

**SUMMARY OF ACTION
 SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
 CITY OF SANTA FE OFFICES @ MARKET STATION
 300 MARKET STREET, SUITE 200, SANTA FE, NM
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2017, 1:30 PM**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER		1
ROLL CALL	QUORUM	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	APPROVED	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES JANUARY 23, 2017	APPROVED	2
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	NONE	2
<u>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW</u>		
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF AMENDMENT 5 TO THE FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	APPROVED	2-4
RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT PRE-TEEN AND TEEN INDEPENDENT TRANSIT AND MOBILITY PLAN	APPROVED	4-5
UPDATE OF THE STATUS OF THE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS ON NM599 AT COUNTY ROAD 70	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	5-9
UPDATE ON THE CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THE 2018-2023 MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	9-10

UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	10-11
MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	11
MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	11-12
NEXT MEETING	MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017	12
ADJOURNMENT	ADJOURNED	12

**SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
CITY OF SANTA FE OFFICES @ MARKET STATION
300 MARKET STREET, SUITE 200, SANTA FE, NM
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2017, 1:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by Chair John Romero at 1:30 pm, on Monday, February 20, 2017, at the City of Santa Fe Offices @ Market Station, 300 Market Street, Suite 200, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Romero, Chair
Richard MacPherson, City of Santa Fe
Paul Brasher, NMDOT
Dave Quintana, City of Santa Fe
Ray Matthew, Santa Fe County
Anthony Mortillaro, NCRTD
Thomas Martinez, Santa Fe Trails
Paul Kavanagh, Santa Fe County
Diego Gomez, Santa Fe County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Erik Aaboe, Santa Fe County
Edward Escudero, Pueblo of Tesuque

OTHERS PRESENT

Desiree Valdez, NM Department of Health
Marcy Eppler, NMDOT
David Harris, NMDOT
Wade Patterson, DOT Liaison
Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Keith Wilson, MPO Senior Planner
Eric Aune, MPO Transportation Planner
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Quintana, seconded by Mr. Martinez, to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
JANUARY 23, 2017**

Mr. Quintana said on page 8, it should say final striping and OGFC will be done.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Mr. Quintana, to approve the minutes as amended.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW

**A. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION OF AMENDMENT 5 TO THE
FFY2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Mr. Wilson handed out a summary of changes which is incorporated into these minutes as "Exhibit 1." Mr. Wilson reviewed the document and changes.

Mr. Brasher said regarding Mr. Rogers second comment we do not plan to add anything to that project. It stands on its own.

Chair Romero said this item is for recommendation for approval to the Policy Board.

Mr. Brasher asked how does S100440 end up.

Mr. Wilson said on the second sheet with the table it is clearer. We added the design funding under FY 17 and include the other changes as indicated.

Chair Romero asked are they lumping the design of all of them together for St. Michaels.

Mr. Wilson said the State wants to either add on to the additional contract with the consultant or go out to PRF and have a mega project.

Chair Romero asked will the design be for all of the projects together.

Mr. Wilson said that is what they want to do.

Chair Romero asked is there a chance that certain aspects of the scope of work if complained about will kill the entire project. He hopes it works out but it seems like there would be a better way.

Mr. Wilson said we are going to get the study done that sets how the corridor looks and then the other projects will know how they fit in.

Chair Romero said he understands but thought the study would result in 3 separate projects.

Mr. Brasher said the idea is to coordinate all of the studies in the same corridor. When we get public comment it seems to him that if public comment results in striking down something it could be dealt with and replaced or changed.

Mr. Quintana asked hasn't there already been a study on a road diet on St. Michaels.

Mr. Brasher said it was conceptual only.

Mr. Quintana said so you guys will jump off of that.

Mr. Brasher said he thinks so.

Mr. MacPherson said there was a study.

Chair Romero said it was a 30,000 foot kind of study.

Mr. Quintana asked so the big picture is that there will be a study to make sure that all 3 facets of this corridor will be aware of the other.

Mr. Brasher said probably and they will stand by themselves.

Mr. Wilson said they will have one control number but each project will take on its own life. It seems like that is the direction from the Feds. Coordination.

Chair Romero said they did some simulation about two and a half years ago. It showed that St. Frances to Llano would be able to sustain a road diet.

Mr. Wilson said several things have caused issues to come up. As an example, the repaving of the road caused ADA issues to come up.

Mr. Quintana asked do we still have construction funding for the interchange.

Chair Romero said yes, in S100440.

Mr. Wilson said it will get fleshed out when we develop the next TIP.

Chair Romero said it will be interesting to see how this works. It is a big undertaking. It seems that the underpass could maintain being separate.

Mr. Wilson said if you approve, please move to approve these changes and approve moving forward on the Safety Maintenance Project that just went through public review.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Quintana, seconded by Mr. Martinez, to recommend approval to the Policy Board of the Amendment 5 to the FFY2016 - 2021 Transportation Improvement Plan and that the Safety Maintenance Project move forward.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT PRE-TEEN AND TEEN INDEPENDENT TRANSIT AND MOBILITY PLAN

Mr. Aune said at last month's meeting there were recommendations for some changes from this Committee and comments from Santa Fe Trail. He has incorporated that into a modified document which is what you see on the screen. He went over the document of and explained the changes. This document is attached herewith to these minutes as "Exhibit 2."

Mr. Mortillaro asked how is teen and youth ridership determined.

Mr. Wilson said the driver pushes a button when someone of that age group comes on board.

Mr. Aune said he is ready to present this to the Policy Board on your recommendation.

Chair Romero asked on the last slide would the members on the TCC be voting members.

Mr. Aune said no, they will be advisory members.

Chair Romero said good job, thank you.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Quintana, seconded by Mr. MacPherson, to recommend approval to the Policy Board.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

C. UPDATE OF THE STATUS OF THE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS ON NM599 AT COUNTY ROAD 70

Mr. Brasher said at 599 and County Road 70, there have been 2 deaths over 2 years. We and DOT have undertaken a study to see what modifications we might undertake to reduce the possibility and likelihood for right angle collisions. They were the result of individuals making left turns from CR 70 to 599, crossing 599. We are designing the intersection so you can turn left from 599 to CR 70 but not left from 70 to 599. The design will be at 60% by the end of April or beginning of May. Several months after that it will be completed. It will be around \$400,000. When the Safety Committee met it was decided that the District would request safety funding for this, \$400,000 to \$500,000. Hopefully it will be under construction in 2018.

Mr. Martinez asked so you can't cross 599 to make a left turn.

Mr. Brasher said they have to go around to the next interchange.

Mr. Wilson said that would be La Tierra to the north.

Mr. Gomez said that it is not County Road 70. It is maintained by DOT.

Mr. Brasher said regardless of maintenance the direction we received was that it was identified at CR 70.

Mr. Brasher said we have had public meetings and here were strong sentiments. They were not well attended. This is the concept is what we came up with.

Chair Romero asked would this violate the environmental document for 599. Did that document identify this as full access that will not be limited.

Mr. Brasher said it did indicate full access. He doesn't not know if it has been revisited.

Chair Romero asked would it have to be amended.

Mr. Brasher said it likely will.

Chair Romero asked at what point in the design is the environmental document accomplished.

Mr. Brasher said soon. The end of April or the beginning of May.

Chair Romero asked would that then require an alternatives analysis.

Mr. Brasher said yes.

Chair Romero said he feels the purpose of 599 was to provide a relief route. It is very important. He is afraid if we limit access it will push cars to the La Tierra interchange and will push cars to small streets that should not have that kind of traffic. It is important to maintain full access. Secondly he is afraid if we do something and term it interim that interim could have a long lasting effect and cause the region to put off building an interchange at this location. The interchange is needed. It is on our Master Plan. It requires funding but he advocates for an interchange and that safety money could be used for this interchange.

Mr. Wilson said regarding safety money, it is not necessarily that it can't be used for it, it is because it is a large dollar amount so they scrutinize it more and you need more fatalities to get it.

Chair Romero said that is a good point but has that analysis been looked at yet. It warrants at least looking at it. It is regionally significant and one that touches everyone's interest.

Mr. Brasher said he agrees with Keith. DOT has just engaged a consultant to study the corridor and re-prioritize the construction of interchanges. The Jaguar interchange is one. This one is on the list but not at the top. There are intersections like this all over the state. This is not unique. They all warrant interchanges. He does recognize that fact that this shifts traffic.

Mr. Wilson asked what is the time frame for the study.

Mr. Brasher said we should have the results of the study by November.

Mr. Wilson asked do we need to be spending \$400,000 for this when we can do it in the interim with quick curbs.

Mr. Brasher said quick remedies tend to work themselves into more permanence. Let's do something with structural integrity. It could be that in the study this becomes a priority. There are some gaps in traffic on 599 and people misjudge.

Mr. Mortillaro asked what is the height of the raised median.

Mr. Brasher said 8 inches.

Mr. Mortillaro said people get anxious and could just drive over them.

Mr. Brasher said we try to take the decisions out of the driver's hands as much as possible.

Chair Romero said the same thing happened on South Meadows. We were effective in pushing forward an interchange. This is something he does not think is a good idea. The intent was to provide full access and not act as a formal barrier between the City and the County. It justifies an alternatives analysis. He advocates for that. This pushes them into lots of City roads that are not designed to be arterials. If you do your design analysis it should be based on 65 mph. That speed of 55 is unreasonable. We need to look at that. It is counterproductive to how a relief route functions.

Mr. Brasher asked what are your reasons for an alternatives analysis.

Chair Romero said he thinks the purpose of doing that is to not move forward with a foregone conclusion. It goes through a full process of public comment and analysis. This has a big regional impact. It is part of a roadway that has a specific document that says it is to be full access.

Mr. Wilson asked when you did the public process this is option 4 of the 4 you looked at.

Mr. Brasher said yes. The other 3 were to do nothing, close it or do something else like this. People insisted that we do something. We still getting lots of emails about this. From the news media as well. The design speed is 65.

Mr. Quintana said with the re-evaluation of those interchanges maybe something to consider is not evaluating this intersection so it stays on the priority list so something like this does not preclude an interchange. The traffic moving to other roads was not evaluated at all.

Mr. Brasher said we get a lot of correspondence from people who say they will not drive this at all.

Chair Romero said that is a justified point. It is not just going over options it is vetting them. If he was doing this he would have done a simulation to see how it effects traffic.

Mr. Brasher asked do you think an alternatives analysis might rule out doing

anything here.

Chair Romero said it provides us with enough information so that we know what is the best decision and how that decision effects other things. As far as getting into town, La Tierra is not a good alternative. There is never a perfect alternative but it would tell us that we made this decision understanding all the ramifications.

Mr. Matthew said it will be years out for interchange funding. Will an alternatives analysis take into consideration.

Chair Romero said yes it would.

Mr. Quintana said this would not be a true alternatives analysis. It is more for interim safety. It is important when we evaluate these intersections that we not include an interim improvement on 70. It would eschew the prioritization.

Mr. Tibbetts said it is the number one priority for that corridor after 61. He agrees with Dave.

Mr. Wilson said when we look at crash data and the 2 fatalities, were there more crashes where people did not die. There are a bunch of factors. He doesn't recall there being a strong pattern of crashes. This is not to say that the fatalities are not critically important.

Chair Romero said good point. With the new highway safety manual you can look at the crashes and compare them and get predictions for the future. He knows this is access controlled. Being that this now has full access if you modify that through this plan do you have to compensate property owners for their limited access.

Mr. Brasher said this is where we are at this time.

Mr. Quintana asked who is doing the study.

Mr. Brasher said Lee Engineering.

Mr. Quintana asked are we asking for assistance for doing this model.

Mr. Wilson said he believes so.

Mr. Brasher said they will make assumptions on when Jaguar is connected.

Chair Romero said Jaguar came up because a developer wanted to build it themselves.

Mr. Martinez said this one is one of the ones that is further toward St. Francis.

Mr. Gomez said yes, almost to Silar.

Chair Romero said the Silar crossing was done to get people north of Santa Fe to the middle of Santa Fe. There are a couple of projects that went through an environmental process that considered this being a major access point in and out of Santa Fe.

**D. UPDATE ON THE CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THE FFY2018-2023
MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Mr. Wilson said at the last meeting we discussed that every 2 years we have to do a new TIP. The call went out in January. If there are any questions or comments let him know. We need the project form and ITS checklist for projects. This is to enable coordination with the NMDOT ITS office. This will be a recurring item on the agenda. At the April meeting we will review the submitted projects and rank them.

Mr. Quintana asked is the County Road 70 project good to go for funding in 22-23.

Mr. Wilson said we may not have the re-prioritization study complete before we put these projects in. He will throw that out to DOT that we have an interchange as a priority.

Mr. Brasher asked is the top priority of the MPO this interchange.

Mr. Wilson said yes, the top unfunded priority.

Chair Romero said we need to come together to see what is the best for the metropolitan region. They should be big priorities for the MPO. We should be looking regionally. We can make requests based off the current plans we have. It can be amended.

Mr. Quintana asked would it be appropriate for the City to do a call for projects.

Mr. Wilson said DOT is the lead agency. The request has to come from DOT.

Mr. Quintana asked would that help facilitate this.

Mr. Brasher said it would be for cooperation from all parties.

Mr. Matthew said if that is the number one priority for the MPO and there are other unfunded priorities how would that work. The MPO charge is to look at transportation from a strategic sense.

Chair Romero said it seems like we could do some form of a formalized request that says we think the next big pot of money should go for this.

Mr. Wilson said this process morphs all the time. Any project submitted will be ranked based on the prioritization process of the MTP. It would be good for all the entities to agree on a priority then work together to determine funding for that project.

Chair Romero said it seems like we should go through the MTP when we look at projects. We need to be in the habit of doing that.

Mr. Wilson said there is always room for other projects to come in, mostly smaller projects.

Mr. Quintana asked would it be appropriate for us to get together with MPO staff and do a PIF and ITS checklist for it.

Mr. Wilson said we could do that.

Mr. Quintana said he will spearhead that and set up a meeting.

Everyone was ok with that.

Mr. Brasher reminded everyone of the Open Meetings Act and the fact that a quorum of this Committee cannot be at the meeting.

E. UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Mr. Wilson reviewed the list of projects which is herewith incorporated into these minutes as "Exhibit 3."

The following projects had updates as follows:

S100070 Mr. Brasher said we will need some sort of hand off process when this is completed.

S100120,21 and 22 Mr. Gomez said there have been some concerns from DOT about our location study. We are working on that. We need to revisit Avenida del Sur in the connector. We may have to revise the MOU. We are getting close.

S100140 Mr. Brasher said there are some punch list items to be done.

- 5100160** Mr. Brasher said the wall is completed. There are some seeding issues.
- S100270** Mr. Quintana said there are some simple things to get done only.
- S100350** Mr. Brasher said this is going out to bid. The bridge will be recast off site. It is on schedule to finish this year.
- S100440** Mr. Wilson said we are in a holding pattern awaiting crash data.
- L500219** Mr. Quintana said the pre con is on the 3rd. There will be about 6 months construction
- Chair Romero said we are not doing Guadalupe Bridge for now.
- S100281** Chair Romero said this is almost complete.
- S100390** Chair Romero said this is starting in April

7. MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF

Mr. Aune welcomed Diego and Paul from the County. He said he appreciates their technical expertise. He also appreciates Desiree from the Health Department coming. This meeting is important. We have touched on everything from transit to collaboration in saving lives and the Chair's point of the importance of the MPO. Thank you.

8. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Mr. Matthew asked are we going to have a work shop type meeting on the call for projects

Mr. Quintana said he will call a meeting on the interchange and other things can come up.

Mr. Wilson said you can review that and discuss it at your meeting and at our next meeting. In the April meeting we will review and evaluate projects and make a priority list.

Chair Romero asked does the Policy Board have the ability to add projects. We stay very objective.

Mr. Wilson said the intent is that you who are staff can talk to and consultant with your policy makers and they should be consulting with you on projects. The Policy Board makes the decision so ethically they could, but we as staff would have to give them guidance. When the Policy Board makes a decision there are 2 more levels of approvals. It is unlikely that they would change it. He will go through the process with them at their meeting this Thursday.

Mr. Brasher said he would think the Policy Board has confidence with this Committee and their recommendations and that it has been thought out. He would be surprised if they made changes.

Mr. Wilson said part of the reason they accept recommendations is the Master Plan we can reference.

Mr. Patterson said regarding the Policy Board coming in after the fact, the whole reason your priority process is set up is to avoid political influence on projects. If it is not consistent DOT will not score it very high.

Chair Romero asked is there a concise way to say what projects are qualified for this.

Mr. Wilson explained the list of types of projects qualified and how the funding works.

**9. NEXT MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017**

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

John Romero, Chair



Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer