

Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

"Promoting Interconnected Transportation Options"



Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Monday June 29, 2015, 3:00 P.M.

*City of Santa Fe Offices @ Market Station
500 Market Street, Suite 200, Santa Fe, NM*

(Map: <http://tinyurl.com/l6kejeq>)

AGENDA

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Roll Call
- ◆ Approval of Agenda

1. Communications from the Public

2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action:

- a. Review and Release for Public Review of the Draft Pedestrian Master Plan – *MPO Staff*
- b. Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2015-2040 – *MPO Staff*
 - Review of the proposed Future Roadway Network Map
 - Review of the proposed Roadway Prioritization List
 - Review of the proposed Fiscally Constrained Project List

3 Matters from the MPO Staff

4. Matters from TCC Members

5. Adjourn - Next TCC Meeting: Monday July 20, 2015

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6/24/15 TIME 2:38pm

SERVED BY Mark Tibbets

RECEIVED BY Glicia Bastus

SUMMARY INDEX
SFMPO-TCC MEETING

June 29, 2015

3:00 p.m.

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE(S)
ROLL CALL	Quorum present	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved as presented	2
1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. Draft Pedestrian MP Review & Release	Approved for Public Review	2-7
b. Draft MTP 2015-2040		7-
8		
• Proposed Future Roadway Network Map	Reviewed	
• Proposed Roadway Prioritization List	Reviewed	
• Proposed Fiscally Constrained Projects	Reviewed	
3. MATTERS FROM MPO STAFF	Discussion	9
4. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS	Discussion	9
5. ADJOURNMENT - Next Meeting: July 20, 2015	Adjourned at 4:50 p.m.	9

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FÉ MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

June 29, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

A special meeting of the Santa Fé MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order on the above date by John Romero, Chair, at approximately 3:20 p.m. in the Large Conference Room, 500 Market Station, Suite 200, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Romero, Chair, City of Santa Fé
Erik Aaboe, Santa Fé County
Desirae Luján, City of Santa Fe
Richard MacPherson, City of Santa Fé
Ray Matthew, Santa Fe County
Dave Quintana, NMDOT
Greg Smith, City of Santa Fe

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jon Bulthuis, Santa Fé Trails
Charles Dorame, Tesuque Pueblo
Adam Leigland, Santa Fe County
Maria Lohmann, Santa Fé County
Vicki Lucero, Santa Fé County
Anthony Mortillaro, NCRTD

STAFF PRESENT:

Keith Wilson, Senior MPO Planner
Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Erick Aune, MPO Transportation Planner
Nathan Todd, Summer Intern

OTHERS PRESENT:

Carl Boaz, Stenographer
Jason Coffey, Urban and Regional Planner, NMDOT

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Aaboe moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Matthew seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.

1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no communications from the public.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

a. Review and Release for Public Review of the Draft Pedestrian Master Plan – MPO Staff

Mr. Tibbetts said the Pedestrian Plan was presented a couple of meetings ago. He said adjustments were requested and made on the ranking process of the identified projects/studies and were focused on the areas of critical concern. Staff has worked on improvements and refinements to the ranking process and added elements like a high-volume/high speed corridor, the presence of pedestrians and the conditions of infrastructure, such as an upgrade or missing sidewalk segments, etc.

He said 35 locations were identified as areas of critical concern. The upper St. Francis Drive (at the Alamo connect to Guadalupe) was dropped as a result, because it is not a corridor issue but one of location. In addition the upper Guadalupe corridor was added, reevaluated and rescored with a scoring range within 2 points of the ten areas of critical concern. This is along the lines of what the MTP indicates as a steady or necessary improvement.

Mr. Tibbetts said he does not have a complete draft with the incorporated changes, but the changes will be incorporated tomorrow if approved, then released to the public. He said if not approved he proposes a meeting on July 6 or July 20th and coincide with the MTP when everything is complete. He said the last motion was to release the draft if Committee members were comfortable with the document and agreed with the ranking and thought it consistent with ongoing studies and evaluations.

Mr. Tibbetts said should there be anything glaring TCC always has the option not to approve or to approve with amendments. He said there did not seem to be major issues at the time the motion was made and if approved staff would finalize the draft and send out for 30 days by Wednesday.

Mr. Aaboe said it appears the Committee does not know exactly what will be released to the public in the final document. He said he isn't sure which is the lesser of the two evils; to have the timing coincide with the MTP review and comment, or to be unsure about whether this is ready to go.

Mr. Tibbetts said the document has not changed, only the final list of projects. He said staff deleted significant projects and put them into an appendix to be available. He said the issue was to look at the ranking and scope and that was done and all of the comments received have been corrected.

Chair Romero said a deadline is looming and he recalled that members had questions on the document. He said he doesn't know if those questions/comments were addressed.

Mr. Tibbetts said they were addressed and all of the significant corrections were made or that would cause concern to the public. He said the ranking of the areas of critical concern is the objective of the plan and the ultimate outcome is for the areas of concern to be studied and reviewed and to develop specific projects from that.

Chair Romero asked Mr. Tibbetts to confirm that although members had expressed the benefit of prioritizing the list of projects, staff did not include that in the master plan.

Mr. Tibbetts said the purpose was to come up with an objective process to score and rank locations of concern. He said part of the process was to develop areas of critical concern and those *are* the priority areas. He explained that the plan priorities are areas of critical concern of the highest rank based on the ranking scores of the locations identified, along with the other factors. He said the process is not driven so much by public input as much as crash data and coincides generally with what the MTP came up with in many cases.

Chair Romero asked to confirm that the request to look at prioritizing maintenance-type projects, quarter projects and info projects was not accomplished.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was a suggestion and the plan includes ranked missing segments and ranked cross walk maintenance. They are part of the spreadsheet of 250 projects that have been scored.

Chair Romero said he is trying to say that the suggestion he made to identify specific maintenance projects to say the priorities are school zones, trail crossings, midblock, etc., was not included in the plan. He asked if the request to make an overall maintenance prioritization framework was included.

Mr. Tibbetts they were included in the high critical areas that have those. He said an overall maintenance prioritization framework would be an outcome of using the plan to look at the areas of critical concern and develop that. He said this helps to define where maintenance should be done first.

Chair Romero said there are a lot of school zones that do not fall into those areas. He said if the City follows this plan, when they don't have enough money they should only do maintenance in school zones within the areas of critical concern.

Mr. Tibbetts said the areas of critical concern came about by a heat map that shows a concentration of projects. He said there are locations that are a separate high concern and not within an area of critical concern that warrant a high degree of attention when in a specific location.

He said the heat map has helped to guide the specific projects and specific maintenance developed from the general master plan. Currently the master plan focuses on the heat map development in the areas of critical concern and has projects identified in the public input process. He said there are several others that have not been identified or were identified through other means. He added that anything forwarded from the City and the County was incorporated at that time.

Mr. Aaboe asked if there are elected officials or other interested parties urging an immediate release.

Chair Romero said there is City elected officials who are anxious to see an approved plan so the City could begin spending the money they have been sitting on. He said they like to see a list with City Council Districts etc. and the MPO list is prioritized based on need and City Councilors could determine how to use the list. He said some Councilors talked about identifying more CIP money for pedestrian safety improvements and would like a list of projects to apply that money toward.

Mr. Aaboe asked if the list in the draft would satisfy City Council.

Mr. Tibbetts said there are 250 locations. The plan points out problem areas and individual points that should be addressed because of their high priority and ranking and locations are in every Council District.

Chair Romero said it shows individual concerns, but not necessarily what the concern is; whether missing sidewalk, substandard intersection, etc.

Mr. Tibbetts said every location has at least 16 fields. The locations can be sorted, filtered and searched to provide a list of all missing sidewalk segments, or all of the crosswalks, etc. All of it is geo-code and GIS-based and each location specifically identifies the issue, but it does not define the project. He said these are all areas that need further study to look at impact, because there are design issues, vehicle traffic, influence of pedestrian environment, etc. The areas of critical concern are not solely pedestrian issues. They come from what a pedestrian deals with such as high-volume, high-speed traffic crossings, etc. The plan is not 100% complete to give orders to engineering, but all are areas that need to be studied for impact.

Chair Romero said an option would be to postpone this again, but the original project team is reluctant to make changes from the original content. He said several meetings later the document could still be the same. He said if this is what staff wants to publish that is fine, but he does not want anyone to think that the Committee is approving is what had been suggested previously.

Mr. Tibbetts said no one has had a chance to see this. He said if the TCC releases the draft and is not comfortable, corrections can be made and they can re-release the document. He said there is a lot of information and detail that you don't see until you actually go through the plan. He suggested TCC release the draft for public comment for now and get feedback from elected officials.

Chair Romero said he agrees that public input is important, but TCC input is just as important and that has been ignored. He said if releasing the master plan as a plan that identifies areas of critical concern and a document not meant as the MTP or the Bicycle Trails Master Plan that gives a list of projects with specific scope in order to prioritize funding; if that is not going to happen, he does not want to keep discussing it.

Mr. Aaboe moved approval to release the plan for public review as presented for 30 days. Mr. MacPherson seconded the motion.

Mr. Quintana said the point that TCC does not have a list of specific projects is a good one and makes it difficult in future programming to prioritize pedestrian projects not incorporated into a road project. He

said we call this a *master plan* but they have two different kinds of outputs. Mr. Quintana said there is one with project priorities and they can make logical decisions on prioritization. He said these concerns were brought up by the TCC and is how the issues were addressed; or not addressed in the plan.

Mr. Quintana said maybe they should postpone the publishing of the plan and take the extra effort; instead of publishing something halfway there that cannot be used to make funding level decisions.

Mr. Tibbetts said the corridor study on St. Francis identified every pedestrian issue and is one of the top rated on the list in the MTP. He said part of the effort is to make sure that pedestrian issues are applied along corridors and roadway improvement projects, which the plan does.

Chair Romero asked staff what authority the TCC and the TPB have over what has been done. He said he would suggest as part of the approval that the Pedestrian Master Plan Improvement include a prioritization of infill projects, safety projects and general maintenance projects. He asked if the TCC could recommend TPB approve that for MPO staff to follow, opposed to the other.

Mr. Tibbetts said there is an opportunity to do that and staff is here to do everything possible to facilitate anything brought up in any of the plans.

Chair Romero said he has belabored the issue. He stated what he feels would be helpful in a planning document in so many different ways and in his opinion this plan did not go that way. He asked if making it a specific part of the UPWP would make it go that way.

Mr. Tibbetts said as the specific tasks in the UPWP, to develop a maintenance schedule and develop things to help in that process; if that helps to expedite implementation of the plan, yes. He said all of the plans can be amended and are expected to be improved upon every time the plan is revisited.

Chair Romero said he had a lot of questions when they discussed the heat map and it seemed their questions were glossed over and staff kept moving in their own direction. He said he has been skeptical since the beginning and voiced concern at that time. He asked what role TCC has and to what extent staff is supposed to listen.

Mr. Tibbetts said staff has been trying to listen. He said a year ago they presented all of this and they held five focus groups and all of the TCC members and the public were invited. He said that was how the heat map was generated and staff welcomes the opinions of the TCC. He said staff wants to continue to work with individual members of the TCC to have a good workable document. He said this is the third iteration and the MTP has improved.

Chair Romero said the MTP, the Bicycle Trails; any document can be improved, but they did come to a list of projects based off of some rationale. He said this document does not and the frustration is that everything has been placed on hold for the plan. He said when the information is presented to the City the City will have to make their own infill planning and safety planning document, which seems like what this was for.

Mr. Aune said as to the role; TCC will be asked to make a recommendation to the TPB and that is an opportunity to make a recommendation to approve or deny. There is also an opportunity to make a recommendation of the suggested changes, and the changes could be specific to the TPB and articulated and that would then rise to the level of the Policy Board discussion. He recommended if that happens, for a member of the TCC to be present.

He said staff has heard from multiple meetings and he prefers from a Planning/MPO perspective that a list procured for the City is in harmony and does not happen separately. He said the opportunity for the TCC to create a list to recommend to the TPB independent of the Pedestrian Plan seems a sensible approach as well. He said his point is that there could be more opportunity here with the TCC.

Mr. Aune said once the MTP draft is done he would be happy to work with Mr. Tibbetts.

Mr. Matthew said summing up the discussion it seems the TAB and TPB could approve the plan with the condition that the MPO staff develop a prioritized list of projects, an implementation plan, for the City and the County with a timeframe.

Mr. Wilson said he has not seen the document and cannot visualize what is there. He said he knows that Mr. Tibbetts is anxious to move this forward, but he thought this should wait until the next meeting. He said Mr. Tibbetts already has a list of 200-300 projects that could be structured to give short-term priorities.

Mr. Tibbetts said that was presented initially and was voted on by TCC to take those out and they were removed and are now in an appendices. He said all of that has been prioritized and assigned in the areas of critical concern and it isn't any different than what was previously presented, except for the removal of the prioritized list of projects.

Chair Romero said he did not agree with the framework. He thought the initial list was almost a list of public comments ranked by staff, opposed to looking at the entire City and developing a comprehensive plan. He said if this is not going to move in a direction that makes more sense, he would hate to delay this and would just approve this as it is. He said if the TCC wants to postpone this until July 20, they should do it under the context that he is giving up for now.

Mr. Tibbetts said as far as having a prioritized list, whether maintenance or missing sidewalks, that is something that can be worked on by staff.

Chair Romero said he has been asking for that and it made sense for maintenance because there are different pots of money. He said that is why it is viable to have a Bicycle Trails Master Plan and an MTP; different pots of money are used for each.

Mr. Tibbetts said he thought those lists could be developed, but the plan deals with the bigger picture and is more than just a list of projects. The project list will come from presenting the plan and its context for public review. He said the public has not seen how all of that was developed into a process to prioritize and they need to see that in addition to the list of projects. He said the final approval recommendation will be the product of the TCC and that doesn't have to happen until later.

Chair Romero said he is skeptical about moving this forward that it will come back from public review and be any different. He said it could have been different six months ago.

The motion to approve the plan release for public review was passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2015-2040 – MPO Staff

- **Review of the proposed Future Roadway Network Map**
- **Review of the proposed Roadway Prioritization List**
- **Review of the proposed Fiscally Constrained Project List**

Mr. Wilson said the last plan listed all the roadway projects and sources and the first set of tables was to help identify what staff will move forward with. He reviewed the Tables of the MTP:

Table 1- lists the projects included in the last plan that have been completed.

Table 2 - is a new list of projects programmed, some close to completion. They will show on the map as green symbols. Smaller projects are not being listed, because they are an interim part of a larger project.

Table 3- this is the list in chapter five that has not been done and is not programmed. There is a question on the I-25 interim safety improvements, a standalone project identified in the I-25 corridor study. Some of the projects might have been done and a question is if it is still important to list that project.

Mr. Quintana thought they did not need to be listed. He said when a successful application comes through they can amend the STIP to include it at that time. He said on Table 2- everything revolves around the TIP and once the project is put to construction he thought it should be shown as a complete project. He suggested coding projects a different color to reflect those that are close to being done.

Mr. Wilson explained that was a way to show active projects, but they could consider that.

Chair Romero suggested taking off anything physically complete prior to approval.

Table 3- Rufina Street connection was shown on the map, but was not in the table and was actually the last plan.

Table 4- new projects that have gone through the study phase such as Guadalupe Street and Paseo Del Peralta intersection improvements in the Road Safety Audit. The remaining are mostly significant on-road improvements that were identified in the Bicycle Master Plan, primarily to add shoulders to accommodate bike lanes.

Chair Romero asked if he could strike "add bike lanes". He did not want it in the plan and then have to restrict what is put in the TIP and trip the scope of the work.

Mr. Wilson said last week staff mentioned they would release the full plan next Wednesday and were going to move the tables into the plan. He said now they will be a placeholder in the plan. He said these are the documents that members will refer to and staff welcomes changes and will make those before the final document. He asked that written comments be sent to Mr. Aune.

Mr. Wilson asked members their thoughts on Table 5 that identifies the studies. He said some of the questions were on the status of St. Michael's Drive and if a study is still needed, or is it a definable project. He said most were identified for study and many were from the Sustainable Growth Management Plan. He indicated that the blue dots were intersections needing study for specific projects.

Mr. Wilson asked that members review the tables. The tables will be in the appendix and the map will be in chapter 5 with a reference to the tables.

Chair Romero said some intersections did not go through a study before becoming a project, like Agua Fria/South meadows. He asked if that should be considered a new project.

Mr. Wilson said with any of the studies, if a project is far enough along to be defined as a project, he can make it a red dot and it will go on the list for fiscally constrained.

Chair Romero said an appropriate framework for studies would be if the project should be on the plan or not, opposed to a study of what the improvement is.

Mr. Wilson said on the blue intersections, Chair Romero probably knows them and could make those a definable project or not, keeping in mind whether they are regionally significant. He also wanted to point out between Zafarano and Campanas along the Arroyo Chamiso Trail.

Mr. Quintana suggested doing one study along St. Francis Drive. He said they could address all of the intersections by doing a complete pedestrian feasibility study along the corridor.

Mr. Wilson said the next phase once all projects have been identified for consideration of funding, is to move them to the prioritization process and rate them against the criteria in the MTP. He said he rushed through the scoring so members are asked to review that.

Mr. Quintana said he thought 6 and 9 should be flipped.

Mr. Wilson said it was a higher priority, but looking at when they were needed, the frontage road was a higher need than the interchange. He said if the timeframes are wrong their feedback would be good.

Mr. Wilson explained the scoring is time/need. He said the important thing is that members make sure staff did not miss a study or something that should be considered and whether the cost estimates are true.

He said TCC will get the full MTP on Wednesday and he would submit everything on the 13th and create the final table in Chapter 8 and Jason has already signed off on it. He said currently the total list is about \$180 million and the inflation factor has to be applied to the long range projects.

3. MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF

Mr. Tibbetts said the TPB voted to meet August 13th to amend the TIP and TCC will need to meet August 10th to recommend the amendment to the Policy Board.

4. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS-

There were none.


5. ADJOURN – Next TCC Meeting: Monday, July 20, 2015

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Approved by:


John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.