it just the stuff that....

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, Councilor, that's everything. That's everything that we've already done, from Belen all the way to Bernalillo, the acquisition of the track, the.... It includes everything. It's all-encompassing for the entire Railrunner [inaudible]

Commissioner Sullivan Track running all the way up to Bernalillo, and I understand there's some efforts to do some improvements now that it's running. Does this...the balance of the budget...is the balance of the budget just to take care of the Railrunner line coming up to Santa Fe? Will it pay for those other costs coming out to Santa Fe? Or does it include some of the retro-fitting that's going to happen [inaudible]?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, we're going to find [inaudible] possibly include for road crossings. I think that's what you're referring to.

Commissioner Sullivan Yeah.

Secretary Faught And so we'll need identification about where the money can come from. If there's money left in the budget for the Railrunner, then we would consider using that. Or

if there is... or if we had to look at other sources of funds. It's not a straightforward answer because it's...we don't have....

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible] I think [inaudible] comments right here is that...we had option [inaudible], then we have options now. Once the Railrunner reaches Santa Fe, then whatever's left of that pot [inaudible] other projects that [inaudible]. If we don't have any stations, that's fine with you.

Secretary Faught That's correct.

Commissioner Sullivan If we want one station, that's fine, if we want two stations, that's fine, or even four.

Secretary Faught That's correct.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. So it's [inaudible] us to decide that. And we'll let you know as soon as possible before you send the money off to [inaudible].

B. Action Items

1. SFMPO Resolution: Rail Runner Alignment EA - *Commissioner Sullivan*

Commissioner Sullivan Alright then, let's move on to then... the Action Items. [inaudible] questions from the Staff. And I think we can get through these fairly quickly. One is item B 2, for anyone in the audience, that's been tabled until our next meeting on November eighth. That has to do with the City of Santa Fe resolution [inaudible].

And I [inaudible] a resolution that I have brought forward, and I want to just [inaudible] forward before the Environmental Assessment. Well, before the [inaudible]. And I just want to focus... it's in your packets. I'm not sure where, but there's...after the [inaudible], there's two final issues in there, and those are expressly concerned for the location for the location for the plan [inaudible] Railroad station near 1-25 and 599 and Richards Avenue haven't been adequately studied. Which we heard here, also mentioned by some of the members of the MPO.

And public input hasn't been solved, and they should be a part of the ongoing Environmental Assessment because, at least in my personal opinion, they are part of the cumulative affect of a rail line is the rail station or stations. And one of the justifications for this alignment that was selected was the increased ridership that it offered. And of course, nobody [inaudible] ridership is [inaudible] the station, the rail station.

So the request that this Resolution puts forward, the DOT would say when it was written, that we would like these studied in the Environmental Assessment. Since

then, at least a portion of the Environmental Assessment has been completed. A [inaudible] has been issued an amazing ten days after the commentary ended. Just absolutely lightning fast. But we still have the issue of the rail stations that we were talking about earlier at the meeting this morning.

And so I guess I'd like to get the [inaudible] comments, Madam Secretary. Would there be a problem putting a rail station assessment into the current Environmental Assessment, reopening it and include it? Or would you do an assessment of all six of these sites? And if so, how long will that take? Or would you do an assessment on one site or two sites? What would be the preferred process from your [inaudible]?

Secretary Faught I'll start [inaudible]. As far as opening up the existing Environmental Assessment, [inaudible]. That, as a utility is not dependant on having it's stations, and therefore we can move forward without opening that back up. As far as the stations can have separate because they have...they are separate [inaudible] function without any stations and is therefore independent of the stations as far as the sections that [inaudible]. So I'll let Chris....

Mr. Blewett We certainly anticipated the station would occur. That's a logical next step after a rail line would be a rail station.

Unknown Mr. Chairman, if I may, I think that, you know, part of this is kind of a pickle, and if you really try to identify all the future things that could happen as a result of this rail that might take about a couple hundred years. But I think in terms of the process that's in place, part of the idea behind that was let's look at this long-term.

Let's look at all sides that may have some potential [inaudible] or twenty years from now, and I think that's one of the reasons the group came up with eight potential ideas.

As I understand, the goal, certainly in the short term, is to narrow the field. And you typically wouldn't do an Environmental Assessment on all eight unless you needed that level of detail to start narrowing the field.

And so what we've done up to this point is really just a matrix that identifies the basic characteristics of all those sites to see if those basic characteristics are enough to start kind of separating the [inaudible] so to speak. [inaudible] process. It's what we've been working [inaudible] process where you don't have the resources to absolutely investigate every idea, and so we use a different level of information to kind of narrow the field.

It's when you get down to what you consider the final ideas that you really need that additional level of information [inaudible] either decide between "a" and "b" or make a decision about "a" and "b" and "c". [inaudible] want to pursue a more

traditional part of the process where...yeah we do need to know before we can make a decision what the traffic impacts are. If there are land use implications, what those might be other than environmental issues... the noise, the biological, cultural, ethical stuff.

So I think that in terms of this process that's how it's proceeding right now [inaudible] to narrow the field to some candidates that could undergo a rigorous process.

Commissioner Sullivan So then let me...and I'm not a fan of the process that's been going on here [inaudible] TCC process is allowing County and City to have their separate inputs, which [inaudible] represent the constituents. But let me just suggest to the MPO that this item be tabled until the next meeting.

And I'd like to rework this in light of some of the ideas that were brought forward here today. In terms of [inaudible] preference for the station, and see where we are for the two public hearings, and help make this resolution solid. It reflects something we can accomplish with the stations hopefully to get a station built rather than to study [inaudible] until the first passenger sets off for Santa Fe, and then find that we no longer have funds for the station. So I would offer a motion to table item B1 until the next MPO Meeting.

Councilor Chávez I will make that motion Mr. Chair.

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible]

Councilor Chávez Yes, sir.

Commissioner Sullivan Alright. And I'll second it. Is there discussion on [inaudible]? Those in favor say aye.

Chair Sullivan Aye.

Vice-Chair Chávez Aye.

Mayor Coss Aye.

Councilor Ortiz Aye.

Commissioner Vigil Aye.

Commissioner Anaya Aye.

Chair Sullivan Okay. Move then to B three.

2. City of Santa Fe Resolution: Rail Runner Service to Santa Fe – *Councilor Ortíz*

This item was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

3. Retention of Independent Peer Review Engineer for Rail Runner, Phase II, reporting directly to City and County of Santa Fe- *Commissioner Sullivan*

Commissioner Sullivan This has to do with our discussions that we started about two weeks ago with the DOT concerning getting [inaudible] I think the news paper this morning talked about it just a [inaudible] stations, but I don't think that was our intent. I think our intent was to have an eyes and ears that represents the City and the County separately through the whole design and construction process. And I believe Madam Secretary had some discussions with City last night about this. [inaudible]

Unknown Mr. Chairman?

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible]

Mr. Blewett Yeah, well I did want to say that we had....

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible, multiple speakers]

Unknown On the Agenda to actually award this contract. It's a contract for the design of a train station location. I tabled the motion, and I tabled it because in light of the inspections that we had. In light of the offers that the State made to pay for at least three months of that. Because we've got that budget now, because of some of the issues involved, I wanted to delay awarding that so that we had alignment in the budget [inaudible] for paying off what I think is the more important function...Which is, we don't need a consultant to tell us what...where the potential stations are.

We do need, I think, an independent engineer to look at this project as it goes through the design and construction phase and give the City and the County input on what that design is.

And so I postponed that item specifically because of the discussions that we had, because I wanted to make sure that, if we were going to [inaudible] that we had available resources. And that's seemed the most ready source of funding that the City and the County had available. Unless there's additional monies that the State has. But that's why I postponed the selection of the consultant for the train station location. So I wanted to put that out there for the MPO's consideration.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. And then, getting back to Madam Secretary. Just to catch up, for those of us

who weren't at the finance meeting, please.

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, our offer was independently viewed [inaudible] I think that we welcome whatever input you want to have. [inaudible]. Like I said, we like to work in a cooperative manner...a collaborative and cooperative manner. That's what our intent is for the City and the County, even if it's not with the MPO process specifically, but their individual staffs.

Commissioner Sullivan And you were thinking three [inaudible]. And I guess the only thing [inaudible] that occurred to me was that...it's my thought wasn't that it be like [inaudible] is there a cheaper way to build this railroad, but [inaudible] Councilor Ortíz, he's talking about and others have and that is to have our own eyes and ears throughout the whole process...that we feel comfortable [inaudible] representing our specific issues in educated construction and traffic issues [inaudible] move forward.

And people may gripe, and some will say who designed *this*, and how did they ever get away with *that*? When we have a non-[inaudible] person that is a technically oriented person and he can go through immediately when our constituents complain and say what's happening out there [inaudible], and can not feel constrained that they have to tell the company [inaudible] specifically to the City and the County.

So I guess...I appreciate the offer, and the three [inaudible] include funding that would be in addition to the 200 thousand, or have you not thought that far ahead on it?

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, I made an offer providing three months of the payments. Not necessarily that that's all that we get [inaudible] would be willing to participate for three of those months.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay, so if we wanted to go for a year, you would [inaudible]

Secretary Faught That is correct.

Commissioner Sullivan Alright. Discussion on item B3? Mayor Coss, then Councilor Chávez.

Mayor Coss [inaudible] Councilor Chávez.

Commissioner Sullivan Thank you Mayor Coss. Councilor Chávez?

Councilor Chávez I'm gonna be sticking against this. I think that we have a substantial investment in staff already. I really see this as busy work. And how much are we...that's a generous offer. I think it's something that you're willing to offer to get this [inaudible].

How much money are you...well, three months could turn into twenty years...so

how much money are willing to invest in this additional task here? Because I really think that we have invested in staff already, and I think that that money could be better spent elsewhere. Do you have a dollar amount? Because I know this is something that was just thrown at you.

- Unknown Mr. Chairman, Councilor Chávez, the idea is to provide a full-time staff for three months at the level of what we call engineer advanced. Which is the highest level of engineer that we have [inaudible]. So that we could provide three months of a full-time engineer. You pick the engineer, we pay for those three months.
- Councilor Chávez Okay, so...and this engineer is going to have to work with existing City and County staff on [inaudible] with the MPO and with the Technical Review Committee, right? This engineer cannot go off and work in a back room or create a different document that doesn't agree with any of the work that we've done today?
- Unknown [inaudible] intended that the presence of this engineer, the work we are going to get would be so that you can feel that what the department is doing right now, that [inaudible] design built engineer, and the work of your groups, both City and County staff are doing, is what you want. That's what I thought you wanted, and that's why we...
- Councilor Chávez Well, I'm not asking for it but I guess there are some that are asking for that. I mean, I don't right now at this point see that it is really needed, that it's money well spent, but maybe I can be convinced [inaudible]. Thank you Mr. Chair.
- Commissioner Sullivan Thank you Councilor. Anyone else?
- Unknown Let me try to convince you a little bit, but maybe not. I wanted to first say the contract team [inaudible] 200 thousand that's [inaudible] the grant, that's from DFAA. And they got something the MPO needs some [inaudible]. 'Cause it's kind of morphed into an MPO project without the MPO ever...MPO's staff's shaking their heads so it's not an MPO project, so it's very [inaudible] to talk about the MPO.
- Commissioner Sullivan It was an MPO project, and it morphed into a city project. [inaudible, multiple speakers]
- Unknown I think the money was always to the City [inaudible] City project. But I think that the idea that there's 200 thousand there in State Grant to the City has some merit when looking at this. The way I'm looking at it is I know right now we have our Traffic Engineer in Albuquerque looking at how this is operated in Albuquerque...the crossings and the signals, et cetera.
- The City's [inaudible] for that would be nice if we had a separate source of money that could help us do some [inaudible] and some checks that the Local

Governments wouldn't want to do. I think I can support that in concept because we need to have that local review and analysis.

That being said, you know...I wanted to say, Madam Secretary, I don't think you're getting away with anything. I think that you're trying to do something that has never been done in the history of New Mexico, and I commend you for that. But I can be in support of using some funds to help profit [inaudible] staff, to help County staff do some independent analysis.

You know, for example, if the traffic study from the State says it's a 60 second delay at Zia, does our traffic engineer believe that, or do his or her data come out the same? You know, if it's more or less [inaudible] what can we do with that data then? You can do something with that data.

And I think that needs some [inaudible] some with concerns that Commissioner Sullivan, Councilor Ortíz, Councilor [inaudible], have brought forward and that there will be somebody working for the Public Works Department, or working for the City or for the County Transportation People. That would be doing some independent use on these issues that are mobile sight-specific, of interest to Santa Feans in the City or the County.

Commissioner Sullivan Commissioner Vigil, then Councilor Chávez.

Commissioner Vigil Thank you. [inaudible] thank you so much. I'm hearing more and more cooperation while I'm here, I appreciate it. One of the things that we've been working on here today is dealing with sort of small future stock. And if we go forward with this particular decision, I think that the County, would in particular want to share in this.

I'm not sure how that dollar is allocated or [inaudible] at this point in time, but one of the issues that we've had is really a double-blind issue. Is this going to be an express train project or is it going to be the regional transit system? Does Santa Fe actually...Is Santa Fe actually where it ends, or what is the future of it?

When we hire someone that has independent source assessment [inaudible] for this, it would be really important I think for rural residents and [inaudible] to really know, you know, there is a big picture here, and I think making that focus, you start addressing stations, you start addressing [inaudible] a much better focus.

So if this independent assessment is going to be done, I think there needs to be a focus of what the vision is.

Secretary Ortíz Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, right now, it's just to Santa Fe...that's the plan, but everywhere I go, [inaudible] that's what it turns out to be. And we have to look at what would be...would actually serve [inaudible] communities. There is interest in taking the train all the way to Taos, for instance. That has been very [inaudible] a

very, very preliminary look into...right now, I don't think that we have the ability to look past Santa Fe until we get it to Santa Fe and see the success of it. We need to identify 'cause...we need to make sure that people using the train, that it is...we feel very strongly it's a benefit to the State of New Mexico, [inaudible] benefit.

So I think that for right now, it is what it is. It's to Santa Fe. That doesn't mean that we wouldn't some day look at extending that to certain other areas, but for today, that's where it is. I don't know if that answers the question very well, but I don't think that we have...we haven't taken that [inaudible].

There's an interest in getting it [inaudible] to Las Cruces and El Paso. That's a very expensive endeavor at this point in time because that is a freight line...a freight rail line, and passenger service is not allowed without some provisions that are very, very expensive. And for type of ridership, we don't know if that is a worthwhile project at this point in time. That doesn't mean that some time in the future with advanced technology, that won't be a worthwhile project.

And that's one of those things I tell folks is that technology changes so quickly that when they...some areas were reachable, particularly where there's already existing track, that we may consider that in the future. But for now, today [inaudible] from Bernalillo to Santa Fe. That's it.

Commissioner Vigil Thank you.

Commissioner Sullivan Councilor Chávez

Councilor Chávez Mark ?, could you come closer to the microphone? I have a couple questions I want to ask you. Maybe I'll start by having you just explain for the record and for [inaudible] and committee members here, the item that was tabled on the Finance Committee Agenda last night. It had to do with trans-oriented developments that was [inaudible] for about 196 thousand dollars or so. Could you explain the reason and rationale behind that grant? And I think there's some confusion about [inaudible] and maybe this independent peer review.

Mark Tibbetts Mr. Chairman, Councilor Chávez, the TOD grant [inaudible] came from...kind of our of the blue, from the Department of Finance Administration, specifically trying to look at what kind of transit our new development would benefit. Initially, it was really targeted [inaudible] the area around Second Street, and it was an effort to encourage that type of [inaudible] people use transit as a...to change their mode of travel and see what type of development opportunities would be opened.

But when the City staff discussed this...and I was part of that discussion with the Long Range Plan, it was...we brought up since representing the MPO, that in order to put this into context, this whole rail service, that the contractors of people responding to the RFP would...should look at one task to have an analysis...well,

not an analysis, but to have public input for stations all along instead of just focused on just the second street, what's mentioned.

To also look at others around that...adjacent to the area, like Zia and possibly Rodeo Road. We presented as the MPO that [inaudible] look at all potential station stops in the Santa Fe area, so they could see there's a... [inaudible] process that you go through in a specific neighborhood to look at how a station could be impacted, and what type of commercial and residential areas. And what we wanted to do was just kind of look at train service coming into Santa Fe so it was just one component of that, to put it into context.

The focus of that brand is to do these Charettes in a concentrated area between St. Fran...I-25, and the second Alta Vista Station, in that area.

Unknown So it'll supplement whatever public process you've already [inaudible].

Mr. Tibbetts Right and what we are trying to do is, when we get a chance for more public involvement, as the train service is coming into Santa Fe, so the public can kind of see it in a greater sense of accessibility for them to use that train to access it.

But TOD study was really to look at Charettes specific Charettes in this area, so it really had nothing to do with everything we're talking about here. Because Charette process really focused specific process for input from the public on how they'd like to see station [inaudible].

Councilor Chávez Thank you for that explanation. I just wanted to [inaudible] so we're clear about the background, the intent, the purpose behind that [inaudible]. Thank you.

Mr. Tibbetts Thank you Mr. Chair.

Commissioner Sullivan Mayor Coss, then Councilor Ortíz.

Mayor Coss Just about additional discussion so the...what that grant was looking at when we go look at 599 or Richards or Cerrillos Road. Wouldn't help that 'cause I looked at the questions that were in the resolutions that councilor Ortíz has [inaudible] noise, safety, traffic, and station location, and I just think if we set out station location now, finding the most likely station locations [inaudible] contract would [inaudible] anyway.

Unknown [inaudible]

Mayor Coss Well, it's amazing how sometimes we get money from the Legislation that we didn't ask for, [inaudible] But I think it's a generous offer from the State, you know, if we just took noise, safety and traffic and we looked at those three things, I'm thinking three months of top Engineers' expenses might give the Local

Governments a pretty good review of those three issues.

And it just sounds like station location [inaudible] Local Government [inaudible] process that would really be better for deciding that. [inaudible] than the Department of Transportation [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan Councilor?

Councilor Ortíz Well I would say that...I'm aware of what that contract was for, and I was aware of the proposed contract that [inaudible] was going to pay for. I think when we're actually...actually study this project, and actually looking at what the impacts are, do we want to see models? Models and artists' renditions of what the best [inaudible] for a particular station on Second Street...where Zia Road is?

Or do we want to have an Engineer who can, for lack of a better term, [inaudible] on this project as constructed. My choice would be for the Engineer because of the particular expertise, and because of the gravity of this project. This is a four hundred million dollar project. [inaudible]. So this is not something that is unfamiliar to the City to have. We have had this kind of a system in place to give input to the City and County staff. To provide that kind of detail that, if we didn't have, could slip under the radar.

And so, again, knowing that this money goes out there, knowing that these larger issues...we're talking about a bigger picture, we're talking about dealing with a system and having those impacts go to the fund and not [inaudible]. Those are larger issues that...how would a proposed [inaudible] for the station on Second Street look? And how nicely could it fit into the surrounding neighborhoods? How could a train station obviously erode [inaudible]? Without addressing the impacts of Richards Avenue...there are many of them. Without addressing the impacts at I-23 without addressing potential impacts at 599.

I understood the nature of the contract. That's why I tabled it. I tabled it because I wanted to have it available. Should the MPO as a [inaudible] say we would rather have Engineering help than have these kinds of train station locations [inaudible] before it's disrupted. That's a decision for us to make.

And if we make that decision, I'll do what I have to do on the City side to see what we can do to turn that money available to us so that the City's budget won't be impacted, so that the County's budget won't be impacted. And I would assume, given the offer that the Department of Transportation made, that we would produce...to utilize those monies that have already been turned over and area a available to us.

That's why I postponed it .I think that as the MPO, more serious concerns are the concerns that the Mayor made about traffic, safety and noise. And what's going to

help us in that kind of process? It's going to help us in that process [inaudible] engineer or engineering firm that will give the City and the County the kind of data that they need to interface with the Department Of Transportation. I think that's the more important, more pressing objective now. Not what the Charettes are going to look like, and what kind of stations are going to be as this proposal moves on.

You heard from the Department Of Transportation. They're looking to build one station, and yet we're studying nine different locations. I think that we can come up with the public process. The MPO staff didn't come up with the meeting for the public, our constituent service people came up with that particular process. And so we've got a system in City Hall that deals with the public process. It's called the Early [inaudible] Notification System. It's a process that works. It's a process that get's people to the table to talk about the problem, to see where there can be solutions.

That's really what we're trying to engage the State with. [inaudible] willing to engage in that type of process. That's the kind of process that we need to deal with the more serious issues. Not how a particular station should look. In a particular location where the likelihood that location is very far off in the future. I think we should have the ability to allocate the resources to the more pressing needs.

And so I'm in support of [inaudible] independent community.

Commissioner Sullivan Let me do something at this point. [inaudible]. Let me throw out a potential motion here to see if we agree on that, and if possible move on to the last couple items. Let me see how we feel on a motion to initiate a process with the Department Of Transportation to determine the scope, the duration and cost of a Figure Review Engineer, and to bring back a recommendation to the MPO in that regard at the next regular meeting. I would make that motion.

Mayor Coss I'd second that motion.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Motion and a second. Discussion? Councilor Chávez?

Councilor Chávez Back on the 200 thousand dollar grant...that was for transit-oriented development, and I would [inaudible] assume that transit-oriented [inaudible] and is going to include more than just train stations. Right? Staff would you like to respond to that? I know that the station locations [inaudible] pressing issue, but I was also under the impression that this grant would go beyond just where the stations might be located, and what they might look like.

Mr. Tibbetts Mr. Chair, Councilor Chávez, the TOD grant is...it's a land use issue. We had [inaudible] the reason we rejected...had that one segment about the current stations. The rest [inaudible] potential stations into that process is because we

wanted to initiate [inaudible] to find out...to solicit some public comment on where station locations...where they would like to have them.

The consultant team, and the various teams that have actually applied to do that service, were made up of not just Charette people [inaudible], also Engineers, people that could design train stations, high experts in their fields, many, many projects they've done in the Boulder area, in Denver, all around the country. And these people are looking at the land use, the economic benefit, the design...not just neighborhood impressions of what they like to see, but what works on a National level.

This is the grant that was given to the City. When it went to Public Works it was taken. We were counting on [inaudible] scheduled meeting with the MPO staff schedule to work with those consultants that were meeting at the end of October.

And since it was [inaudible] and tabled again at, I assume, last night at Finance...that...then we found out that through the initiative [inaudible] the Councilors, Councilor Ortíz, to have a public input. That's all they're trying to do with the MPO and staff is to get public input into this process.

We wanted to find out as an initial attempt to get public input was to have that first [inaudible] be where does the public want to see train stations. It's going to be an open question with this amount is going to be shown. To help go through this elimination process, to get down to a shorter list, to get public input.

So far, the public has not had an opportunity, and I realize that's the reason why [inaudible] unclear as to what [inaudible] not just on station location, but on the [inaudible] issues I talked about. Likewise on the thirtieth the DOT's going to do a presentation, and likewise, after that, possibly in November, if [inaudible] the Policy Board doesn't decide [inaudible], we will have another meeting with the TOD once it gets started. The TOD is the Land Usage and Station Locations. Just the reason brought it on at first was [inaudible].

Unknown

Okay, so it seems like we're all just kind of going in the same direction as far as [inaudible] peer review and maybe the [inaudible], but I will motion, Mr. Chair, Okay, so we don't have a cost...[inaudible] go to an RFP process? How are we going to hire this consultant? Is that enough time to go through that process and then have this as an action item upon the next Agenda?

Commissioner Sullivan

I think that's what we need to determine with the department, and we can address the scope of this TOD fund [inaudible] this project. We could, as Commissioner Vigil said go for the County's [inaudible] what's the scope of work, what's the duration? How much is three months of an Engineer [inaudible] full time to work? [inaudible] and then indicate whether we can piggy-back on some other existing contract or if we need to go to RFP.

There is an expedited RFP process that we can follow. And as I say, since our next meeting is not too far away, [inaudible] I think we need...it's about the amount of time we can put that together. So those are all the questions, and the reason I structured motions that way is that, we need to sit down and iron this out with the DOT, the City and County, and [inaudible].

Okay. Other discussion on this? Okay, Commissioner Anaya

Commissioner Anaya Yeah, [inaudible] Madam Secretary

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, and Commissioner, what I was thinking as I listened to the discussion on this is that perhaps [inaudible] give you a dollar amount. And you [inaudible]

Unknown [inaudible, multiple speakers]

Secretary Faught That's what I'm thinking. I'm thinking [inaudible]

Unknown So we may not have to go through an RFP process, but we have existing funds for City. We have 150 thousand available through procurement code. And it bills the City and the County separately. And those [inaudible] might [inaudible]

Secretary Faught [inaudible, multiple speakers] and actually we'll make sure that your staff here has the bills for your County staff and your City staff.

Unknown Okay, so that's [inaudible]. So I guess his question is is three weeks enough? Do you think we could put together a package and come back to the MPO [inaudible] with it?

Secretary Faught [inaudible] will be how we originally anticipated it. [inaudible] hire an individual in the community. Like we would hold a position. If you could fill a position [inaudible]. So we could...I'm gonna go back and see how much we can pull out of contract monies, and see what we can put in instead [inaudible].

Unknown And then if we wanted that person to be there longer, regards to the peak [inaudible] is either available from this TOD grant if not separate from the State and separate from the County. And I think there will be some [inaudible] to supplement that. [inaudible]

Secretary Faught Where does the [inaudible] can talk about just yesterday [inaudible] got through all the way. Certainly what we will do within this three week period is we'll have a variety of different options that we can participate in. We'll certainly work with your staff anyway so that it's not a surprise. I think that we can have some of [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan Other Questions? Okay, Mayor Coss.

Mayor Coss I just wanted to put some record out...I'm still hopeful that the amount we get from transportation would take care of the questions and we wouldn't need to dip into that grant fund from the state. [inaudible] that grant fund from DFA...and I see MPO staff doing much [inaudible] essentially City Land Use planning function. And I think MPO should look at that.

Now I'm hearing more detail...detail Councilor Ortiz is talking about [inaudible]. If we're not looking at those other stations, I think maybe we should be. And I can just tell you from a long [inaudible] City politics where you got those three yellow circles in the City, you're gonna hold Charettes you're going to find a lot of people that want them and a lot of people don't want them. And there's just going to be political decisions made. That circle at 599...there's hardly anybody that stands up and says "I don't want it" because there's nobody that lives there. [laughter]

So I'm just saying the MPO needs to bear that in mind as we're trying to get the train into Santa Fe and decide where...the requirements say we might build one station, maybe two if we have extra money. That means [inaudible] station. That's a bigger spot, and I think, you know, the transit-oriented district, that funding from the State, the 200 thousand, it would be my hope that we don't have to dip into that. [inaudible] however much Staff you [inaudible] I [inaudible] to say is that an MPO function? Is that a City of Santa Fe Land Use Department function? Or maybe is that even a Regional Transit District function to do that plan? [inaudible]

Commissioner Sullivan Okay, thank you. A motion and a second. Those in favor say aye.

[The motion passed four to two]

Commissioner Sullivan Four in favor two against, motion carries. Alright. Thank you folks.

Secretary Faught Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt you but....

Commissioner Sullivan You don't want me to read that motion do you? [laughter]

Secretary Faught No, but I want you to...someone brought to me something that said I need to clarify statement I made earlier. [inaudible, multiple speakers] Restate that we had 400 million dollars for the train and includes the station [inaudible]. The 25 million dollars we have budgeted, that's for any contingencies. For over-runs or some unforeseen cost. I just wanted to make sure that we understand that all of this is still included in the 400 million dollars and that the 25 million isn't for contingencies.

Unknown You need some contingency as you're going into construction because not everything is the way it looks on the plans.

Secretary Faught That's correct. And so I just wanted to clarify that because [inaudible] misled you to believe that we had 425 million for everything. But it's 400 million, the 25 [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan But what I did hear you saying earlier on is that if you didn't need those contingencies, you had [inaudible]. Then you'd take what was left and put it into [inaudible]

Secretary Faught [inaudible] projects, yes.

Commissioner Sullivan Yeah, okay, so you still have 425, but you don't want us to spend the full 425. You want us [inaudible, multiple speakers]

Secretary Faught The 25 is for contingencies [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible] good clarification. Okay. Next item then...so moving forward [inaudible] put together a [inaudible] or concept on how this would work, and we'll work with the City and the County [inaudible].

4. Appointment of New Policy Board Chair

Commissioner Sullivan Okay, item A...correction, B 4, we're now at a point where we need a Policy Board Chair, which would also indicate that it's time for the appointment of a Vice Chair. Over time, we've been [inaudible] six months and we have kind of sloughed off [inaudible] here. The Vice Chair of the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization is Councilor Chávez. And I am the [inaudible] Chair [inaudible, secondary conversation near microphone:

[Commissioner Sullivan moved to appoint Councilor Chávez as the Vice Chair of the MPO Policy Board.] Councilor Chávez agrees. They're shaking their heads.] [inaudible] [laughter].

Commissioner Sullivan Alright those in favor of the motion say aye.

Chair Sullivan Aye

Vice-Chair Chávez Aye

Mayor Coss Aye

Councilor Ortíz Aye

Commissioner Vigil Aye

Commissioner Anaya Aye

Commissioner Sullivan Those opposed? It carries [inaudible] six to zero.

Commissioner Sullivan **moved to appoint the Councilor Chávez as the Vice Chair of the MPO Policy Board.**

Commissioner Anaya **seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.**

MATTERS FROM THE SFMPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD:

Commissioner Sullivan Okay do we now have any other matters from the Policy Board? Okay, hearing none, Communications from the DOT and FHWA

COMMUNICATIONS FROM NMDOT AND FHWA:

Commissioner Sullivan Is the FHWA present today? Are they? Say yes or no.

Woman No.

Commissioner Sullivan I've tried to call them on the phone and all I get is an answering machine. Can somebody tell them to pick up their phone? [laughter] We're talking about communications, right? Okay, Communications from the floor. Is there anyone who would like to address the MPO? Oh, excuse me there is one thing from Staff. I believe, Mark...would you want to give us information on this MPO membership structure study?

Mr. Tibbetts The only [inaudible] proposed Agenda for the membership study. This is an outcome of the review, the special review that the Santa Fe MPO has been going through since about a year ago. Actually it was first presented last September last year. And this was one component was to study the membership structure and proper MPO planning process. And there were several interviews about two weeks ago...I'm not sure...pretty sure all of you got a chance to [inaudible].

And this meeting will be on November seventh. It's going to be facilitated by [inaudible]. This is stuff from [inaudible] and association, they're the number one that's doing this study. And basically this Agenda is...it's going to be just presenting anonymously all of the comments that were made. Not attributed to any individual, just...it will be just listing all of the different comments.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay.

Mr. Tibbetts And I'll do a complete report...probably by...they said by December they'll put it all together. So it just gives an opportunity for everyone to hear all the comments. [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. The public [inaudible] that's November seventh. Mark just said from ten to one.

Unknown We need a location.

Mr. Tibbetts Alright, this is for the Transmission Policy Board. [inaudible] the location is at the Casa...

Woman Hotel Plaza [inaudible]. Is that 125 Washington

Unknown Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Tibbetts [inaudible]

Unknown We just received the Agenda...the final Agenda this morning. And we will distribute those out actually today [inaudible].

Commissioner Sullivan The Agenda's for this Workshop?

Unknown That's correct. The Workshop will be...

Mr. Tibbetts I've handed this out to the policy board there's another one that's going to be for the Technical Coordinating Committee, TCC, of that Committee that's made up of the City and the County are both members. All other members [inaudible]. Those, the County...Tesuque pueblo is also a member of that group, [inaudible].

But the TCC will be inundated later in the afternoon, like one to three. So this...the ten to one is focused primarily on this board's policy. If you have a chance, could you put some [inaudible] in the afternoon for the TCC. And the next TCC meeting is next Tuesday, in which we will be talking about [inaudible]. Okay.

Commissioner Sullivan Okay. Thank you Mark.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR:

Commissioner Sullivan We'll go back to see if there's any comments from the public who wanted to address the Board. Step forward.... Mr. Jones. Or sit down and speak into the microphone. Give the Recorder your name and address if you don't mind.

Mr. Jones My name is Edgar Jones. And I'm not sure whether it's good or bad...I haven't

determined that yet, but our family does have property which joins the railroad. The present railroad that is.

And I apologize if I missed it, but I had an [inaudible] mention by the DOT primarily. What criteria...what guidelines are used in selecting the different locations? I'm sure that's [inaudible] from the general public when you hold a meeting with them. Another one is just strictly mechanical. I don't understand. What are they going to do when they pull the train in? How are they going to turn around to get it headed back to Albuquerque?

Commissioner Sullivan You can drive it from either end I read in the documents.

Mr. Jones Pardon?

Commissioner Sullivan You can drive it from either end.

Mr. Jones Oh, you can?

Commissioner Sullivan Yeah, yeah. Am I right [inaudible]?

Unknown That's correct.

Commissioner Sullivan There's a steering wheel in the front and a steering wheel in the back.

Mr. Jones [inaudible] the engine ahead of the cars?

Commissioner Sullivan [inaudible] It's like the Subway in New York. You can drive it [inaudible].

Mr. Jones My first question is...that's concerned...concerns...you're gonna have a feeder bus, or busses that service the station from various locations in the town. However, that's not going to be available to everyone who might want to use the rail service. And what kind of parking is there going to be if...say the [inaudible] that are in the town...I wanted to ride the rail. I need to drive to the station location. What kind of parking is going to be available?

Commissioner Sullivan That's...[inaudible] mention Mr. Jones that's the comment that the County staff had as well. And one of their comments was that the focus seems to be on getting the passengers from Albuquerque to Santa Fe. But in fact, we have a great number of commuters who work in Albuquerque and who live in Santa Fe, and have to work in Albuquerque in order to get a good-paying job.

And so...that component seems to be missing in the analysis. And that causes, you know, the need for [inaudible] that train station which results in [inaudible] and that's one of the reasons that they favor 599 because yeah, you get all of that parking [inaudible] is a shoe that would fit. But it is a good issue because parking,

and the traffic related to that parking becomes [inaudible].

Mr. Jones Thank you Mr. Mayor...or Commissioner.

Commissioner Sullivan That's the Mayor over there.

[inaudible, multiple speakers]

Mr. Jones Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sullivan Well thanks for sitting through everything. I appreciate your [inaudible]. Any others from the audience that would like to [inaudible]? If not we will declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT:

Its business being completed, the meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

Approved by:

Jack Sullivan, Chairman

Submitted by:

Carl Boaz, Stenographer