



Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization

"Promoting Interconnected Transportation Options"



Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Monday, October 24th, 2011, 1:30 P.M.

**City Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall*

200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, NM

**Note Change from Regular Meeting Location*

AGENDA

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 10-19-11 TIME 10:24am

SERVED BY Maria Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Roll Call
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 26th, 2011

1. Communications from the Public

2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action:

- a. Review and recommendation on amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review – *MPO Staff*
- b. TIP Project Updates:
 1. Update on the NM599/CR62 Interchange – *NMDOT Staff*
 2. Update on the I-25/Cerrillos Road Interchange Study – *NMDOT Staff*
 3. Update on the Caja Del Rio Road Project – *County Staff*
- c. Review and recommendation on an amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program – *MPO Staff*
- d. Presentation of the Preliminary Draft of the Bicycle Master Plan – *MPO Consultant*
- e. Update on the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture – *MPO Staff*
- f. Update on the status of the Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization – *MPO Staff*

3 MPO Officer Report

4. Communications from TCC Members

5. Adjourn - Next TCC Meeting: Monday November 28th, 2011

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.

SUMMARY INDEX
SFMPO-TCC MEETING
October 24, 2011

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE(S)
ROLL CALL	Quorum Present	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved as presented	1-2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES September 26, 2011	Approved as presented	2
1. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	2
2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION		
a. 2012-2015 TIP Amendment	Approved	2
b. TIP Project Updates		
1. 599/62 Interchange update	Discussion	2-5
2. I-25/Cerrillos Road update	Discussion	5-6
3. Caja del Rio update	Discussion	6
c. UPWP Amendment	Discussion	6-7
d. Bicycle Master Plan Preliminary Draft	Discussion	7
e. ITS Architecture Update	Discussion	7
f. Federal Transportation Bill Update	Discussion	7
3. MPO OFFICER REPORT	Discussion	8
4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS	None	8
5. ADJOURNMENT - Next Meeting: Nov. 28	Adjourned at 3:00 pm	8

**MINUTES OF THE
SANTA FÉ MPO
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
October 24, 2011**

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Santa Fé MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order on the above date by Chair John Romero at approximately 1:41 p.m. in the Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Romero, Chair - City of Santa Fé
Shelley Cobau for Jack Kolkmeier – Santa Fé County
David Quintana for Miguel Gabaldon – NMDOT District 5
Andrew Jandáček – Santa Fé County
Richard Macpherson for Reed Liming – City of Santa Fé
Desiree Luján for Eric Martínez – City of Santa Fé
Jack Valencia for Tony Mortillaro – NCRTD
Tamara Baer for Greg Smith – City of Santa Fé

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Jon Bulthuis – Santa Fé Trails
Robert Martínez – Santa Fé County
Vacancy - Tesuque Pueblo

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Mr. Tim Rogers, Consultant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Claude Morelli, NMDOT
Mr. Michael Wright, NMDOT
Mr. David Quintana, NMDOT
Mr. Paul ??, NMDOT

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Valencia moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Jandáček seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 26, 2011

Mr. Valencia moved to approve the minutes of September 26, 2011 as presented. Mr. Jandáček seconded the motion and it 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 recommendation on amendments to the FFY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for release for Public Review

Mr. Tibbetts referred to the spreadsheet in the packet to share the amendment. The amendment was the Acequia Trail crossing. For the design of the project it had to be put on the TIP to get a STIP control number (required by NEPA). It was a city project.

Ms. Baer asked how the contract would be let.

Ms. Luján said they were using Engineering On-call for it.

Ms. Baer asked if they approved it now for publication what flexibility on cost they would have. She understood that it was an estimate. She asked if it was likely to stay at that amount and if that was a consideration when letting the contract. Ms. Luján agreed.

Chair Romero said they only submit for what they bid.

Mr. Valencia moved to approve the amendment. Ms. Baer seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. TIP Project Updates:

1) Update on the NM599/CR62 Interchange

Mr. Quintana said Mr. Gallegos provided most of the information last time. He showed displays of the roundabout aesthetics and the art work. Bill Hutchinson had contacted Tesuque and Agua Fria to provide some art work. DOT left the decision making up to the respective communities to pick the art. Mr. Gallegos had mentioned that it would be stamped on the concrete rather than using tile. They had a public meeting on October 6th and the artists shared their vision. There were about 20 people there. There was good feedback and the time was too limited for full public participation in the request for artwork.

He explained the design of the interchange (diamond with roundabouts). He showed a diagram of it. It would be a November production for January let beginning construction in April.

Mr. Valencia asked if the roundabout was at the frontage road at South Meadows.

Mr. Quintana agreed. It would have South Meadow on the sign instead of CR 62. They would shut down South Meadows during construction to use the old route. Two lanes on 599 and temporary connections to the off ramps would handle traffic and construction should move quickly. The contract would be about 180-200 days for construction.

Ms. Cobau asked about the cost of artwork.

Mr. Quintana didn't have it but usually it was less than 1% (\$7-8,000).

Ms. Cobau hoped for more simple art work. She referred to the Pojoaque Bridge which was much simpler.

Mr. Quintana said they would be simplified somewhat. They had some concern with color.

Mr. Jandáček said on September 26 he requested from Mr. Gallegos that the existing images be used in the public process. He asked if that had happened.

Mr. Quintana said they didn't on October 6th. These would be digitized and stamped onto the abutment. They didn't go into that process. They needed to get it into production next month and didn't want to delay it further.

Mr. Jandáček said in that case the TCC should be able at least to review the final designs.

Mr. Quintana said that wouldn't happen because they had taken comments from County and City already. City and County staff could see the plans for production but the staff had been part of the review process.

Ms. Baer pointed out that the images here were the same images the Committee saw last time and the Committee had broad concerns on colors and detail. She didn't even know where they would go.

Mr. Quintana said they would be on either side of the abutment as you drive through.

Ms. Baer asked if that meant there were no changes from the last meeting.

Chair Romero pointed out that the TCC was a transportation planning committee. But the art work was less than a technical matter which he was not saying was unimportant but these were more courtesy presentations.

Ms. Cobau said it was technical if they have to get out there and shut down a lane to correct them afterward.

Chair Romero said DOT would be maintaining them. They were responsible for the maintenance. Each organization could determine their own liabilities.

Mr. Quintana agreed. DOT felt they needed to provide an opportunity for artwork but they were committed to get it built as soon as possible. They provided for the minimum public participation. Having art work was better than grey only.

Mr. Paul >> said he was the engineer on the Tesuque bridges. When they took the art work they tagged it and had to do a color by number process because some of what Federico did was a little too detailed. They scaled it and put the color in it. Putting it into the structure itself was okay although some detail might be lost.

Ms. Cobau pointed out that this was a city known for its art and it would have been nice to have had competition among artists.

Mr. Quintana agreed but they had public comment and with the accident history there, DOT felt art was secondary to safety.

Ms. Cobau suggested they could have art competition well before a bridge got in the pipeline.

Mr. Tibbetts asked about colors on railings.

Mr. Quintana said they would be colored and the specific color would be determined during construction.

Ms. Baer liked the horizon part of the art.

Chair Romero said art was in the eye of the beholder. "We all have different feelings on it."

Mr. Quintana said they were all better than grey. They did all agree on the time schedule.

Paul explained the process for stamping the concrete.

Ms. Cobau asked about lighting.

Mr. Quintana said it would be standard lighting around the roundabout. Chair Romero explained it further.

Ms. Baer asked if it would have both pedestrian and bike lanes.

Mr. Quintana agreed; on both sides of South Meadows and 599 as well as sidewalks. The sidewalks were 5' to the bridge and 4.5' on the bridge because of curb and gutters.

2) Update on the I-25/Cerrillos Road Interchange Study

Paul presented the update. They looked at several designs. The diamond seemed to be best. He said the Ramp B movement bridges were deficient and needed to be replaced. They had 9 different alternatives. We were recommending the ones that no longer needed the ramp b bridges and look at a roundabout or signalized terminals. The diamond was more capable but they might have more future demand that divergent diamond would provide. They were not finished with all of the traffic analysis. The public meeting would be on November 16 at Genoveva Chávez Community Center and get public input.

This area was urbanizing. A diverging diamond provided for free-flow traffic. They anticipated firm recommendations later in December. After the public input in November they would bring back recommendations for the TCC. Preliminary design would be done next summer. Their scope was to look at a couple of bid alternatives but they stepped back to consider these alternatives and came up with what they think was the best fit. Not having the bridges on ramp b would save about \$15 million.

Ms. Cobau had a concern that the frontage road to La Cienega didn't function well and they would have to go way out of their way. She asked if there was any way to improve that frontage road.

Paul said with a diamond it could connect but diamond designs didn't work well with continuous frontage roads.

Mr. Quintana pointed out that the intersection wouldn't go far with Las Soleras and Buckner there. And with the southbound onto I-25 you have to weave over 3 lanes. That was a driving force for changes.

Paul said they needed to evaluate the alternatives results. He would provide real numbers next time and what the real benefit was along with future connections. Tight diamonds had real benefit for connections. They were trying for tightly controlled traffic whether they would preserve the right of way or not.

Mr. Quintana said they probably would not vacate it.

Ms. Cobau explained they had Las Soleras reserve ROW for future interchanges. The City knew that area well. They also needed to reserve ROW for the Richards interchange.

Chair Romero asked if this project was for 2013.

Paul agreed. He said if TCC members had ideas to let DOT know. He agreed to come back in December with some answers. The ramp B corridor was an opportunity for a future underpass trail connection for bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian use. They would either go through a roundabout, diamond or signal. The interstate bridges were deficient and would cost \$5 million to replace or have an arch for a multi-modal connection. When they were doing 599 they were talking about Arroyo Hondo for a connection. An arch would be much less costly.

Mr. Rogers said Keith Wilson asked him to start thinking about it. You don't plan for grade separations just anywhere. On the south side the county had been working on the trail along Dinosaur Trail and that could provide for a connection there.

Paul asked for the necessary dimensions needed and he would do it.

3) Update on the Caja Del Rio Road Project

Ms. Cobau said the project now just involved widening and turn lanes along there. They didn't have a nice display today. They had 30% design plans.

c. Review and recommendation on an amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Tibbetts said they got \$11,000 more for this year from Section 12 administration and \$10,000 from FTA. With local match the total came to \$111,000 so they were filtering it into the UPWP. They were making modifications in January and those would go to TPB for approval. They were looking at on-call staff instead of permanent staff because of possible cuts in the future. There was a continuing resolution through March so on-call services could enhance capacity. They were also looking at improving the network as well as demographics, partly through Paul's project - a modified demand audit.

They took \$10,000 from pedestrian and put it into transit so now they were going to reinstate that and put \$25,000 into transit study - part of it on the Zia station. He hoped that would go to the City Council next month. The Council didn't want parking at all. So Public Works redrew access without parking. There would be a waiting area and handicapped parking only.

They were also looking at ITS. A lot of it had a question on messaging or monitoring signs. They would look at acquiring some of that through consulting services to see what was feasible at a reasonable cost for traffic management. It was still a congestion issue.

On safety, last year Worchester IT had talked about bringing 2 groups but now maybe just one group and a UNM intern. The issue was compiling the crash data in a more accessible component on our web site. They wanted to acquire software for MSQ out of Ann Arbor to have uploaded traffic data including a

street view. It would keep a history of traffic counts at various locations. It would cost \$15,000 for basic plus more for added upgrades.

They were still maintaining the simulation software that would be in the outreach section of UPWP. They wanted to have more connection with these projects in understandable media.

He didn't have a complete document for the Committee right now but that was how they were shifting the funds.

Chair Romero said once the City got access they would share it with everyone. Everything that had blue tooth capacity would deliver the messages.

Mr. Tibbetts agreed and it would be consistent and reliable data source.

Ms. Cobau said the County staff was meeting on first and third Thursdays and had noticed safety problems already in the new Walmart parking lot. There had already been one accident. County staff was reviewing applications with developers.

d. Presentation of the Preliminary Draft of the Bicycle Master Plan

Mr. Tim Rogers noted that when the WPIT students came they talked about creating an app for way finding

Mr. Rogers showed a power point and went through the general recommendations. The September draft was on the web site. The plan was to have a draft for public review in November and approve it in December and then start implementing in January.

The City was just awarded Bicycle Friendly Community at the bronze level and was shooting for gold in 5 years with this plan.

He went through each one of the goals and recommendations as shown in the power point.

Ms. Baer said the plan would go to the Planning Commission on December 3.

e. Update on the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture

Mr. Tibbetts said the consultants from Massachusetts presented their draft of ITS. They would have some certificate process. ITS would have several future projects in the system and they would share what was possible. Any PIF project going through the MPO would be included. They were looking for ways to stay up with it. This was all on the web site.

f. Update on the status of the Federal Transportation Bill Preauthorization

Mr. Tibbetts said there was not much to report right now. It would be discussed more when they got closer to the deadline. (End of March 2012).

3. MPO OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Tibbetts said they were finishing up the quarterly report.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM TCC MEMBERS

There were no communications from TCC members.

5. ADJOURNMENT - Next Meeting: Monday, November 28, 2011

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Approved by:


for John Romero, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer