

Appendix B  
Public Meeting Summaries and Comments



**Public Information Meeting  
I-25 Santa Fe Corridor Study  
Genoveva Chavez Community Center  
August 20, 2009**

**Meeting Attendees:**

Seventy stakeholders attended the meeting:

No.	Name
1	Carolyn A.
2	Josephine Brennan
3	William Brennan
4	Ed Brown
5	Dewey Bullard
6	Doris Carswell
7	Tom Chilton
8	Michael Coca
9	Steve Coca
10	Jonathan Cohen
11	JoAnne Vigil Coppler
12	Jana Cordova
13	Jody Cramer
14	Jody DeCoursin-Good
15	Robert G.
16	Astrid Gardner
17	Donald Glascock
18	Barbara Goede
19	Ernest Gonzales
20	Rudy Gonzales
21	Anna Hansen
22	Diana Hardy
23	David Henderson
24	Barbara Hope
25	David Hope
26	Linda Hortter
27	Corinne Hutchinson
28	Maris Hutchinson
29	Ray Johnson
30	Paul W. Keaton
31	Jules Klapper
32	Pat Lange
33	Kathy LeBeau
34	Suzann LeBeau
35	Katherine Lee
36	Dale Lettenberger
37	Joseph Lopez
38	Julie Luetzelschwab
39	Manuel R. Lujan
40	C. Dave Mc Quarie
41	Sgt. Joe McLaughlyn
42	Claire Meador
43	Diana Monroe
44	Ben Montaño
45	Harold Ortega

46	Edward Ortiz
47	Martha Pineda
48	Howard Pritchard
49	Leroy Quintana
50	Sandra Quintana
51	Steve Rivera
52	Dorothy Romero
53	Gilbert Romero
54	George Sanchez
55	Mela Sanchez
56	Sherry Sanchez
57	Malcolm Schnitker
58	Trevor Smith
59	Faith Spencer
60	Liz Stephanics
61	Gene Tomlinson
62	Diane Toomey
63	Harold Trujillo
64	Zelda Trujillo
65	Marilyn Tubos
66	Carmen Vigil
67	Marilyn Warrington
68	Skip Whitson
69	Kitty Wolfe
70	Stakeholder

Project team representative at the meeting included the following individuals:

- Dan Andersen, CH2M HILL
- Rochelle Byars, NMDOT
- Greg Heitmann, FHWA
- Bill Hutchinson, NMDOT
- Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates
- Ross Lujan, CH2M HILL
- David J. Martinez, NMDOT
- John Nitzel, CH2M HILL
- David Quintana, NMDOT
- John Romero, City of Santa Fe
- Jessica Sebring, Marron and Associates
- Mark Tibbetts, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Keith Wilson, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Eric Wrage, Bohannon-Huston, Inc.

### **Presentation**

David Quintana introduced the project and project team. Dan Andersen described the corridor planning process, and Ross Lujan followed with a discussion of the alternatives under consideration.

### **Clarification Questions**

The objective of this session was to answer any questions related to clarification of the alternatives and concepts presented.

The concept 2 roundabouts – are they above the freeway?

- A. The roundabouts are at grade, however I-25 and the Rail Runner structures would continue as now to pass over Richards and the at-grade roundabouts (intersections)..

Would you go directly into roundabout?

- A. Yes, you would go directly into roundabout at Richards.

On Camino Carlos Rey – I don't understand where it is going to end up.

- A. Camino Carlos Rey comes to Governor Miles. This would extend Camino Carlos Rey and connect with Rabbit Road.

On Camino Carlos Rey – is it east or west of the new subdivision?

- A. The new subdivision is south of Governor Miles to the east Camino Carlos Rey if it were extended. The extension of Camino Carlos Rey would go between new and existing subdivision.

You said it is to improve the traffic for people on south. I don't think that many people would go across Camino Carlos Rey.

What do you mean by planned roads?

- A. The Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has a master transportation plan (MTP). The City of Santa Fe has a master plan that shows Governor Miles. The County Master Plan has roads south of I-25. These are currently planned roads, but plans don't always get executed.

I don't know where Governor Miles Road ends on east side on the map. What street is that?

- A. It is a dead end to east of new development. It ends right now to the west of the proposed road. However, there are two plans which should be considered that address an extension of Governor Miles.
- Santa Fe MPO MTP [approved 2005] (see above). This plan shows Governor Miles to Galisteo and shows Yucca connecting to this planned road.
  - Future Land Use Plan City of Santa Fe [approved 1999]. This shows Governor Miles extended to the first street in Rodeo Business Park which connects to Rodeo Rd at Sawmill. This is consistent with what is proposed in this study. This extension also shows planned connections to Yucca and Galisteo.

Have you studied the distance between Pueblos del Sol and Villa Toscana developments?

- A. In the next phase we will look at it.

It is about 2 1/2 of these buildings (pointing to map) so it would go through the buildings.

- A. I do not believe any buildings need to be taken as there is sufficient width in the right-of-way for a 2-lane road.

Please point out Las Soleras. Do you have news on the state supercomplex?

- A. We do not have information on that. The Las Soleras development is in that area (pointing to map).

What do you have planned right there on Dinosaur Trail and using Beckner to cross into Las Soleras?

- A. We have an overpass over I-25 to connect Beckner, north of I-25, to a new section of frontage road south of I-25.

Would the bridge be part of Rail Runner station for Las Soleras?

- A. These concepts were developed to address system connectivity, and were initiated before rail runner stations were studied.

With Richards Avenue, are you proposing a train station in the middle of it?

- A. No. There is a location adopted by the Transportation Policy Board. The study team will generically look at a station location between Richards and Cerrillos.

You are going to move the freeway closer to Rail Runner on both sides at Richards?

- A. This is just one concept that would work, that would minimize, or eliminate, the need for additional right-of-way. It would move the lanes closer.

Where is Las Soleras on the Richards concept?

- A. Here (pointing to map to area bounded to south by I-25, to east by Richards, to west by Cerrillos Road area, and north by existing housing).

On overpasses, has the state done a study on traffic flow impacts on the neighborhoods north of I-25?

- A. We will do that analysis in the next 2 months.

We only have 2 lane streets. There are already impacts south of Rodeo. The state needs to address all these neighborhoods.

- A. We will do that.

Why use roundabouts rather than stop signs or signals?

- A. We will study that in the next phase. Roundabouts are considered because they allow continuous movement of traffic from the freeway to the intersecting cross street, and because they would be consistent with other roundabouts on Richards, helping traffic operations all along Richards.

Governor Miles over to Rodeo Park. Will that be an overpass over the Rail Runner?

A. Yes

There will be no Yucca crossing?

A. There will not be a Yucca crossing.

Yucca is dead?

A. If new evidence comes forth suggesting the feasibility of an extension of Yucca, we would consider it, but at this point we don't believe it is a viable option.

What is the status of the state supercomplex? The New Mexican reported that there is tentative contract between state and Las Soleras. They are negotiating about 4.5 acres on Galisteo.

A. We do not know the status of the state supercomplex.

You are proposing to reduce the speed limit to 65 mph. Where will that happen?

A. From the Bypass to Old Pecos Trail.

What studies have been done for animal crossings under road?

A. That will be studied in more detail in next few months.

### **Public Comment Session**

I have a letter from my neighbor. Myself and my neighbors are against extending Governor Miles eastbound. I don't see any purpose. You are creating a short cut for people to fly through the neighborhoods. It doesn't serve much purpose. I am totally against extension of Governor Miles. No. No. No to any extension east of Governor Miles Road.

On Concept 2 – Richards Avenue – these ramps have been needed forever. It will increase traffic on an inadequate road. Richards Avenue will need to be widened to a 4 lane road and extended to Cerrillos. On traffic circles, please consider something else. Traffic lights would be a good idea.

This is a statement from Camino Carlos Rey del Sur Homeowner Association. We wish to go on record as against extension of Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey. Things are very bad in our neighborhoods. We cannot take anymore noise, pollution. The roads will carry traffic day and night. I-25 and Rail Runner live in our backyard. Any increase in traffic will make our neighborhoods unlivable. One or two of the roads are 15 feet from the pavement. The community of native Santa Feans could be condemned. We would request that the traffic study be confined to another place south of I-25. These developments contain thousands of people. These arteries will run in our backyards. It will be like an airport. On September 28, 2005, this homeowner association stood before the Santa Fe City Council. Councilor Ortiz directed staff to condemn right-of-way and foreclose connectivity of Governor Miles going eastbound. Our homeowner association was given assurance that nothing was going to happen. Please consider us in your planning as people.

I am completely in support of interchange at Richards Avenue. I support a roundabout at Richards Avenue. Hire professionals to design roundabouts. I support a rail station at Richards Avenue and another roundabout could be used. The community college needs to be served. I support extending Richards to Cerrillos. I am a little concerned moving the freeway in towards the interchange. It is important that people think about roads – the more roads you have the more traffic they can carry. It is important having two 2-lane roads rather than one 4-lane roads. A greater number of smaller roads will carry more traffic with less impact to neighborhoods. Oshara will put any other comments in writing. We have requested a stop for the Rail Runner at Richards Avenue.

A. Our study does not cover the location of a Rail Runner station.

Extension of Devon Street to Governor Miles – this will have a decrease in property values. When your back or front yard is on a busy street, people don't want to buy those houses. That is not a good thing in this real estate market. There is no buffer on Yucca Street for many of the houses that are there. We have had 2 deaths on Yucca St. Extending Yucca would be a free-for-all. I support Richards Avenue. Routing this traffic on 2 lane quiet streets creates more congestion. The park on Yucca serves many residents – one of the last open spaces there. We don't want to see the park demolished. What happened to early neighborhood notification? The city council does not need neighborhood associations. The south side has train tracks; we have that noise. The south side has already suffered these ideas that do not address the quality of life and people that live there.

A. The Yucca Street extension is not on the table anymore. That portion of the map was screened out.

You said the Yucca extension was screened out. You're saying extension of Yucca over interstate is screened out, but the paved extension is still on plans.

A. That is not part of our study.

I definitely support access to I-25 at Richards Avenue, and it would be really wonderful if it could go to Cerrillos. The traffic is unbelievable on Rodeo Road. Access at Richards would relieve an incredible amount of traffic.

I live in a 35 year old subdivision. The extension of exits at Richards – Richards is already inadequate. The road will need to be widened. Safe bicycle paths should be added. The traffic circles (existing) are very difficult for bicycles. Has there been consideration of other frontage roads closer to I-25 in areas that are not already developed? Please consider.

I think the Governor Miles extension is not practical and doesn't take into consideration the neighborhoods that surround that area.

I live on Camino Carlos Rey. The houses are about 40 years old. I have many concerns. We already have a lot of traffic. I take a bus to work. I can tell the pollution from the cars zooming by. There are accidents out there. These improvements in residential area would affect quality of life.

Extension of Governor Miles – the property could be condemned. People in our neighborhood are in agreement that we don't want the extension. We like the idea of Richards Avenue being extended and widened. Roundabouts make sense. This extension of Rabbit Road continue on south side of interstate makes sense. It is an existing road that would connect to St. Francis. Delete the extension of Governor Miles. Extend Rabbit Road on south side of interstate.



I own 27 acres off of Governor Miles extension. I don't want Governor Miles extended through our property.

I live in a subdivision on the east side of Rodeo Road. We lost a lot of piñon trees between I-25 and Rodeo Road. It has become noisy. A 65 mph speed limit on I-25 would help. The Rodeo Road speed limit needs to be lowered. Have you considered a noise wall?

- A. Noise walls will be considered. Once a concept is in place, once we get to design details then we consider noise walls.

We are opposed to extending Richards north to Cerrillos. This would bisect our neighborhood. This is not part of this study. There are a lot of original owners who still live in the neighborhood. Traffic is a problem on Camino Carlos Rey, Governor Miles. Connecting Cerrillos to Richards is not part of the scope of this study.

- A. That is correct.

I have 2.5 acres at proposed Governor Miles extension on east side. Most of traffic is coming from new subdivisions on west side of Richards. The developers should take care of this problem. You are taking care of traffic of people who don't live in neighborhoods. There are approximately 2000 vehicles of traffic west of Richards. I agree with on and off ramps at Richards and widening Richards. The developers need to be involved in this.

I want to reiterate everything that has been said on the extension of Governor Miles. That will not work. The police are out there all the time slowing people down. I have seen homeowners east of Governor Miles get encroached by traffic. Take in consideration of wildlife, bike paths. Don't discount us as numbers rather than people. I would agree on extending Richards Avenue and involving developers. I would like to know that we are being taken seriously. I was assured that there would be no development east of Governor Miles. I would like more advanced notice of public meetings.

I live on the corner of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles. Are you out of your mind? Now we are going to have stop lights and more traffic. I don't want Governor Miles or Camino Carlos Rey extended.

I am certainly against extension of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles. I didn't hear anything from presenters on pollution, speed.

I was in this room a couple of years ago when they were talking about Rail Runner. We were assured that we would not hear noise above 70 decibels. We need noise abatement walls. How high would the bridge have to be at Camino Carlos Rey over interstate?

- A. We will prepare a visualization to help illustrate that.

I know the bridge will have to be at least 20 feet over train tracks; so it will be 60 feet high in elevation – one ugly bridge. The road system was not designed to handle the level of traffic you have talked about.

I live off of Rabbit Road. If Camino Carlos Rey is extended, some kind of study should be made on how to improve Rabbit Road. It is an old road with no shoulders.

I am opposed to an interchange at Richards Avenue. We have three churches, the community college, and this facility here (community center).

What happened to other side for extending Governor Miles to Galisteo? Who is responsible for that?

A. I am not sure.

I just moved in. Part of the draw in the neighborhood is it is so calm. To see high traffic where my family lives is not good.

Go to Governor Miles and see how close those homes are to the road. One house is right on the road.

You are faced with an unusual situation with many people who are frustrated and angry. Talk to people on these communities. People want to be included in the planning. None of us have been involved in the public input. We want to be considered as citizens of the city.

A. The alternatives are not being judged on just four problem areas. We are doing a quantitative analysis of many factors, including the community and environmental impacts. This study is not just about vehicular mobility. We are also trying to provide safer access and mobility for bikes and pedestrians. The input received tonight is critical and influences the criteria.

When is the next meeting?

A. After we have done the data collection. We don't have a date yet.

May the presidents of the associations receive copies of the notes?

A. The entire report is on the NMDOT web site: <http://nmshtd.state.nm.us/main.asp?secid=15443>.

We are also interested in these comments.

A. We will post the comments on the web site: <http://nmshtd.state.nm.us/main.asp?secid=15443>.

The next MPO Transportation Policy Board meeting is Thursday, October 8, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. That might be a place to bring your concerns and be in front of a variety of city councilors and county commissioners.

## Written Comments

**Comment 1:** Gene Tomlinson, President, Las Estancias Neighborhood Association

We have been here before, gentlemen. The subdivisions that are established and hoping that no more traffic will be diverted into their streets have spoken. I hope this time you are listening (this is input to your May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting).

Traffic planning by outside firms is a necessary part of planning, but they do not take into consideration the real world that exists, nor the impact that such traffic planning will have on the present residents of the City. They may well give NMDOT some good planning information, but it will lack the intimate knowledge from those of us who live here.

It is about time that Santa Fe – city, county, and NMDOT really develop a master plan. It is obvious that any earlier studies fell short of the impending and future growth to the overall area. As a result, subdivisions were and are being built that obstruct good traffic flow. The south side of the City of Santa Fe is full of examples of such poor planning.

As examples: Yucca goes from the College of Santa Fe to just south of Rodeo and cannot connect to St. Michaels. Camino Carlos Rey, now improved from Gov. Miles to Zia runs into a neighborhood just north of Zia (not able to directly connect to Cerrillos Rd.) and Gov. Miles seems to be headed eastward into more homes. Richards stops at the county fair grounds (though with a bridge it could go on to Cerrillos Rd. and further north, but would require displacement of some homes).

Cutting through established neighborhoods with added traffic is a safety hazards as well as an increase in traffic noise. It also invites an increase in crime and neighborhood vandalism.

Bridges over the I-25/Rail Runner from any of the north-south streets to get to Rabbit Rd. or beyond (south) is an expensive, eye-sore that takes away from the open look of the area while just pushing traffic where it was never envisioned, i.e. into established subdivisions, both north and south of the I-25 corridor. In short the bridge idea should be taken off the table.

So what would be a better more plausible solution to traffic flow from south of I-25 and the growing development in that area of the county and the established City of Santa Fe?

Also, how can we improve our busy corridors to handle the increased traffic that was never properly planned for in earlier studies and the now completed road projects?

**First:** A second ring road around greater Santa Fe is possible, if we are not too late in getting it in place. From Old Pecos Trail on the east to 599 Relief Route on the west and south of the I-25 corridor a major road can be provided to move the increased traffic that will develop in the county area from such developments as Rancho Viejo and others that are and will be planned. (I would refer you to Kansas City, KS planning and ring road development.)

Old Pecos Trail, St. Francis, Richards, Cerrillos Rd., and 599/14 can all connect to this major southern (east-west) portion of an outer ring road. The east side of the ring road is Old Pecos Trail. The west side is 599. The east side would feed into town and have to go into Paseo de Peralta on the east and north to St. Francis, but it does now. People living or traveling to the south of the interstate would have five north-south roads to choose from plus the outer ring road, i.e. 5 established roads in less than 15 miles which should be most adequate for new development. See attached purple lines on the NMDOT map.

This would use the present north-south roads as connectors to the southern outer ring road and provide for increased traffic from the southern county development without disturbing established south side Santa Fe neighborhoods.

**Second:** All the north-south corridors need to be improved to handle traffic in a safe and efficient manner. Old Pecos Trail may have to be widened south of I-25, and at the least good right turn lanes completed so as not to impede traffic flow, north of south.

St. Francis (with better traffic light control) needs right turn lanes at some intersections to improve traffic flow. The overpass at St. Michaels needs to be widened another lane on the north bound side to allow for safe entrance for merging traffic. The southbound entrance from St. Michaels needs to have an improved entrance lane. This may require the purchase of property along the right of way. St. Francis up to Cordova

Rd. is fairly clear of obstructions and driveways that impede traffic flow, but north of Cordova Rd. up to Agua Fria, the road is too narrow and the traffic flow is impeded by the cross streets of the old city neighborhoods and businesses. This is an area that perhaps only time can improve with proper city planning and future re-development. The result is that northbound traffic will have congestion, as it does now, from Cordova to just north of Paseo de Peralta. Note: Through truck traffic, like the hay haulers, should be required to use the 599 Relief Route.

Cerrillos Rd. is a disaster and a black eye to the City of Santa Fe. Tourists and New Mexico residents entering Santa Fe by Cerrillos Rd. and even we who live here realize that this is a Mexican Border town street that though improved in recent years, does not do the City Different any favors. Future planning and careful redevelopment may improve it, but a traffic study will not solve the eye sore problem or the narrowing corridor north of St. Michaels.

The 599 Bypass is, at present, a clean acceptable way around Santa Fe, or for many, a better way into the city from the north than trying to enter from any of the over crowded southern corridors, particularly during morning and evening rush hours.

So, lets get going on an out ring road that does not impact older subdivisions, improve our existing north-south corridors including an I-25 interchange at Richards and a widening of Richards to support the major flow of traffic from an interchange with the interstate – both south of the interchange and north to at least Cerrillos (bridge the arroyo and go north). The interchange has been talked to death – build it and improve the traffic flow now.

**Third:** Gerard Martinez will remember that the Las Estancia Neighborhood Association requested that the NMDOT consider improving the noise and light abatement from the I-25 corridor after the Rail Runner was completed. The area at the end of Galisteo (atop of and north of the railroad) needs a wall (not the present wire fence) to reduce the light and noise pollution from the interstate into our subdivision. This wall should be part of the beautification of all southern corridor entrances into Santa Fe. Other south side subdivisions also will need to be included in this beautification and light/noise abatement project.

Old Pecos Trail is reasonably open and a nice entrance into our City Different. So is the 599 Relief Route. Cerrillos Rd. is not congested up to Rodeo/Airport Rd. and with some beautification can be acceptable. St. Francis needs the most work to reduce the noise/light pollution from the I-25 Corridor and much needs to be done to make St. Francis a beautiful entrance into the City Different. The Richard's interchange can be developed with beautification included.

**This is the State Capital, Gentlemen.** The 84/285 (Taos Highway) to the north of Santa Fe is much improved and a fine example of what we now need to do to the southern entrances to our city. A study is needed and then construction of noise and light abatement walls, etc. that also welcome visitors and residents to this City Different. We have talked to NMDOT about this in the past. **Let's get it done.**

I, for one, see the overall traffic pattern of Greater Santa Fe as a large wigwam or teepee. The bottom is the outer (southern part) or a new ring road. The poles of the wigwam are the north-south arteries that already existing. Paseo de Peralta is a circle at the top of the wigwam around its opening and encompasses the downtown of the City Difference. The cross roads like Cordova, St. Michaels, and Rodeo Rd. and Gov. Miles are patterns of art that decorate the wigwam. That is how I see our City Different.

If further expansion into the County is contemplated, and it's obvious that it is, then that is outside of the City Different has to be considered as separate communities in the County that should be self sufficient

and not dependent on the City of Santa. **Future growth in the county will happen and must be looked at as separated from the City not an extension of it.** So a traffic plan should look at how these new development can interface with I-25 and with the established north-south arteries, but not included in the future City of Santa Fe traffic plan (for daily use of these arteries for workers in and out of the city). Light rail to support the Rail Runner and bus service can be developed from these new developments to relieve traffic and the limited parking in our City Different. (Reference to Portland, OR light rail system) We must remember that Tourism is our second most important business; let us not discourage it by limiting access to the City or ample parking to our guests. We need to be aware of where our tax dollars come from and not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

We do not need more direct entrances to Santa Fe that disturb the established neighborhoods and flood our residential streets with through traffic. We **do** need to improve our existing corridors and clean up and beautify our entrances into the City Different from the I-25 Interstate. We need to provide a wide and easily accessible outer ring road south of the I-25 interstate (in the County of Santa Fe, and we need to do these projects now.

**Comment 2:** Tom Chilton, District Chief, Hondo Fire Department

An interchange at I-25 and Richards Road would reduce our response time for incidents on I-25 northbound between Cerrillos Road and St. Francis. At present we need to go southbound from our station on Seton Village Road to Cerrillos then exit and return to the northbound lane.

**Comment 3:** Marilyn Northington

If you widen Yucca to accept traffic from and to Gov. Miles and have traffic from Gov. Miles to Galisteo you will create a ghetto of Las Estancias with major traffic on all 4 sides.

**Comment 4:** Karen Akerfelds

As a business owner and homeowner on the south side of S.F., my home backs up to Yucca at the dirt road. I am against the extension of Gov. Miles up any further than were it is today, 8/20/09. I also am against the paving of Yucca behind my home. 5 yrs. ago a drunk driver took out my back fence. I can't imagine how bad it will be if it becomes a thru street. My house, shakes, rattles, and the existing noise is already too much. Put a frontage road up toe Rabbit Rd. side with and exit at Richards. There is note space on that side of I-25.

**Comment 5:** Katherine Lee

- Oppose extending Carlos Rey and Gov. Miles **STRONGLY**
- Favor exit 25 onto Richards
- Favor construction of sound abatement along I-25
- Don't forget to consider ADA requirements

**Comment 6:** Robert Grimm

No extensions Gov. Miles, Cam. Carlos Rey

Noise control structures along the interstate

Narrow Cam. Carlos Rey with a median to help safety and traffic control

**Comment 7:** Louise Montoya

I reside at \_\_\_\_\_. I am writing to advise you that I am totally against any extension of eastbound Governor Miles Road.

I think the extension would only encourage more traffic – and more noise to the area. I also think my neighborhood security would be at risk.

NO! NO! NO! To any extension of Governor Miles Rd. eastbound. The road should end where it is now.

**Comment 8:** Julie Luetzelschwab

1. You are not adequately notifying neighbors/residents. I attended the April meeting and signed up as a stakeholder. I e-mailed Eric at least twice since then. I have never received an e-mail from Eric confirming he received my comments, and I did not receive an e-mail notifying me of this 8-20-09 meeting. Furthermore you cannot only notify neighborhood association leaders. They cannot be relied upon to notify a neighborhood. You must use tax records and mail notifications. Your study is flawed because you failed to notify affected parties.
2. I am against the Gov. Miles to Galisteo to Rodeo Park extension. This will add traffic and noise to my neighborhood, greatly changing the character of my neighborhood. If Gov. miles ends at Galisteo, it will dump traffic to the Galisteo x Rodeo and Galisteo x Zia intersections, which are already over-taxed intersections.
3. I am concerned about displacement of wildlife with new development. For any acres you develop, you must give/set aside equal acres of open space in our neighborhood.
  - Also – extending Gov. Miles east will add more traffic to existing Gov. Miles and there are driveways currently on Gov. Miles. Adding traffic is very dangerous.
  - Also – the Rail Runner noise is much louder than NMDOT said ... it is much louder than a semi-truck. Adding more arterial frontage roads will worsen the noise. Sound barriers should not be dismissed as they were so easily tossed out of consideration in the Rail Runner studies.
  - Also get the fact straight from other gov't. agencies. If the city tabled Gov. Miles ext., it should not be on your plans. And update yours maps – take off Yucca Extension. Half the comments were against the Gov. Miles ext. If its already off the table, focus only on what's on the table.

**Comment 9:** Walter MacGillivray

Do not extend Governor Miles Rd. east – it will endanger the neighborhoods!

**Comment 10:** Kitty T. Wolfe

Want to see Richards out through to Cerrillos Road.

**Comment 11:** JoAnne Vigil Coppler

With regard to Yucca St. extension to Gov. Miles:

I live on corner of Yucca and Vista Caballero. I am a realtor and have concerns for increased traffic on Yucca decreasing property values. Backyards are right there. There is no buffer for noise.

There are other outlets for traffic – I-25 ramp on Richards Ave. Also, Rabbit Rd. connects now.

Routing all this traffic onto 2 lane roads create more congestion. The intersection of Yucca and Rodeo has had at least 2 deaths and countless accidents. We don't need more. The passive park behind Via Cab 3 and Las Estancias is heavily used and creates quality of life to our neighborhood.

This is the first time we heard of this meeting. No notice to the neighborhood has occurred.

We have already suffered the train tracks going through, and this adds to our devalued property. The south side always seems to bear the brunt of the city's bad ideas.

**Comment 12:** Astrid Garner, President, Camino Carlos Rey del Sur

*Camino Carlos Rey Home Owners Association, City Council Meeting of August 2009, Note to City Council Members and File*

My name is Astrid Gardner, and I am the President of the Camino Carlos Rey del Sur Home Owners Association. We are a group of 68 homes on the east corner of Carlos Rey and Governor Miles, Villa Tosacana is the forth phase of this development. On behalf of the members of this Association I wish to go on record that we strongly oppose the extension of Govern Miles to Rodeo Park and the extension of Camino Carlos Rey over I25 to Rabbit Road, by overpass.

I think that there is no one here that does not know the traffic problems we already have going through our neighborhoods. Did the out-of-state company, at \$373,000, spend any physical time on the south side?

Can they explain how will we enter and exit our neighborhoods with such planning? These roads will carry major traffic, day and night, creating noise, inaccessibility and air pollution. With no trees to cut noise on the greenbelt I-25 and the rail runner are already in our backyard, the noise is amazing. Any increase in traffic will make our neighborhoods unlivable. There is no question about this. This plan will make our neighborhoods unlivable. Please also note that the homes on Governor Miles are right on the road, there are no large stretches of land separating the house from the pavement. In some cases it is a mere 10 feet to the sidewalk. I don't think this company ever set foot in these neighborhoods.

Areas to be affected are the densely populated Park Plazas, Camino Carlos Rey del Sur, Villa Caballero, Pueblos del Sol, and Villa Tosana. I would also like to mention a group that has no homeowner's association representation, the community of native Santa Feans south of Villa Caballero. These people not only face the traffic, air and noise pollution nightmare that our developments face. These people have their properties condemned. We cannot sit back and let this happen. This is discussed verbatim in the City Council Minutes of Sep 25, 2005.

We would request that traffic improvement study be confined to south of I-25. Rabbit Road will serve perfectly well to meet the needs of the I-25 corridor traffic management. Rabbit Road is not at all densely populated, and a road is already there.

On September 28, 2005 our homeowners association stood in front of you with respect to this same matter – the extension of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles. In the Santa Fe City Council Minutes of that date it is stated, I quote “Mr. Gonzales asked if abandonment of the right of way is included in the motion, and Councilor Ortiz responded that those conditions are not appropriate to this development, **but he PLANS TO DIRECT STAFF UNDER COMMUNICAIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY TONIGHT TO TAKE STEPS TO MOVE FORWARD AND CONDEMN THE ROW (that is Carlos Rey) AND ALOS FORECLOSE THE POSSIBILITY OF THE INTERCONNECTIVITY OF GOVERNOR MILES GOING EASTBOUND.”**

We had understood that this is what is going to happen. We heard nothing to the contrary at any time until this meeting. We ask the City to stand by their word and protected this densely populated area of Camino Carlos Rey del Sur, Pueblos del Sol, Park Plazas, Villa Caballero, and Villa Toscana.

Thank you for allowing me to speak. I would respectfully request that my objection goes on record, and the Camino Carlos Rey del Sur homeowners association be provided with minutes of this meeting.

**Comment 13:** Mateo and Zelda Trujillo

We are not in favor of the expansion of Gov. Miles to Galisteo.

**Comment 14:** Steve Coca (S.W. Bellamah Neighborhood Assoc.)

The Southwest Bellamah Neighborhood Association is opposed to extending Richards Rd. north to Cerrillos Rd. An extension of Richards north is not part off the scope of the I-25 Corridor Study, therefore, this cannot be studied or expressed as an idea or alternative.

**Comment 15:** Jane Cordova

My name is Jana Cordova. I live on Louraine Street, which is off of Richards Ave. behind Baillos. I hope the exchange or ramp you are hoping to build isn't used as a back door to extend Richards Ave. to Cerrillos Rd. We already get a lot of traffic from off of Siringo Rd. and people who use neighborhood streets as side streets to get to Rodeo. We always have to be cautious even when we walk on the sidewalks because of all the traffic in our neighborhood. Hold the developers responsible! Before people try the houses. Its someone's life we're talking about, not just more and more expansion.

**Comment 16:** Thomas Romero

Re figure 7-3, Concept 2 – Richards Interchange.

The proposed concept brings the main travel corridor closer to the rail line, effectively precluding any consideration of a transit stop at Richards. There is still a study to be done to determine the optimum locations (Las Soleras or Richards), and this is also linked to the conditions imposed by the MPO on the transit site selection – especially re the gov't supercomplex.

Final design should not presume location till this is settled. Also, giving up median limits future development.



**Comment 17:** Diane Toomey

It doesn't make sense to extend Gov. Miles between Cerrillos Rd. and Camino Carlos Rey. There are 9 "speed humps" and 2 roundabouts. It is almost all residential almost all is setup as cul-de-sac. So, these neighborhoods would be severely impacted with the obvious increase in "through" traffic. And, at the 4-way stop at Camino Carlos Rey and Plaza Verde, people run that stop sign really often – I think we would see a noticeable increase in problems there.

If the Richards Ln. exit is pursued, the only way that would be efficient, is if Richards goes all the way to Cerrillos Rd – affecting that neighborhood! But most of these areas are residential – some churches, some schools – Sounds like a true waste of money!

**Comment 18:** Jody DeCoursin-Good

I attended the recent meeting on the Interstate 25 Corridor Study. Please accept my comments regarding this project as follows:

The Richards Avenue option is by far the best solution over the extension of Camino Carlos Rey and/or Governor Miles Road. As a homeowner in the new development of Villas Toscanas, we are currently exposed to high traffic noise from the highway and now Rail Runner noise throughout day and night. Any extension of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Mile would simply impact our and surrounding neighborhoods with even more traffic and noise. Prior to purchasing a home in Villas Toscanas, we were told that the Rail Runner was going to be on the other side of the freeway. It obviously wasn't and as time passes, it seems that the Rail Runner noise is becoming louder, probably due to the normal wear-and-tear of the train's mechanism. My request of a noise proof wall between the highway and Villas Toscanas and Pueblos del Sol Developments (as Albuquerque has done successfully) would help tremendously.

Having the Richards Avenue connection to I-25 will alleviate traffic on Rodeo Road and Governor Miles for those accessing Santa Fe Community College. Currently, traffic is at a stop-and-go pace between 5:30 am and 6:30 pm from Old Pecos Trail to Rodeo Road and Richards Ave. for people traveling to SFCC (right in the middle of residential areas). People driving from all areas of Santa Fe could easily get n I-25 directly to the Richards Ave. exit.

The high noise pollution of this immediate residential area is negatively impacting our property values now, and will further affect it if any extension is approved for the Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey streets.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

**Comment 19:** Carolyn Dechaine

Thank you for considering lowering the speed limit between Santa Fe and Albuquerque. I have long felt the 75 mph is far too fast for a highway connecting two urban centers, especially since drivers on that stretch of I-25 actually drive between 80 and 90 mph, with the occasional driver topping 100 mph. It feels like a dangerous highway at those speeds, given the density of vehicles on the road and the frequency of exits and onramps. 65 mph would be a much more appropriate sped limit, although I would be happy with a 60 mph limit between Santa Fe and Albuquerque! Lowering the speed limit is also environmentally responsible course of action, given that it will reduce gas consumption and emissions.

For safety reasons, concrete dividers between the northbound and southbound lanes should also be added to prevent vehicles from entering oncoming traffic by crossing the median.

Any design elements that would deter drivers from entering the highway going the wrong direction at onramps must also be seriously thought through and incorporated since drunk drivers seem to enter going the wrong way with terrible regularity.

Thank you again for our work. I sincerely hope to see the speed limit reduced by at least 10 mph in the near future.

**Comment 20:** Sasha

I attended the I-25 Corridor Meeting at the Genoveva Chavez Community Center yesterday. However, by the time that I arrived, they had already run out of the handouts with the proposed project diagrams and maps. Would it be possible for you to email me a PDF of the pamphlet from the meeting?

I did watch the powerpoint presentation and glance at some of the boards in the back of the room, and I have a few questions about certain elements of the proposal.

1) Could you clarify how roundabouts would be incorporated into a possible I-25 Interchange at Richards Avenue? Are there alternate embodiments of an I-25 Interchange that would not include the use of roundabouts? A vast majority of residents in the Community College District are not fans of the two existing roundabouts on Richards Avenue, and the prospect of increasing that number to four roundabouts in such a small distance seems extremely undesirable. Drivers are often unsure of who has the right-of-way with the existing roundabouts given that they are not used very frequently in this area. People have even driven straight through the roundabouts, as evidenced by the tire marks left in the middle. I would support an I-25 Interchange, but do not support adding additional roundabouts to Richards Avenue.

- A. The on- and off-ramps at a proposed interchange at Richards Avenue will require some sort of traffic control to move vehicles safely and efficiently between the ramps and Richards. Most of the other interchanges on I-25 use ramps that are free-flowing which permit traffic to merge without stopping, but these require additional right-of-way that does not exist at Richards. Other options to a free flow ramp are stop signs, traffic signals or roundabouts. Simply installing stop signs at the ramps will not work from a traffic and safety perspective. Roundabouts are free-flowing, similar to the other I-25 interchanges, but with a small footprint that will fit within the right-of-way. In earlier meetings, options of signals, and roundabouts were presented and there was some sentiment by the public and Project Team for selecting roundabouts. However, roundabouts can be confusing to drivers, as you note. The primary purpose of this study is to consider whether or not an interchange is supported and justified at Richards Avenue. If it is, the final configuration and traffic control of the interchange can be looked at in more detailed, and as appropriate, modified in subsequent environmental and design phases.

2) I understand that the placement of Rail Runner stations is outside of the scope of your I-25 Corridor Study. However, as a proponent of a Rail Runner station at I-25/Richards Avenue, and having heard in prior presentations that a Rail Runner station and interchange are not mutually exclusive, I do not support the narrowing of the I-25 lanes of traffic at Richards Avenue. It seems as though it is an unnecessary expense which would further preclude the possibility of a Rail Runner station at Richards Avenue. Are there possible interchange design proposals that would keep the width of the I-25 median at Richards Avenue intact?

- A. Yes, there are other configurations that would not require moving the I-25 mainline closer to the Rail Runner. We could recommend leaving the mainline alignment where it is, which would require additional right-of-way to accommodate the on- and off-ramps. Part of our analysis will include a comparison of costs associated with relocating the mainline I 25 alignment, versus acquiring additional right-of-way. If acquiring additional right-of-way would be less costly and not have any adverse community or environmental impacts, then it might be more desirable to leave the I-25 mainline where it is.

3) I noticed a road drawn on one of the boards at the back of the room, but it was not discussed during the presentation. I believe the road was once referred to as the NE Connector, and it is located along the far Eastern edge of the existing Windmill Ridge portion of Rancho Viejo. There is a dirt road currently in that location named Sunshine Mesa. From the map, it appears to go north to the Rabbit Road area East of Oshara Village, but it also continued south off of the mapped area. Could you elaborate on the short-term and long-term plans for that specific road? Additionally, on a few of the boards, the contour of the road appeared to veer to the East, creating a ">" shape. Is that the design concept of the proposed road extension? And what would happen to the triangle of land between Sunshine Mesa and the newly proposed road?

- A. The proposed road you refer to came from the Santa Fe Master Transportation Plan (MTP), and is not part of this study. From what we understand, the alignment of these proposed roads is not precise--they are just shown for planning purposes. We included them in our mapping to show how the improvement concepts presented in this study would integrate with other planned transportation improvements. Mark Tibbetts or Keith Wilson from the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization might be able to address your question in greater detail.

Please let me know if you would like further clarification of any of my questions.

Thank you in advance for the additional information,

**Comment 21:** Dorothy Romero, Board of Director, Camino Carlos Rey del Sur

I presently reside at Camino Carlos Rey del Sur. My husband and myself attended the meeting on August 20 concerning I-25 corridor improvements. I strongly oppose extending Governor Miles to Camino Carlos Rey and feel that this would have a negative impact to our semi-rural peaceful neighborhood.

Our master bedroom faces Camino Carlos Rey where there is currently an abundance of traffic. Presently our nights are interrupted by police lights and on occasion sirens where the police officers go after those cars that do not stop at the stop signs at the corner of Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey or are exceeding in speed. On many occasions, motor vehicles and motorcycles usually drive at higher speeds than allowed by speed limits. If these roads are extended there will be a considerable amount of traffic on these roads and a high volume of traffic in our neighborhood, not to mention the noise, air pollution and inaccessibility. How will we enter and exit our neighborhood? The roads in our residential area cannot take the large volume of traffic.

There are homes on Governor Miles that are very close to this road. This is another negative and dangerous impact to the road extensions. The safety of our families need to be taken into consideration.

The above proposal has already gone before the City Council on September 28, 2005. Councilor Ortiz was quoted as saying that the conditions are not appropriate at this development. He also stated that "he plans to direct staff under communications from the governing body tonight t take steps to move forward

to condemn the ROW (that is Carlos Rey) and foreclose the possibility of the interconnectivity of Governor Miles going eastbound.” Will the City not stand by their word?

I am requesting that my objection go on record. I am requesting that the Camino Carlos Red del Sur be provided with the minutes of this meeting and a follow up to this meeting.

**Comment 22:** Jonathan Cohen

Regarding: HONDO FIRE STATION EMERGENCY ENTRY – Emergency Vehicle Access improvements (located in District 5) – Please improve the old dirt drive from the HOND FIRE STATION to the NORTH BOUND LANE of I-25 with a locked gate, a graded ramp, and a “caution emergency vehicles entering,” possibly with blue flashing lights. This could save lives by dramatically improving response times to MVA’s between Old Pecos Trail exit and Eldorado exit and beyond. Minutes count, and current response time within Hondo district on I-25 is greatly slowed by having to go to the highway exit closest the MVA when I-25 is right in our backyard. This could be a low budget project with a lot of measureable results in the form of the improved fire, rescue, and ambulance response time along I-25. Thank you for the chance to comments.

**Comment 23:** Julie Luetzelschwab

I would like to state that I am support of reducing the speed limit on I-25 from Old Pecos Trail to 599 to 65 mph to reduce traffic noise. I am also in favor of adding a NO ENGINE (aka jake) BRAKE law on this same stretch of highway.

Because of the slope southbound trucks regularly apply the jake brake at all hours of the night starting around the St. Francis exit. Signs and enforcement would be helpful.

**Comment 24:** Julie Luetzelschwab

I attended the I-25 Corridor Study meeting on May 5th. There is apparently a need to plan for increased traffic flows between southwest (Community College/Rancho Viejo, Las Soleras) and northeast (Plaza, State Offices) Santa Fe. I support options that improve and funnel traffic to existing main roads and connections (St Francis, Cerrillos, Richards). I do not support building connections and then filtering cross-town traffic through existing neighborhoods (Yucca, Galisteo) and across already over taxed intersections and Rail Runner crossings.

I live in the Las Estancias neighborhood between the south ends of Yucca and Galisteo. I-25 is behind my house. I have major concerns about constructing a frontage road on the south side of I-25 between Yucca and Galisteo, and concerns about constructing a bridge across I-25 at Yucca. I don’t believe constructing a frontage road between Yucca and Galisteo is practical because of the topography and land ownership. I’m also concerned about the additional traffic and noise this would bring to my neighborhood.

In 2007 – 2008 my neighbors and I endured 5 months of sleep deprivation during the Rail Runner tunnel night construction. The landscape has changed dramatically because of that railroad tunnel and 20 - 30 ft deep channel. Because of that tunnel and channel cut it would make it very difficult or at least very expensive to construct bridges and platforms in order to expand I-25 southbound to 3 lanes, or build a frontage road paralleling I-25 between Yucca and Galisteo, or widen and pave Paseo de Enrique to pass as a frontage road. Currently Paseo de Enrique is a narrow dirt road between the channel cut and back yards of the Las Estancias neighborhood and also has two steep grades as it dips down and back up out of

an arroyo. There is also a major utility line in this corridor which would further impede attempts at constructing a major road through this narrow corridor.

Furthermore, if a frontage road were constructed from Richards to Galisteo this would bring a huge amount of additional traffic to the Rodeo-Galisteo intersection, which would then pass to the Zia – Galisteo intersection then to Zia –St Francis. These intersections are already over-taxed and problematic because of the Rail Runner and Rail Trail crossings plus the apparently imminent opening of the Zia Rail Runner Station/Housing/Office development. Funneling traffic in this manner would impact two Rail Runner crossings in one trip.

There is a Rail Runner crossing and a Rail Trail crossing at the Rodeo – Galisteo intersection. The City conducted a traffic study here a few years ago when a new housing development was planned in the area and at the time concluded this intersection could not handle a large increase in traffic and a traffic light was not feasible because of the railroad crossing and proximity to the Sawmill traffic light.

My next concern is if Yucca ends up being attached to an I-25 frontage road and/or Governor Miles but it's decided not to extend the frontage road to Galisteo that traffic will then short cut through the Las Estancias neighborhood from Yucca at La Silla Dorada or to Paseo de Enrique to get to Galisteo and Rodeo Road increasing cross town traffic through the Las Estancias neighborhood. I hope measures can be taken to deter short cutting through our neighborhood.

**Comment 25:** Barbara and David Hope

On August 20, 2009, we attended a meeting at the Chavez Center in Santa Fe. Our comments concern the proposed extension of Camino Carlos Rey. This extension would have an extremely adverse effect on several neighborhoods: Carlos Rey Del Sur, Toscana, Pueblos Del Sol, Park Plazas, and all Villa Caballero subdivisions. All who live in these neighborhoods enjoy exactly that – the fact that they are neighborhoods. There is already an overload of traffic on Camino Carlos Rey. Please do not turn it into a thruway/thoroughfare. Please let us know if this plan remains under consideration and if there is any other forum where we should be voicing our objections. Thank you.

**Comment 26:** M. Rudy Lujan

I do want to outline a few comments about the study, specifically Concept 2: New Interchange at Richards.

As I stated at the meeting traffic in this area is something that will not go away but only increase. I grew up in Santa Fe and I can remember that the New Mexico School for the Deaf was "way out of town." I know that this is area is one that everyone considers it an ideal access for traffic. The following points are reasons of concern to me at this time:

- At present Richards is a street that is over used. It two lane. The traffic is "heavy." I live off Richards on Calle Vera Cruz street and the early mornings when school begins and in the afternoons and evenings when school ends the traffic is so heavy that you have to wait until it subsides in order to go out.
- We have a 5 church's on Richards. There is a tremendous amount of traffic generated in and out from these churches especially on the weekends when services are conducted.
- We have 2 private schools and the Santa Fe Community College on Richards. At school times during the day the traffic is increased again in order to accommodate these places. There is also a Charter School off of Governor Miles Road that people use Richards to get to that facility.

- There are some businesses on Richards and on the streets off of Richards that use it for their business. There are numerous times during the week that delivery trucks to these places need to navigate around the neighboring streets in order to get out due to their size.
- We have the residents that live on the Nava Ade, Rancho Viejo, and the Oshara subdivisions that need to use this street for their destinations.
- There is a connection to NM Highway 14 that is used on Dina sour Trail Road off of Richards and also a connecting road to Rabbit Road that people use off of Richards/

These are some of the items I am make me oppose the use of Richards as traffic stream connectivity at this time. Until attention to these items of concern that I have outlined are not addressed Richards is not a viable area for an interchange. However if they are addressed and corrected perhaps we can again consider this concept.

Thank you for letting me voice my concerns and please add my email address to the list of individuals receiving information on this study and future meetings.

**Comment 27:** Joan Morse, [journies@comcast.net](mailto:journies@comcast.net)

I am writing in reference to a public information meeting held on August 20, 2009 at the Chavez Community Center, regarding recommendations by NMDOT on the Phase A report findings for the I-25 Corridor Study. I and my neighbors live off Old Las Vegas Highway, three miles south of Old Pecos Trail. It is our understanding that NMDOT is considering lowering the speed limit from NM 599 to NM 466 (Old Pecos Trail) from 75 mph to 65 mph. We would like NMDOT to consider extending the lowered speed limit to 285/El Dorado exit. If the speed limit remains at 75 mph, we feel noise levels, which have become troubling as it is, would increase along this short stretch, as people accelerate to the 75 mph limit - - -or greater.

Also, have you considered rubberizing this stretch of the road? They did this in the Phoenix/Scottsdale area, and I believe it lowered the road noise considerably.

**Comment 28:** Jonathan Cohen

Regarding: HONDO FIRE STATION EMERGENCY ENTRY – Emergency Vehicle Access Improvement (located in District 5) – Please improve the old dirt drive from the HONDO FIRE STATION to the NORTH BOUND LANE of I-25. With a locked gate, a graded ramp and a “caution emergency vehicles entering”, possibly with blue flashing lights. This could save lives, by dramatically improving response times to MVA’s between Old Pecos Trail exit and Eldorado exit & beyond. Minutes count, and current response time within Hondo district on I-25 is greatly slowed by having to go to the hwy. exit closest to the MVA when I-25 is right in our backyard. This could be a low budget project with a lot of measurable results in the form of improved FIRE, rescue, and ambulance response time along I-25. Thank you for the change to comment.

**Comment 29:** Jon Messier c/o Claude Morelli, NMDOT Planning Division, Government to Government Unit

I wanted to relay to you a question/comment from someone I spoke with recently while riding the Rail Runner. His name is Jon Messier, and he is a retired planner for the City of Albuquerque. He asked me if I knew whether anything being proposed in the I-25 Corridor Study would prevent the addition of a second main track along the Rail Runner alignment (including at stations along the line). The context for his question was a discussion we were having about the potential to add Rail Runner service to the

corridor in the future. He expressed concern that changes along I-25 might not easily allow the expansion of rail capacity in the future. His preference would be for any changes to I-25 to occur in such a way that a second track could still be added without incurring a large additional cost (i.e., a cost beyond the level that would otherwise be incurred in the absence of changes to I-25).

I told him that I would pass his question and comment along to you for incorporation and consideration in the I-25 study.

**Comment 30:** Alisanne Toomey

If you are contemplating the feasibility of a corridor connecting the Santa Fe Community College campus, the Institute of American Indian Art and the communities south of the Interstate 25 Corridor at Santa Fe, the only feasible choice would be the opening of Richards Avenue from Rodeo Road to Cerrillos Road. Not only would this be a shorter route than Camino Carlos Rey, but it would make much more sense considering the BOTTLE NECK that already exists on Camino Carlos Rey where Rodeo Road and Zia Road are cross...Camino Carlos Rey has a traffic light at the Rodeo Road Shops and parking on the west. At present it is often necessary to stand through two lights at the Zia crossing; additional cross traffic would certainly cause additional problems. Zia and Rodeo are busy streets. Single family homes from Zia to Siringo would certainly be adversely impacted and feeder streets in that area would be cut off. The I-25 corridor should be Richards Avenue. Thank you for your interest.

**Comment 31:** Jeannie Hardie

I was appalled to read that consideration is being given to an interchange from I-25 onto Camino Carlos Rey in Santa Fe. This street is bordered in its entirety until Cerrillos Road by residential neighborhoods. All that would be accomplished is that more traffic will end up on Rodeo Road and with the station at Zia and St. Francis Drive, Genoveva Chavez Recreation Center and the ever-growing Zarafano shopping area cause Rodeo to be further burdened. This street is barely able to handle its current traffic load. The small shopping center at Zia, Carlos Rey and Rodeo has not enough parking for current business, and Interstate exiting traffic will just add to the load and jam up the traffic.

There is no thought to the traffic patterns on the south side of Santa Fe. It is just build, build, build with no planning or forethought to the destruction of residential neighborhoods and the density of the traffic of the results.

What are you thinking?

North of Zia, Carlos Rey narrows, and is bordered by houses with lawns that come down to the street on either side. In addition, there are two parks where children play – how dangerous will this be?

The obvious choice is to put the interchange at Richard's Avenue and complete Richards through to Cerrillos Road. We are talking about 500 yards. Richards crosses Cerrillos and continues all the way to Agua Fria. In addition this interchange Rancho Viejo and the expanding Community College and for the most part Richards does not traverse a residential neighborhood except for a few hundred feet.

I will be making my state, city and the Governor's office aware of my thoughts and those of my neighbors.

**Comment 32:** Jane Steinberg

I concur with our board President, Richard White.

Camino Carlos Rey is a poor choice:

- No opportunity to increase lanes as traffic increases
- No commercial property from I-25 to Rode Road
- Currently, a quiet residential neighborhood
- Already close to Exit 282: St. Francis

Richards offers:

- Opportunity to increase # of lanes
- Current commercial property
- Access to enormous Viejo development & the community college

**Comment 33:** Julie Luetzelschwab

*First Comment:* I attended the I-25 corridor study meetings on May 5 and August 20 and I was hoping to see you there (City of Santa Fe Councilor Matthew Ortiz). I was shocked to see there are still plans to extend Governor Miles to Galisteo and now further east to Rodeo Park drive. I stated my comment below back in May and have a couple of other questions/comments for your.

First is the city still planning on extending Governor Miles east to Yucca and Galisteo? If not, the I-25 Corridor study should take it out of their study options. If so, the affected neighborhoods need to be notified and informed.

Second, are there new development plans for the area between Rosemont and I-25? The New Mexican article “New site located for state ‘supercomplex’” on 8-20-09 stated the State will be trading their 4.45 acres of land off Galisteo for some Las Soleras land deal.

Finally I want to be sure the city and other entities are NOT relying on neighborhood associations to forward information. For proper notification postcards must be mailed to affected neighborhoods.

*Second Comment:* If you are still including the extension of Governor Miles in your study, I’d like to inform you again, that the City removed this option from its transportation plans years ago. Please see City Councilor Matthew Ortiz’s email below on this:

Ms. Luetzelschwab

Sorry I didn’t get this the first time.

I didn’t attend the meeting b/c, quite frankly, there was nothing new to be presented.

I was a shocked as you (and others) to hear that there is still talk of extending Gov. Miles Road.

Back in 2004, I got city staff to remove the extension from the city general road map. As far as I know, that act put to rest any more extension talk. After I saw the outcome, and the confusion from that corridor study, I confirmed with city staff that, in fact, that action I took is still in effect at city hall.



As for new development, the only place where the state is trying to put in any development is in Las Soleras, which is west of Richards Ave. and east of Cerrillos Road.

As far as I know, there is not any other development planned for nay piece of land next to/adjacent to Rosemont.

*Response from Eric Johnson: As I noted in previous email, the comments we are receiving regarding the Governor Miles Extension will weigh heavily in our analysis and recommendations. Your comment is particularly helpful in that you provide specific back-up.*

*For clarification purposes, this concept is shown on the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) adopted by the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization in 2005, and is the basis for considering it in greater detail in this study. Concepts proposed in the MTP, such as this, still require analysis before proceeding. The I-25 study is providing some of that analysis.*

*We will provide a preliminary review of the analysis at a public meeting in early November. We are working on the dates now, and will notify you as soon as we have it firmed up. You note below that there will be an I-25 public meeting on Oct 6, which is not the case. That public meeting will be for the NM 599 study, which starts at I-25. I believe that rumor started when someone received notification for the NM 599 study, noted I-25 in the subject line (as part of the project limits), assumed it was the I-25 public meeting, and began circulating emails to that effect. In any case, our public meeting will be in November, and we will let you know the date as soon as possible.*

*Thank again for your interest and constructive comments.*

**Comment 34:** George and Alice Lukac

We are residents of Park Plazas and are writing regarding two of the proposals under consideration for changes in Route I 25 in our area. We are in favor of the idea of building on and off ramps where 25 intersects Richards Road. This makes sense since Richards is a major artery, especially because it leads to the Community College and the large expanding Rancho Viejo and other developments. These ramps would facilitate access to and from these sites. On the other hand, the proposal to extend Camino Carlos Rey under I 25 to connect with Rabbit road makes little sense. It would be a waste of money since it would provide a connection to virtually nowhere. Besides, Cerrillos, Richards, St Francis and Old Pecos already provide adequate access from Santa Fe to the area south of I 25. This is submitted in your consideration of the possible alternatives.

*Response from David Quintana: Thank you for your comments: they will be taken into consideration as the study moves forward. Should you have any other comments or possible solutions that the study team is not considering, we will be glad to take them under advisement. If you need to discuss further the options, what the thought processes are I would be happy to talk with you. I live in Via Caballero I and have lived there since 1978, so I am very tuned into the traffic patterns and issues with regard to the south side. Again, I thank you for your comments, and should you like to discuss any further, please call me at \_\_\_\_\_, or respond to this e-mail.*

**Comment 35:** Richard White

As many of you know, the New Mexico Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration are in the process of developing ways to improve the stretch of I-25 between NM 599 and

Old Pecos Trail. Their goal is to "...meet the existing and future travel demands for this segment of I-25."

One scenario has them constructing an interchange where Richards Avenue goes under I-25. Another scenario is to extend Camino Carlos Rey to connect with Rabbit Road or possibly extend Camino Carlos Rey south of I-25 to connect with a yet to be constructed road.

Extending Camino Carlos Rey would result in a massive increase in traffic on the eastern border of Park Plazas. Creating an interchange would most likely have the same result, but if something has to go in, this would be my choice. The biggest difference between the two options, at least in my eyes, is that with an interchange, vehicles will have more than one option to get where they want to go. Extending Camino Carlos Rey really doesn't afford too many options.

I don't know all the politics on the issue, and I could be way off the mark, but I suspect the Department of Transportation has access to Federal money that may be characterized as "use or loose it."

Our responsibility in the community is to let the powers-to-be know our feelings on the matter. I, for one, don't want to see Camino Carlos Rey extended. I think such an extension would be detrimental to our community with increased traffic and all that that brings. The homeowners association to the south of us is not in favor of the extension, and I have been in contact with their president. In my opinion, if there was ever an argument for not doing something that adversely affects our property values, this is an issue worth arguing.

To get information on the entire study you can visit our website at [ParkPlazas.com](http://ParkPlazas.com).

Please take the time to get informed on this issue and let the Department of Transportation know how you feel. You can E-mail the project mangers through a link on our website or write your comments on the back side of this page.

**Comment 36:** Melanie A. Dugan

As a resident of Park Plaza, I am gravely concerned about consideration of Com. Carlos Rey's extension. I hope that you will turn attention to new road development toward the SW side of town, which is currently in the planning phase for new infrastructure. Is this not an opportunity to plan infrastructure before building communities so as to enhance property values and insure peace, quiet and harmony for residents, who have, in many cases, made their biggest investment here and come for aesthetic reasons. Thank you for your consideration.

P.S. I-25 access is quite convenient as it is! Why create more? Pecos Trail and Cerrillos are less than 2 miles away!

**Comment 37:** Robert and Lena Sweeney

Living on the corner lot on Carlos Rey and Plaza Blanca in Park Plaza, we have adjusted to traffic on Carlos Rey. We feel that if Carlos Rey is extended, an increase in traffic will cause many more problems. Thus, we are against such an extension. Richards Ave. already is better designed.

**Comment 38:** Patricia F. Judd

It makes sense to create an interchange at Richards and I-25. This is the location where an interchange would serve the greatest number of drivers. It would expedite access to SFCC for the thousands of students driving to classes at all hours of the day and evening from many directions. I have been wondering for a long time why there hasn't been I-25 access from Richards. Now it looks as though this greatly needed convenience may occur!

**Comment 39:** Christina Dennelly

I am definitely not in favor of the Camino Carlos Rey proposed extension. This road is currently over extended, which has impacted negatively on the family neighborhood.

**Comment 40:** Martha Anne Freeman

By way of introduction, I have lived in Santa Fe for 33 years and in Park Plazas since the late 1980s. I have witnessed first and both welcome and regrettable growth. The acceleration of the latter in the last decade has been a concern for all I come in contact with. Unfortunately, most of these folks do not take the steps necessary to hopefully bring about a slowing of growth. Without exception they are conservationists and understand what changes need to be wrought to bring about a change in direction. They, like the good citizens of our country, tend to think that surely our elected leaders will put the brakes on development that is robbing our exceptional 'enchanted' land of open space, robbing it of scarce water, robbing it of the beautiful vistas, putting a historical way of life in jeopardy. Allowing development that increases population does indeed make our officials robbers.

You, the NM Department of Transportation in tandem with the Federal Highway Administration, need to stop and listen and think. Are you really listening to the people or are you bending at the waist to please lobbyists? Have you considered that by not extending Camino Carlos Rey to assuage those lobbyists could be a cog in the wheel that turns back this unnecessary and unwelcome growth? I implore you to think of Camino Carlos Rey as an opportunity to show the citizens of Santa Fe that they can trust you be obliterating its extension from your development map. Thank you.

**Comment 41:** Nancy Barth

I would oppose the extension of Camino Carlos Rey. There are many senior citizens who live in Park Plaza. The Rodeo Road exit is often hazardous due to constant traffic. At present the Camino Carlos Rey entrance/exit from Park Plaza is the only consistently safe one. Increased traffic would negate the reason I moved to the area.

Please relocate the traffic to Richards where there are more options due to it being a new area.

**Comment 42:** Phillip and JoAnne Jager

The proposal to extend Camino Carlos Rey across I-25 is inadvisable because it is *not an arterial road* like St. Francis, Cerrillos, or Richards Avenue. Another connection with Rabbit Road is unwarranted since that road and region are already adequately accessible from St. Francis and Richards Avenue.

Extending Camino Carlos Rey south to Rabbit Road would greatly increase traffic on this local *residential road* (25 mph limit), which is already seeing heavy through-traffic and speed violations. The open-space perimeter established along the south side of Governor Miles should not be breached.

Governor Miles Road interesting with Carlos Rey is also residential (25 mph) along its length and would also be negatively impacts. There are also mixed semi-rural neighborhoods in this vicinity. *Traffic that can be channeled along established arterial corridors elsewhere, not residential ones, is the preferable alternative.*

An I-25 interchange at Richards Avenue was *envisioned, but not implemented, more than 10 years ago, and ought to be revisited*, in particular with the addition of Rail Runner service and the recent and proposed developments in the area of Richards Ave. from Rodeo Road to beyond the Community College. In addition, the Eldorado community and others in outlying areas will have more convenient access to the services offered in this area (e.g., Community College) with such as interchange that will relieve arterial road traffic funneled off the existing intersections.

**Comment 43:** D. Tassel

No extension of Camino Carlos Rey.

Interchange @ Richards, probably inevitable with R. Viejo Development & SFCC & no existing roadside hwy.

**Comment 44:** Elizabeth S. Munson

To improve S side traffic movement in SF, Richards is much more logical for expansion than Camino Carlos Rey. The latter is in a residential development that became a thoroughfare by default. Richards, which serves commercial, churches, comm. college & rodeo grounds, has the location and space for expansion. An exchange with I25 would do away with all the traffic from outside the interstate, which has to divert and more through residential areas that were not developed to handle it. The same applies to the short stretch of Richards between Rodeo & Siringo Rds which should have been put through years ago.

**Comment 45:** Barbara Elwood

I am Barbara Elwood, a resident and home owner in Park Plazas since 1983. The President of our Association, Richard White, recently informed the residents that the New Mexico Dept. of Transportation and the Federal Hwy Admin. may be considering building an interchange at Richards Ave and I 25 or extend Camino Carlos Rey to ultimately connect with I 25. I oppose the extending of Camino Carlos Rey. The increased traffic would be noisy and dangerous and would adversely affect the desirability of our community. Please email me with any info I may not be aware of concerning this. Thank you for your attention.

**Public Information Meeting  
I-25 Santa Fe Corridor Study  
Genoveva Chavez Community Center  
December 3, 2009**

**Meeting Attendees:**

Sixty stakeholders attended the meeting:

No.	Name
1	Carolyn Agard
2	Tom Agard
3	Dewey Bullard
4	Kimberly C.
5	Kevin Chapman
6	Mary Beth Chapman
7	Lynn Christiansen
8	Steve Coca
9	Linda Cole
10	Wayne Darnell
11	Harold Fagor
12	Alexis Girard
13	Barbara Goede
14	Anna Hansen
15	Diana Hardy
16	Kathryn Holladay
17	Marlies Hoksberger
18	JoAnne Jaeger
19	Andrew Jandacek
20	Will Karp
21	Peter Krusko
22	Greg Kulka
23	Joyce Lathrop
24	Jerry Lawlor
25	Dale Lettenberger
26	Jean Liska
27	Andy S. Loegs
28	Joseph Lopez
29	Manuel R. Lujan
30	Lynette MacGillivray
31	Don Martinez
32	C. Dave Mc Quarie
33	Diana Monroe
34	Katherine Mortimer
35	Celeste Newbrook
36	Dustin Offerman
37	Lien-Shin Wang Offermann
38	Councilor Matthew Ortiz
39	Jim Plewa
40	Leroy Quintana
41	Sandra Quintana
42	Armando Ramirez
43	Ken Reese
44	H.L. Robbins
45	Thomas Romero

46	Rosemary Rowell
47	W. Salomon
48	George Sanchez
49	Mela Sanchez
50	Sherry Sanchez
51	Debbie Seif
52	James Siebert
53	Gale Simonson
54	P. Stephenson
55	Jack Sullivan
56	Rusty Tambascio
57	Councilor Ronald Trujillo
58	Teresa Trujillo
59	Keith D. Walter
60	Kitty Wolfe

Project team representatives at the meeting included the following individuals:

- Dan Andersen, CH2M HILL
- Rochelle Byars, NMDOT
- Greg Heitmann, FHWA
- Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates
- Ross Lujan, CH2M HILL
- David J. Martinez, NMDOT
- John Nitzel, CH2M HILL
- David Quintana, NMDOT
- John Romero, City of Santa Fe
- Mark Tibbetts, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Keith Wilson, Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

### **Presentation**

David Quintana introduced the project and project team. Ross Lujan and Dan Andersen discussed the study process, alternatives, ranking of alternatives, and recommendations.

### **Discussion Session**

The following is a summary of the questions and comments presented at the meeting. NMDOT project team responses presented at the meeting are shown in italics.

On the four you are not recommending, is that a function of too much traffic for too little traffic. Could that change with a better economy or more political interest?

*This is just a recommendation from us. It is ultimately the transportation policy board to decide what lines go on the map. That is where the final decision will be made. But the transportation board could keep it alive.*

Where do we go as a body of dissenters?

*Their meetings are public meetings. The policy board meets bi-monthly. That is where you voice your concerns.*

How many times have they overridden your recommendations?

This is the first time we have done this (a NMDOT corridor study forwarding recommendations to the Metropolitan Planning Organization [MPO] policy board). After this study, the ball is in their court. I assume they would take our recommendations to heart, but I can't be sure.

I am definitely opposed to Camino Carlos Rey. Our input may not be valid. Why are we opposing things if this may happen anyway?

*It was the past public input that put these at the bottom of the priority lists. That is why it was not included in the list of recommendations.*

It seems ambivalent.

You need to talk to your elected officials. You need to lobby them.

*This is just the process for projects to be built in Santa Fe. The reason they were considered because they did meet the purpose at need at some level. At this point, these projects will not be recommended for inclusion the transportation plan.*

Thank you to Marron and NMDOT to their response on the south side of Santa Fe. They pay attention to the public outcry. We have two councilors here tonight. We need to give them feedback. The process is somewhat broken in Santa Fe. There are some developers steering this process. We need our government to pay attention to the people in these neighborhoods. We have a voice. Use it.

How can we find out about future meetings? Can we be kept in the loop?

*I am Keith Wilson with the Santa Fe MPO. These are recommendations that will go to the transportation policy board as part of Metropolitan Transportation Plan. With respect to meetings of policy board, they meet on December 10. This project will be presented in February. We will have meetings in January as part of our plan outreach. Every month from January to June, the policy board will meet. The meetings are on web site [santafemmo.org](http://santafemmo.org). You can e-mail me at [kpwilson@ci.santa-fe.nm.us](mailto:kpwilson@ci.santa-fe.nm.us).*

If you want to attend MPO meetings, they are held in middle of day. You may want to suggest that they hold meetings for people who work. The Rail Runner crossing was not discussed much. It does not make sense and assumes a station at Las Soleras and connects to Dinosaur Trail a private road. It is a blight on the landscape for people in the area. In terms of Richards, that is also problematic. The idea is to get several different access points to community college. We are missing context sensitive design. Richards Avenue would have to be enlarged to 4 lanes and become more dangerous, more stressful to drive, and more like Airport Road. Widening to 4 lanes would take away the buffer zones. Oshara has already intruded on the buffer zone. It will also take property and have other negative impacts by widening to 4 lanes. Who will pay for it? The county and city taxpayers would have to pay it. If you look at your evaluation factors, the half moons and full moons are nice way to look at it intuitively. I assigned numbers to the symbols. There is the same number of positive points for Governor Miles and Richards. I am not recommending the Governor Miles Extension, but Richards is not a slam-dunk. In hopes of moving traffic off of Richards Avenue, the Rail Runner station was put on NM 599. Access to St Francis needs to be discussed. That would also provide access to the community college district and also provide relief to Richards Avenue. I don't think the interchange is a slam-dunk. If you consider impacts, people will be sorry.

I have a couple of concerns about Richards Avenue. What traffic will flow on Governor Miles? Governor Miles is really busy? I don't understand how you will take on traffic. The roundabout on Richards is really small, and the bike lane ends at the rotary. It is a dangerous situation. I have seen roundabouts proposed at Richards. I think roundabouts are negative. How would bikes cross that intersection?

*Adding an interchange at Richards takes some of the traffic off of Governor Miles because it allows some of the traffic onto the interstate and off of Governor Miles.*

I would be interested in seeing those studies.

*We looked at safety carefully. None of the other interchanges have sidewalks or bike lanes. On Richards, we plan to add sidewalks and bike lanes. Bicycles can merge in with the traffic on roundabouts, and we can make the roundabout so bicycles can move around traffic. Skills bicyclists like it, but kids and unskilled cyclists would be of concern.*

You would have to walk across the lanes with the bikes where the vehicles enter the roundabout.

*You have to carefully locate the crossing point so vehicles and pedestrians can see each other. It has to be designed carefully. That may not be the configuration of the interchange. The study just recommends an interchange or no interchange, and it could change significantly.*

I agree in that I don't support the overpass at Las Soleras. It is not needed. I do support the interchange at Richards. If there are roundabouts, there needs to be another roundabout at Richards. Roundabouts have a lower fatality than signals. The Oshara roundabout works for bicycles and pedestrians. I don't support 4 lanes on Richards, but I support the interchange. I don't understand the need for realignment of Richards at I-25. Consider a design with a rail station to make more multi-modal. The overpass at Beckner doesn't seem to have any reason. You can cross at Richards. The community college is designed as small roadways. The northeast connector will be the next road and will relieve traffic on Richards. On St. Francis going south, I would like to see a better connection with Rabbit Road so the whole area is integrated with Richards.

*We are showing roundabouts to preserve right-of-way. If we didn't reconstruct the interchange, the ramps would be outside of the right-of-way. This study is not looking at whether Richards should be 4 lanes. We were trying to look at alternatives that might allow us to not widen Richards. That is why we looked at two crossings such as Governor Miles. The crossings do not help relieve traffic on Richards. Those additional crossings did not relieve traffic enough on Richards. If it needs 4 lanes, it will be determined in another study. Once everything is fully developed there could be a lot of cars on Richards.*

On your I-25 auxiliary lanes, will they go inside or outside of I-25?

*They will be a continuation of the ramps.*

Why are using old maps, such as Governor Miles Extension, because the Rail Runner should appear on your maps? There is no feasibility because of the Rail Runner. Your map does not show the Rail Runner coming under the highway and walls and abutments. You are not making a recommendation for this. As long as this is on the table, my house is worthless. No one has considered the impact on neighborhoods. I cannot put my house on market since you may tear my house down in four years. We would like some affirmation that this will not happen.



My name is Matthew Ortiz. Resolution 2006-65 says it is city policy that Governor Miles does not extend eastward and Camino Carlos Rey does not extend southward. I will present a resolution that it is city policy. I had to go to the MPO and present the resolution in 2006. It is city policy that the two roads will not be extended. Why this did not show up in this discussion befuddles me. Why it was not part of this study astounds me. We are to formally present it. We said clearly that this is not going to happen. We have annexed I-25 into the city. If it is in the city limits, it is for the city to determine. It is our policy and will continue to be our policy. At the MPO, I will reintroduce the resolution. The MPO has no business telling us what to decide since it is in the city.

*I have the resolution here. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) can only be amended by the MPO. It is because of this resolution that prompted it not to be included in MTP. It still has to go through the MPO policy board. In 2006, the county commissioners decided that we had to wait for this study. We are not trying to force extensions down people's throats. The MPO ultimately decides transportation plans in the city.*

I am going to thank both of you gentlemen (councilors) right away. If they take that side of my property, it eliminates my well, shop, and greenhouse. I will be watching for that meeting next week.

I would like to thank Mr. Ortiz for speaking. If Governor Miles and Carlos Rey go through, it will affect several subdivisions. They currently have drag racing on Governor Miles in middle of night. More traffic will bring more traffic in neighborhood. I don't see how Richards could be put in without widening road. The roundabout would need to be redesigned. It is a policy in Santa Fe that you guys make mistakes that cost money, and we throw money at it to correct. On Old Pecos Trail, that will impact the whole area. There is bicycle traffic on Old Pecos and that bike traffic blocks car traffic. With regard to the Rail Runner, Governor Richardson said the reason for Rail Runner is to prevent widening of I-25. You are proposing to widen I-25. People do not have integrity on their follow-through. A serious look has to be taken at people in these areas. Go to Mr. Garcia and see where his house sits. Take all these people's concerns into consideration.

*Let me see if I can explain Old Pecos interchange better. Traffic going on I-25 to Albuquerque would exit here. Now you have to cross lanes of traffic, and it is dangerous. We are proposing that if you want to turn left on Rodeo, you come on this leg, and them stop. You would get in a dedicated left turn pocket. You would not cross multiple lanes of traffic.*

My comments have been covered. Will notes be available?

*Yes, on NMDOT and MPO web site. If a comment is really important, then you need to provide a written comment.*

I don't have much to add. If you want to see copy of resolution and MPO minutes, e-mail me at [mortizlaw@msn.com](mailto:mortizlaw@msn.com). I don't think the MPO can decide this. I think Richards will need more discussion. I appreciate that the NMDOT has to move to evaluate environmental impacts. Those of us who live near I-25 were given promises with respect to sight, visual, and noise impacts that were not followed through. So to add lanes on I-25, it will not be acceptable in terms of sight, visual, and noise impacts. The state has annexed I-25 into the city limits. It is my belief that the state will have to conform to local policy and procedures along I-25.

*When we do environmental analysis, part of that process is to do a noise study. If and when I-25 auxiliary lanes come into the picture, the environmental analysis will consider noise barriers.*

I want to comment on Richards Avenue. I am representing Santa Fe Community College (SFCC). The governing board of SFCC passed a resolution endorsing the Richards Avenue interchange and Richards Avenue as a site for a transit stop rather than Las Soleras. I think the Richards design tends to raise the cost by realigning I-25 than if you bought more right-of-way. I have \$40 million for that interchange. I doubt it would take \$20 million to build a diamond at that location. In your factors, you give a big negative to cost. If the cost were lower, it could rise in priority. I think it is important not to have a high cost figure drive your priority. By moving the lanes in towards the center, you eliminate policy decision for the median such as a rail transit stop. I think there is a study going on. The issue of the transit stop location has not yet been finalized. We at the college are now addressing how to get people from NM 599 and other parts of the city to the school. There are not any transportation modes other than city buses, which extend time to get to the college by an hour. Your design should not limit the policy options for the MPO. I have attended all the county transportation plan meetings. There are a lot of options for south of I-25 such as the southeast connector that would affect traffic. People should not rush to judgment on a 4-lane Richards until all of the studies have come together. The 4 lanes have not been bourn out by factual study. We are very concerned about bicycle and pedestrian safety on Richards. The roundabout at church was build off-spec and made smaller and that is why it doesn't work well. The Oshara roundabout does work well. We are trying to encourage alternate forms of transportation. There is a great deal of support for these improvements that would affect the community college district.

*In Phase A and B, we heard people didn't want signals at the ramps. This is just a concept but keeps free flow.*

My only question is cost.

You already heard Councilor Ortiz. We have been on top of this. I will make sure that it is on the web site and in the paper. The meetings are open to everyone. I want to thank you all for being here. Regarding the third lane on I-25, promises were made by the NMDOT and were not kept. I want the promises kept. Should Richards be built, what will the impact be on St. Francis Drive? I would see timing of the lights on St. Francis. It doesn't function as well as it should. Contact your county commissioners and city councilors.

*The auxiliary lanes, the reason they would be recommended. If Richards goes up, a lot of traffic will go up. That is why they are shown. Traffic was getting on to St. Francis from Zia and now it will go on I-25.*

The Rail Runner has already impacted neighborhoods. Timing traffic on St. Francis will get things better.

I live in Pueblos del Sol. I appreciate having two councilors here to discuss impacts. I can see the Rail Runner go by from my kitchen. Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles should not be on the table. We have paid our dues from noise and pollution from I-25 and Rail Runner. I think we were sold a bill of goods on the decibel increase from Rail Runner. I don't recall the discussion of air pollution from Rail Runner. I am concerned about the auxiliary lanes. What are the noise impacts of the lanes?

*That is part of the next phase when a project moves forward.*

That is too late.

*We have just identified projects.*

I am concerned about air quality. It is far more of a concern than we were lead to believe. I am concerned about the auxiliary lanes and want to see Governor Miles and Camino Carlos Rey kept off the table.

*The projects can die in the next phase. Stop and start traffic also causes pollution. The freeway has free flow and can have less air emissions than local streets. The air quality analysis will be done.*

I see positive and negative effects of the Richards interchange. I am in favor of the interchange but not the roundabouts. I don't agree with cars and cyclists merging and competing for space. Get rid of the roundabouts, and we can create bike lanes. Roundabouts – they should go.

Thank you councilors for this meeting. The NM 599 meeting will be on December 10 in councilor chambers (Santa Fe).

The cost/benefit ratio is critical in deciding. What is the span of costs from Gov Miles and the number 1 (ranked) project?

*We are still looking at it. We are making some adjustments. We will put those costs in our report. Once the report is posted on web site, we will send out an e-mail blast so you can look at costs.*

It would cost a lot of money without much benefit for low ranking projects.

*They would cost \$20-40 million.*

Could a developer put in money and skew that ratio?

*I imagine that would be a possibility. It is also the neighborhood disruption and lack of public support. It doesn't carry enough traffic to offset negatives.*

Is it a state project?

*There is no money, but if there were, it would be federal.*

Is the auxiliary lane a frontage road or attached to the freeway?

*It would be attached to the freeway. It would be a ramp-to-ramp connection. It is just a stripe.*

If you do those lanes, because that is a change to existing I-25 corridor, will there be a buffer wall installed? Could that be addressed?

*That would be considered in the environmental process.*

## **Written Comments**

**Comment 1:** Carolyn DeChaine (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

Thank you for your e-mail and regular mail. Unfortunately I am not going to be able to make it on the 5<sup>th</sup> (meeting changed from November 5<sup>th</sup> to December 3<sup>rd</sup>), but I still support lowering the speed limit on I-25 between Santa Fe and Albuquerque. I also support any changes that will make it harder for drivers to cross the median or to enter going the wrong way.

**Comment 2:** Stephen Bing (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

We would oppose any extension of Camino Carlos Rey. There has already been an increase in traffic over the last 5 years, and it has made a quite neighborhood noisier and more polluted. A new interchange seems unnecessary as one can get to I-25 in 10 minutes anyway.

**Comment 3:** Christine Dennelly (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

Thank you for this information. I looked at the extension web-site. I and many of my neighbors are not in favor of the extension of Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles Road. It will have a major negative impact on the families in this neighborhood. Thanks again for receiving input.

**Comment 4:** Eugene Tomlinson (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

The neighborhoods in your area are raising concerns about the NMDOT I-25 Corridor Study. My neighbors in Las Estancias, those in Via Cab and the folks in the County area between us and the I-25 Corridor have continually been asked to submit their input to Eric Johnson and the NMDOT staff. We have not been able to get across to this study team that two of their proposed ideas are not feasible and not required.

It is our impression that they are telling the city of Santa Fe and the County of Santa Fe how to control traffic on streets and roads that are not directly State controlled (so designated by State Route numbers) and thus are extending their study beyond the I-25 Corridor. Specifically, we are concerned about their continued suggestion, despite our objections, to the I-25 Crossing at Camino Carlos Rey and the extending of Governor Miles to connect to Yucca and cut through to Rodeo via Galisteo Rd. We believe that the city has on its books correspondence that states that Governor Miles will never be extended beyond its present east end. We also object to the crossing at Camino Carlos Rey since it would add additional traffic through our subdivisions and not provide access to Cerrillos Rd without cutting through other long established neighborhoods. It would also be an eyesore to the area (The Rail Runner station between the I-25 lanes is an example of function without thought to its ugly appearance to the area.)

We have suggested that there are four or five avenues that already exist from the south of the I-25 Corridor from Old Pecos Trail on the east to I-599 on the west and are State or Federal right-of-ways. These roads can be improved and connected south of Rabbit Road and north of Rancho Viejo and the Community College, if the land is selected and set aside, to provide a Boulevard that would connect these north south access roads in the area and provide adequate traffic lanes for the increased development to the south of the I-25 Corridor without disrupting the established neighborhoods and subdivisions north of the Corridor.

Gentlemen, we need your support in removing the Crossing at Camino Carlos Rey and the extension to the east of Gov. Miles from this study. Can we ask that you appear and provide your input to Eric Johnson and to the NMDOT Staff?

(My rather long, but I would hope sufficiently descriptive, report to Eric Johnson and the NMDOT Staff, et. al. is again attached for your consideration.)

To: Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates  
CC: David Quintana, NMDOT  
Gerard Martinez, NMDOT  
Stephen Ulibarri, Santa Fe County

April 21, 2009  
Revised Aug. 20, 2009

Mayor David Coss, City of Santa Fe  
Mathew Ortiz, Councillor, City of Santa Fe  
Ron Trujillo, Councillor, City of Santa Fe

From: Gene Tomlinson, President  
Las Estancias Neighborhood Association

Subject: I-25, Major Santa Fe Corridors Improvement Study

Reference: The New Mexican, Thursday, April 16, 2009 (Meeting Notice April 21, '09)

We have been here before, gentlemen. The subdivisions that are established and hoping that no more traffic will be diverted into their streets have spoken. I hope this time you are listening, (this is input to your May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.)

Traffic planning by outside firms is a necessary part of planning, but they do not take into consideration the real world that exists, nor the impact that such traffic planning will have on the present residence of the City. They may well give NMDOT some good planning information, but it will lack the intimate knowledge from those of us who live here.

It is about time that Santa Fe – city, county and NMDOT really develop a master plan. It is obvious that any earlier studies fell short of the impending and future growth to the overall area. As a result, subdivisions were and are being built that obstruct good traffic flow. The south side of the City of Santa Fe is full of examples of such poor future planning.

As examples: Yucca goes from the College of Santa Fe to just south of Rodeo and can not correct to St. Michaels. Camino Carlos Rey, now improved from Gov. Miles to Zia runs into a neighborhood just north of Zia (not able to directly connect to Cerrillos Rd.) and Gov Miles seems to be headed eastward into more homes. Richards stops at the county fair grounds (though with a bridge it could go on to Cerrillos Rd. and further north, but would require displacement of some homes).

Cutting through established neighborhoods with added traffic is a safety hazard as well as an increase in traffic noise. It also invites an increase in crime and neighborhood vandalism.

Bridges over the I-25/Rail Runner from any of the north-south streets to get to Rabbit Rd or beyond (south) is an expensive, eye-sore that takes away from the open look of the area while just pushing traffic where it was never envisioned, i.e. into established subdivisions, both north and south of the I-25 corridor. In short the bridge idea should be taken off the table.

So what would be a better, more plausible solution to traffic flow from south of I-25 and the growing development in that area of the county and the established City of Santa Fe?

Also, how can we improve our busy corridors to handle the increased traffic that was never properly planned for in earlier studies and the now completed road projects?

**First:** A second ring road around greater Santa Fe is possible, if we are not to late in getting it in place. From Old Pecos Trail on the east to 599 Relief Route on the west and south of the I-25 corridor a major road can be provided to move the increased traffic that will develop in the county area from such developments as Rancho Viejo and others that are and will be planned. (I would refer you to Kansas City, KS planning and ring road development.)

Old Pecos Trail, St. Francis, Richards, Cerrillos Rd., and 599/14 can all connect to this major southern (east-west) portion of an outer ring road. The east side of the ring is Old Pecos Trail. The west side is 599. The east side would feed into town and have to go into Paseo de Peralto on the east and north to St. Francis, but it does now. People living or traveling to the south of the interstate would have five north-south roads to choose from plus the outer ring road, i.e. 5 established roads in less than 15 miles which should be most adequate for any new development.

*See attached purple lines on the NMDOT map.*

This would use the present north-south roads as connectors to the southern outer ring road and provide for increased traffic from the southern county development without disturbing established south side Santa Fe city neighborhoods.

**Second:** All the north-south corridors need to be improved to handle traffic in a safe and efficient manner. Old Pecos Trail may have to be widened south of I-25, and at the least good right turn lanes completed so as not to impede traffic flow, north or south.

St. Francis (with better traffic light control) needs right turn lanes at some intersections to improve traffic flow. The overpass at St. Michaels needs to be widened another lane on the north bound side to allow for safe entrance for merging traffic. The southbound entrance from St. Michaels needs to have an improved entrance lane. This may require the purchase of property along the right of way. St. Francis up to Cordova Rd. is fairly clear of obstructions and driveways that impede traffic flow, but north of Cordova Rd. up to Agua Fria, the road is too narrow and the traffic flow is impeded by the cross streets of the old city neighborhoods and businesses. This is an area that perhaps only time can improve with proper city planning and future re-development. The result is that northbound traffic will have congestion, as it does now, from Cordova to just north of Paseo de Peralto. Note: Through truck traffic, like the hay haulers, should be required to use the 599 Relief Route.

Cerrillos Rd. is a disaster and a black eye to the City of Santa Fe. Tourists and New Mexico residents entering Santa Fe by Cerrillos Rd. and even we who live here realize that this is a Mexican Border town street that though improved in recent years, does not do the City Different any favors. Future planning and careful redevelopment may improve it, but a traffic study will not solve the eye sore problem or the narrowing corridor north of St. Michaels.

The 599 Bypass is, at present, a clean acceptable way around Santa Fe, or for many, a better way into the city from the north then trying to enter from any of the already over crowded southern corridors, particularly during morning and evening rush hours.

So, lets get going on an outer ring road that does not impact older subdivisions, improve our existing north-south corridors including an I-25 interchange at Richards and a widening of Richards to support the major flow of traffic from an interchange with the interstate – both south of the interchange and north to at least Cerrioss (bridge the arroyo and go north). The interchange has been talked to death – build it and improve the traffic flow now.

**Third:** Gerard Martinez will remember that the Las Estancias Neighborhood Association requested that the NMDOT consider improving the noise and light abatement from the I-25 corridor after the Rail Runner was completed. The area at the end of Galisteo (atop of and north of the railroad) needs a wall (not the present wire fence) to reduce the light and noise pollution from the interstate into our sub division. This wall should be a part of the beautification of all southern corridor entrances into Santa Fe. Other south side subdivisions also will need to be included in this beautification and light/noise abatement project.

Old Pecos Trail is reasonably open and a nice entrance into our City Different. So is the 599 Relief Route. Cerrillos Rd. is not congested up to Rodeo/Airport Rd and with some beautification can be acceptable. St Francis needs the most work to reduce the noise/light pollution from the I-25 Corridor and much needs to be done to make St Francis a beautiful entrance into the City Different. The Richard's interchange can be developed with beautification included.

**This is the State Capital, Gentlemen.** The 84/285 (Taos Highway) to the north of Santa Fe is much improved and a fine example of what we now need to do to the southern entrances to our city. A study is needed and then construction of noise and light abatement walls, etc. that also welcome visitor and residence to this City Different. We have talked to NMDOT about this in the past. **Let's get it done.**

I, for one, see the overall traffic pattern of Greater Santa Fe as a large wigwam or tepee. The bottom is the outer (southern part) of a new ring road. The poles of the wigwam are the north-south arteries that already exist. Paseo de Peralto is a circle at the top of the wigwam around its opening, and encompasses the downtown of the City Different. The cross roads like Cordova, St. Michaels, and Rodeo Rd. and Gov. Miles are patterns of the art that decorates the wigwam. This is how I see our City Different.

If further expansion into the County are contemplated, and it's obvious that it is, then that is outside of the City Different and has to be considered as separate communities in the County that should be self sufficient and not dependent on the City of Santa Fe. **Future growth in the county will happen and must be looked at as separated from the City not an extension of it.** So a traffic plan should look at how these new developments can interface with I-25 and with the established north-south arteries, but not be included in the future City of Santa Fe traffic plan (for daily use of these arteries for workers in and out of the city.) Light rail to support the Rail Runner and bus service can be developed from these new developments to relieve traffic and the limited parking in our City Different. (Reference to Portland, OR light rail system) We must remember that Tourism is our second most important business; let us not discourage it by limiting access to the City or ample parking to our guests. We need to be aware of where our tax dollars come from and not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

We do not need more direct entrances into Santa Fe that disturb the established neighborhoods and flood our residential streets with through traffic. We **do** need to improve our existing corridors and clean up and beautify our entrances into the City Different from the I-25 Interstate. We need to provide a wide and easily accessible outer ring road south of the I-25 interstate (in the County of Santa Fe), and we need to do these projects now.

**Comment 5:** Teresa Trujillo (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

Gentlemen: I am requesting that Camino Carlos Rey NOT be made into a main artery off I-25 to connect with Cerrillos Road. There are many children living in this neighborhood; there is a city park on Camino Carlos Rey between Zia and Siringo (many children and families use this park); the traffic is already very heavy because both Zia and Rodeo, which intersect Camino Carlos Rey are main arteries to the shopping on Zafarano, Sam's Club, etc. Rodeo Plaza is also a magnet for traffic; there have already been several fatalities close to the Camino Carlos Rey intersections, which is why there was significant city street construction on Rodeo to slow down the traffic. Moreover, the bike path, which intersects Camino Carlos Rey, has many many pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the day. Camino Carlos Rey is a two lane street; it simply cannot handle any more traffic. Camino Carlos Rey is also used heavily by all living in the Rodeo / Zia area who are accessing Home Depot, Walmart, and other shopping on Cerrillos. I am a user of Camino Carlos Rey and am very aware of the existing situation.

It is a huge safety issue if Camino Carlos Rey receives any more traffic. I live off of Rodeo and Yucca and my little grandson lives on Artesano (which intersects Camino Carlos Rey), therefore, I am in that area daily at different times throughout the day. I am concerned about his safety and the safety of everyone else affected.

I plan on being at the meeting at GCCC on Thursday. Please forward this input to any else that is receiving input.

**Comment 6:** Councilor Matthew Ortiz (comment received before December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

To all:

I've attached an electronic version of what I intend to present to the D.O.T. tonight.

Councilor Trujillo and I introduced and passed a resolution in 2006 that specifically states the policy of the city with respect to both Camino Carlos Rey and Gov. Miles Road.

I then had this resolution presented to the regional planning authority. I have attached the minutes of that meeting so that you all can see that it was (former) county commissioners Campos and Sullivan who would not consider adopting this resolution. At the time, the portion east of Gov. Miles Road was outside the city limits.

Since then, the city has annexed that portion of property. Thus, given the resolution passed, it is my opinion that the state has to abide by the CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL policy that there be no further extension of either Camino Carlos Rey or Gov. Miles roads.

Regards,

**Comment 7:** Julie Lutzelschwab

I was unable to attend tonight's meeting. My comments are:

I am OPPOSED TO EXTENDING GOVERNOR MILES. City Councilor Matthew Ortiz has also stated the city DOES NOT plan to extend Gov Miles in their master plan (see email below). The Galisteo/Rodeo and Galisteo/Zia and Zia/St Francis intersections cannot handle 100s of additional cars each day. This extension if it connects to Yucca could also funnel more traffic through residential neighborhoods (e.g. Las Estancias) shortcutting to Rodeo/Galisteo and through traffic is not desirable by the Las Estancias neighborhood.

I am supportive of reducing the speed limit to 65 mph on I-25 in the study area.

I feel it is imperative to implement an engine/jake brake prohibition ordinance along this section of I-25.

**Comment 8:** Celeste Newbrook

The study at this phase shows thoughtful attention to the environmental and visual factors so important in planning in Santa Fe, "The City Different."

Thank you!



**Comment 9:** anonymous

Make the Richards interchange a higher priority and connect through El Dorado on Richards or St. Francis (most trips from Eldorado are to Santa Fe, not Albuquerque)

**Comment 10:** R. Rowell

I do not want Gov. Miles Extension chosen.

**Comment 11:** anonymous

I vehemently oppose the overcrossing or undercrossing at Camino Carlos Rey. It would significantly increase traffic near Pueblo del Sol (where I live) and the noise level. I do not think the Richards Interchange makes sense, but not the addition of 2 new lanes. We can't afford this as taxpayers.

**Comment 12:** Peter Krusko

My name is Peter Krusko and a homeowner at 2601 Via Berrenda, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505. I attended the NMDOT Public Meeting, December 3, 2009, concerning the Interstate 25 Corridor Study: NM 599 to NM 466.

I am opposed to auxiliary lanes on I-25, the Governor Miles Extension, Camino Carlos Rey Undercrossing, and the Rail Runner Loop Over-crossing. These concepts if completed would determinately affect the long established family neighborhoods of which I am a resident. The increased traffic, noise, and pollution caused by the construction and implementation of these proposals would completely and utterly change the character and quality of life that these neighborhoods have brought to the peace and well being of its residents.

**Comment 13:** Don Martinez

As president of the Pueblos Del Sol Owners Association, located at Camino Carlos Rey and Governor Miles Road, our community feels that the New Richards Interchange should be your highest priority and completed/funded first. Secondly, next priority would be the Governor Miles Road Extension; this would ease the traffic load on Rodeo Road as well as Zia Road. By having these parallel roads to I-25 would also help NMDOT obtain funding from the US Government. Finally, the Camino Carlos Rey Under-Crossing should be your lowest priority or completed last. Not that we are in favor of the project, but we don't see how any traffic would be aided.

**Comment 14:** Manuel R. Lujan

My name is Manuel R. Lujan. I attended the meeting noted on this e-mail regarding the I-25 Corridor Study. I am primarily addressing my comments to the "New Richards Interchange" proposal. You have my comments from the August 20, 2009 presentation and for the sake of brevity I am submitting the following comments as an addition to those I outlined on my electronic correspondence (9-03-09) to Ross Lujan and you on this topic.

Governor Miles appears to be a choice of a means to get in and out to places off of Richards Avenue such as SF Community College, the 5 churches, the 3 schools, Rancho Viejo, Nava Ade' and new developments...and I think an interchange would alleviate this problem...and for this reason I am not

conceptually opposed to an interchange there. I do support an overpass at Las Soleras, and I do support streamlining the overpass at Beckner with access to and from the SF Community College and Richards Avenue from there. There should be some connectivity at Rabbit Road point in order to give the whole area on Richards Avenue relief from that point. There should also be a study on the impact of neighborhoods.

Richards Avenue is too narrow in my estimation to handle an interchange as a two lane road and I believe increased traffic will be worse. I live off of Richards Avenue, and it is difficult in the mornings and evenings to get out of the area because of traffic. I notice that there was not a consideration on these points brought up at the last meeting. The analogy is one of a plugged up artery waiting for bypass surgery waiting to happen.

I believe that streamlining I 25 is not needed, which is probably where the major cost of the proposal is. A diamond interchange would suffice and would probably be affordable. It probably would not take any or less right-of-way thus making it less expensive. There would not be a need for more roundabouts. We already have two which are too small. The large trucks and city bus vehicles are too large, and they tend to go over them. There is a artifact on the Oshara one, and I don't know how long it will take for it be taken down from them. There would be 4 of these roundabouts and one on Dinosaur Trail Road where a resident was in the process of following up on that point.

**Comment 15:** Andris and Rosalind S. Sildegs

We the undersigned as homeowners residing in the Park Plaza Development (SW quadrant of Rodeo Road & Camino Carlos Rey intersection) do adamantly object to the proposed extension of Camino Carlos Rey to cross Interstate I-25 for the following reasons:

1. I-25 has been a natural barrier between communities to the north and south of it. These communities have been developed with this fact in mind and the quality of life of each is dependent on this barrier as it exists. Both north and south communities will be disrupted by the incursion of traffic that the crossover (or underpass) will generate. Likewise, the increase of traffic on the existing Camino Carlos Rey will split communities east and west of it creating the potential of promoting barrios in lieu of a homogenous community as it exists today. This repeats the mistakes of the 1950s/60s when traffic planners had such a negative impact on social structures of communities.

As a side issue communities south of I-25 would be better served by:

- (a) Extending Hwy 599 to connect with I-25 east of Lamy as an I-25 by-pass.
  - (b) Improving I-25 interchanges at Richards Road and Saint Francis Drive as you have proposed.
  - (c) Extending both Richards Road and Saint Francis Drive south to interchange at this suggested by-pass.
2. Currently noise generated by vehicular traffic on Rodeo/Zia Roads can be heard through the Park Plaza Development. Likewise traffic on I-25 can also be heard. To increase traffic on Camino Carlos Rey with a crossover (or underpass) will just add to the problem.
  3. The Park Plaza Development is served by only one (1) main street (i.e. Plaza Blanca) which serpentine through the development providing the only exists at Rodeo Road and Camino Carlos Rey. We have many elderly residents who are reluctant to enter or cross Rodeo Road because of the heavy traffic on it. Most currently choose Camino Carlos Rey as the exit out of the

development. With the increase of anticipated traffic on Camino Carlos Rey their mobility becomes more hazardous and in many cases isolates them to remain in the development because of their fear of traffic.

4. Increase of traffic on Camino Carlos Rey due to the construction of an I-25 overpass (or underpass) will add to the congestion at Carlos Rey/Rodeo intersection traffic light. This congestion and related traffic delay at the light will encourage drivers to shortcut from Rodeo to Carlos Rey via Plaza Blanca thereby impacting our community even more than mentioned above.
5. Increase of Camino Carlos Rey traffic traveling north past Rode/Zia Roads will impact use of two (2) public parks/playgrounds and impede the use of the Arroyo Chamisa Recreation Trail north of Zia Road.
6. The construction of Camino Carlos Rey crossover (or underpass) encourages future development of it as an I-25 interchange thereby exacerbating reasons for our objection even more.
7. Not only will the increase of traffic due to Camino Carlos Rey I-25 crossover (or underpass) affect our quality of life but we anticipate that it will also create a financial hardship on us by impacting property values. For all the reasons mentioned above we anticipate that housing values will fall because our community will be less desirable to live in. With loss of property values due to the current economy, the overdevelopment of Camino Carlos Rey just adds to our burden.

We sincerely appreciate your effort in presenting the study and the many hours it has taken to come up with all the proposals and evaluations. We also realize the questions and consideration raised by your study had to be asked regardless of outcome.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our objections. We hope that you will consider the social issues presented and expand your study beyond the traffic planning discipline.

