



A G E N D A

Farmington Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee Meeting

**** Work Session ****

Executive Conference Room
City of Farmington Municipal Building
800 Municipal Dr
Farmington, NM

January 14, 2008
10:00 a.m.

**** WORK SESSION ** AGENDA**
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
January 14, 2008 10:00 AM

This meeting will be held in the Executive Conference Room, Farmington City Hall, 800 Municipal Dr., Farmington, New Mexico.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call meeting to order.	
2. Approve the minutes from the November 28, 2007 Technical Committee Work Session.	1
3. Review and revise typical road section diagrams for access management.	8
4. Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan. a. Review the list of proposed walking and biking improvements. b. Review the criteria to be used to rank and prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements. c. Review policies that apply to access management and bicycle/pedestrian plan development.	9
5. Business from: a. Chairman b. Members c. Staff	
6. Business from the Floor	
7. Adjournment	

ATTENTION PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: If you are an individual with a disability who is in need of a reader, amplifier, qualified sign language interpreter, or any other form of auxiliary aid or service to attend or participate in the hearing or meeting, please contact the MPO Officer at the Farmington Community Development Office, 805 Municipal, Farmington, New Mexico, at least one week prior to the meeting or as soon as possible. Public documents, including the agenda and minutes, can be provided in various accessible formats. Please contact the MPO Officer at the Farmington Community Development office if a summary or other type of accessible format is needed.

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
November 28, 2007 10:00 A.M.

Members Present: Nica J. Westerling, City of Farmington
Dave Keck, San Juan County
Julie Baird, City of Bloomfield
Martin Lucero, City of Farmington
Chair Steve Christensen, City of Aztec

Members Absent: None

Staff present: Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Robert Messenger, MPO Associate Planner
Virginia Turney, Secretary

Staff Absent: Mike Sullivan, MPO Officer

Also present: Joyce Cardon, SJC Homebuilders Assoc.
Steve Krest, City of Farmington
Dave Martinez, NMDOT

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Christensen called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. ACCESS MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND STANDARDS

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
**** Work Session ** Agenda Item**

Subject: Access Management Policies and Standards
Prepared by: Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date: November 19, 2007

Background:

The Access Management Advisory Group (AMAG) and the Technical Committee have finalized policies for access management and have begun development of standards and objectives to support the policies. The policies and standards are attached. Since this item was not discussed at the November 15 Technical Committee meeting, it was requested that a Work Session be held to review the access management policies and standards.

During the Work Session, the Technical Committee is asked to:

- Determine the road classifications and their respective definitions, functions, and purposes that pertain to the FMPO.
- Finalize the objectives that support the third access management policy.
- Develop typical road section dimensions that relate to the agreed upon road classifications.

Through research, staff has provided for review additional objectives to support the need for access management. A summary of road section data collected from existing NMDOT and entity documents is attached.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Technical Committee review and develop the draft access management standards.

Discussion: Mr. Delmagori presented the staff report and thanked everyone for showing up. Ms. Westerling said the first thing she noticed that needed to be fixed is the roads listed in the example do not have a city attached. She added the cities often have the same road names, such as Mesa Verde, which is listed as an example. Mr. Delmagori said he would add the cities to the street names.

Mr. Delmagori read the third policy to the Technical Committee. Mr. Krest asked if consolidated shared driveways could be added as an objective. Ms. Westerling said it was covered under the 1st objective. Mr. Krest said that objective was talking about mobility between joint businesses, so people would not need to go out onto the arterial to reach another store, but what he meant was the number of actual access points from the arterial being shared. Mr. Lucero said it would be like a strip mall location, and only allowing access to the arterial from one or two main points. Mr. Krest agreed and said that adjacent properties could be accessed from the shared driveways, and only have set access points to the arterial. Mr. Krest said he did not feel the first objective covered that issue. Mr. Delmagori said the way he understood the request is to take the parentheses out and reword the existing objective, and add the new objective.

Mr. Lucero said locating the frontage road 300-500 feet away from the intersection of a main street is a good idea, but if the frontage road is not engineered properly the roads can jam up. Mr. Lucero said he did not like the term frontage road because it would open up too many issues. Ms. Westerling said she did not like the term frontage road either. Mr. Christensen said the roads do access highways but also serve as other types of roads and have businesses that are accessed. Mr. Lucero said that most true frontage roads have a dead area and are closer to the main road. Mr. Christensen said that is what the drawing looked like and asked that Mr. Delmagori add some boxes that would indicate businesses on the road. Mr. Christensen said the road should be a dedicated road and not a frontage road. Ms. Westerling said a dedicated street could be called a frontage road, even if it is not really a 'frontage road'. Ms. Westerling added to make the frontage road bigger on the drawing and have it showing as a two way street.

Ms. Westerling said if the road has business access off of it, it would not be a true frontage road. Mr. Krest brought up the backs of buildings would be seen from the highway and said that does not give a good impression from the main highway. Mr. Krest said there should be something about facades being included in the objective so the backs of buildings would not be seen. Ms. Westerling said that was a zoning issue and not a transportation issue and the MPO has no authority in that matter. Mr. Krest asked that main street be changed to main line to reduce confusing it with the actual Main Street.

Mr. Delmagori said he would change the objectives and add the other objective suggested by Mr. Krest regarding access issues. Mr. Delmagori said that on page 8 of the agenda there were 8 more objectives which he took from a NCHRP Report on access management and asked if the Technical Committee would also want these objections included. Ms. Westerling said number 8 on the list was more a purpose statement and less of an objective.

Mr. Delmagori asked if number 7 needed to be changed. Mr. Krest said it should be a part of the access management plan but the entities could choose to enforce it or not. Mr. Krest asked if the NMDOT had developers do a TIA for access management. Mr. Martinez said the NMDOT asks the developers to prove they have to deviate from the Access Management Plan with a TIA. Mr. Martinez said the developers need the process of appealing to deviate from the Access Management Plan or the process will become politicized and can undermine the NMDOT efforts for access management. Ms. Westerling agreed about the need for the developers to be able to appeal changes to the access management plan. Mr. Krest said some verbiage needed to be added to the objective and it needs to be fleshed out.

Mr. Christensen asked if some one could explain number 5. Mr. Krest said it had to do with when the developer comes in with sketch plans and the need to discuss access issues for sketch plans. Mr. Krest added that this would objective would fall under the entities responsibility. Ms. Westerling said it was covered under the Farmington UDC and should be covered under the other entities codes. Mr. Lucero said it was a zoning and subdivision issue and said objective 5 is trying to create the opportunity to network and facilitate access, so there will be no land locked parcels.

Mr. Christensen said there needs to be some alternatives for parcels and roadways and liked objective 4. Ms. Westerling said this objective would only apply to the larger roads and not to the small land locked parcels. Mr. Lucero said objective 4 should be part of the entities major thoroughfare plan and the MPO could encourage more alternate routes. Mr. Messenger said the plan will not have any smaller streets in it as the MPO does not deal with anything lower than a collector. Ms. Westerling said she wanted to keep the objective, but when it comes to subdivision road design that would fall under the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Board and not access management. Mr. Messenger said if the development is large enough to impact the regional road ways the MPO should be involved. Ms. Westerling said that if a subdivision is big enough to have a collector road in it the MPO and other Farmington divisions would be involved, however, there are no developments of that size in the foreseeable future in Farmington.

Mr. Christensen asked if the development access off a highway would have impact. Mr. Lucero said the NMDOT would be involved with that and the development would have to meet the NMDOT access standards and typically the entities don't get involved with that process. Ms. Westerling said she could see the need for entities to be involved. Mr. Christensen said that NM 574 is a prime example of smaller developments accessing a highway which then feeds into NM516 and the City of Aztec would like to have some say in the access management of the area, even if the NMDOT is the lead on the access management.

Mr. Lucero said there will need to be a way to mitigate deviations to the plan and that some developers have been upset with local governments asking for road standards. Mr. Krest said there needs to be a policy to explain the mitigation process. Ms. Westerling agreed and said the access management plan needs to have everything specifically spelled out so developers won't try to get around road standards. Mr. Krest said the entities need to adopt the same standards and same mitigation processes, so developers won't continue to say one entity allows this process. Mr. Keck agreed and said it would help in the county to have the access management plan; it would give the county something to hang its hat on. Ms. Cardon said the Homebuilders have stated having the same standards would make it easier to develop land. Ms. Westerling said there should be the TIA mitigation measure and the ability for each entity to change the plan.

Mr. Christensen said that there needs to be some sort of way to regulate the access from new developments to collectors or above because of the impact the vehicles will have on the roads. Ms. Westerling asked if Mr. Christensen wanted the entities to adopt objective 4 and institute impact fees. Mr. Keck said that could be one option. Ms. Westerling said the Homeowners Association and the developers would fight against the objective, because they fought against any impact fees during the UDC process. Mr. Christensen said he wants to see dialogue regarding objective 4 and alternate roads to continue to be considered. Mr. Krest asked if the objective would be part of the Access Management Plan. Ms. Westerling said the Policy Committee would need to adopt it and then it would be presented to the entities councils and commission for adoption. Ms. Westerling said she did not think the Policy Committee would approve of impact fees.

Ms. Westerling said the entities can develop the AMP but the real problem is the smaller subdivision that will never need a TIA. Mr. Krest said it might be a good idea to have the TIA objective in the AMP for that reason. Mr. Keck said the County only has the access issues in the subdivision regulations.

After discussion on the third policy concluded, Mr. Delmagori asked if the definitions for Policy 1 were acceptable. Mr. Krest asked that all speed references be eliminated. Ms. Westerling asked that under the description for function that access be changed to access points. Ms. Westerling also asked that under the definition for urban principal arterial that a statement be added saying this road classification shall have designated access spacing. Similarly, she mentioned that a sentence stating there be designated access points with reduced spacing requirements should be added to the Urban Minor Arterial and said the entity names need to be on the examples to indicate which city the road was in. Mr. Krest agreed and gave the example of East Blanco which could be in either Aztec or Bloomfield.

Mr. Lucero said the abbreviations of the road descriptions need to be listed such as Urban Principal Arterial needs (UPA) listed. Mr. Lucero asked that under the Rural Principal Arterial a sentence needs to be added to state that it is part of the critical transportation infrastructure.

The Technical Committee then went over the example roads. Ms. Weserling said that 20th Street was not a good example of a properly working Urban Minor Arterial even though it is classified as that. Mr. Delmagori said it was only an example of what an

Urban Minor Arterial is, not how well it implements access management. Ms. Baird said that East Blanco is a horrible example of an Urban Minor Arterial. Ms. Westerling said the explanation of the road classification needed to be added to the example column. Ms. Westerling asked that Classification be added to the Example column on the policy table.

Mr. Messenger asked if “identifiable neighborhoods” needed to be kept in the purpose statement for Urban Minor Arterials under Policy 1. Mr. Lucero said it did need to be kept so roads did not get identified wrong which could cause some neighborhoods to become drive through neighborhoods. Mr. Messenger said he was worried about some poorer neighborhoods not having enough political voice on changes to roads. Mr. Lucero said the neighborhoods need to be identifiable and the City of Farmington has never had that problem. Ms. Westerling said that it probably did not apply to the area. Mr. Messenger said he was worried about express ways, etc. taking eminent domain and there being no political voice or method to protest the process. Mr. Lucero said that the Technical Committee is talking about minor arterials, not express ways or freeways. Mr. Messenger asked who is in charge of making the decision to determine identifiable neighborhoods. Mr. Krest said that would be up to the City Planners. Ms. Westerling said the biggest issue is the smaller subdivisions that are causing the increase on minor arterials. Ms. Cardon added the standard definition for a subdivision is two-lots or greater.

Mr. Delmagori said the Technical Committee still needed to identify road classification examples. Mr. Keck said that County Road 350 would be an example of a Rural Principal Arterial, and added that County Road 390 would be an example of Rural Minor Arterial. Mr. Christensen agreed.

Mr. Keck said that County Roads 6100, 3950 and 2950 are Rural Major Collectors. Mr. Lucero asked where the definition for Rural Major Collector came from. Mr. Delmagori said it was the State’s definition.

The Technical Committee agreed to drop the national security reference under the Rural Principal Arterial definition and made no changes to the Urban Collector, Rural Minor Arterial, and Rural Major Collection classifications. Mr. Krest asked where the rural local road definition came from. Mr. Delmagori said that a couple of the Federal Road Classification definitions were combined. Mr. Delmagori added the rural local roads are roads used by very few people. Mr. Lucero asked if it even needed to be defined. Mr. Delmagori said it needed to be defined to keep in compliance with the federal standards. Mr. Krest said that urban local roads need to be defined also. Ms. Westerling said there is a difference between rural local roads and urban local roads, a rural local will have less than 10 houses in a great distance and is not typical, where as an urban local road would be any road in a subdivision serving a greater population. Mr. Krest said the rural local roads may have some funding and the definition should match. Ms. Westerling said the MPO area doesn’t have rural local roads, the roads fall into the county jurisdiction and are very far out in the county. Mr. Keck said there are lots of rural roads that have four houses on a 20-mile road, but agreed that keeping this classification would give him some say over the development of these roads. Ms. Westerling asked if the MPO and entities could still get funding with the combined definition. Mr. Martinez said the funding would still be available since the definition fell within the Federal standards.

Mr. Krest asked what the difference is between a frontage road and an access road. Ms. Westerling said it is the purpose and need and the control of access that define the difference between the two road types. Ms. Westerling said an access road is a local road adjacent to arterial that provides access to local properties. Mr. Messenger said that most access roads run parallel to the arterials. Mr. Lucero said some access roads do not run parallel to the arterial and he has seen some access roads go into nowhere. Ms. Westerling said access roads provide access to property as an alternative to accessing the arterial over and over again.

With no more discussion on the first policy, Mr. Delmagori presented the changes to Policy 2. Ms. Westerling said the Policy needed to match the UDC. Mr. Krest asked why the MPO needed this policy. Ms. Westerling said the MPO was asking for this policy to be adopted to ensure consistency between the entities. Mr. Keck said it would help the county enforce planning. Ms. Cardon said it would also make it easier for developers to have one set of standards.

Mr. Krest asked the MPO to supply drawings of the road sections. Mr. Delmagori said he could do that at the next meeting and had not done so to this point because he wanted dimensions to be agreed upon first.

Mr. Krest said the state right-of-way requirement is 120 feet. Mr. Martinez said he believed it to be 150 feet. Ms. Westerling said it was a good idea to ask for the rights-of-way before a development goes in, but to retro-fit the rights-of-way now would be very difficult.

Mr. Krest said the first three right-of-way requirements are good, but he did not know about the rest. Mr. Keck said the requirements for rural and urban should match. Mr. Martinez said that 40 feet for a frontage road is really small. Mr. Lucero said frontage roads should have 60 foot of right-of-way. Ms. Westerling said 60 foot right of way for a frontage road is ideal but in some circumstances that much right-of-way may not be attainable. Mr. Lucero suggested the frontage right-of-way be 40-60 feet, but not less than 40 feet.

The Technical Committee agreed to have a ROW dimension of 100' for both types of principal arterials, 80' for both types of minor arterials, 60' for urban collectors, 80' for rural major collectors, 60' for rural locals, and 40-60' for frontage roads.

Mr. Delmagori asked if anyone had any comments about the sidewalk standards in policy 2. Ms. Westerling said 6 foot sidewalks should be the standard, but the homebuilders and Technical Advisory Committee will not agree to that. Ms. Baird said the City of Bloomfield changed the 4 foot sidewalk regulation. Ms. Westerling said the City of Farmington changed from 4 foot sidewalks to 5 foot sidewalks. Mr. Lucero said the Farmington City Council can change the standard to 4 foot. Mr. Krest said the 5 foot minimum should be used as the future standard. Ms. Westerling said 5 foot is about the smallest dimension for a good sidewalk.

Mr. Krest asked what the standard for bike lanes should be. Mr. Christensen said the bike and walking paths need to be separate. Mr. Delmagori said that on rural roads it may be difficult for the two to be separated. Mr. Keck said that if the standards for

bike lanes and sidewalks don't have some sort of amendment process there will be sidewalks and bike lanes in the middle of nowhere. Mr. Lucero said the three tier system should be used in considering these standards. Mr. Lucero asked what the sidewalk buffer zone would be. Ms. Westerling suggested it be 5 feet.

Mr. Christensen said the MPO is a good vehicle to get these standards done and in the entities systems. Mr. Christensen said the Bicycle/Pedestrian plan will also be an added benefit for the area. Mr. Keck said NM574 would be a good example of where these standards should be implemented and will be really useful to the area.

Mr. Christensen said the MPO staff can leave in the right-of-way information but he would like to see the road section drawings Mr. Krest suggested before going further. Mr. Krest suggested the Technical Committee direct the MPO staff to put together drawings for the next meeting. Ms. Westerling said the drive lanes need to be 12-foot each at minimum.

Action: Ms. Westerling motioned and Mr. Lucero seconded the Technical Committee direct the MPO staff to have road section drawings for the next Technical Committee meeting. The motion passed unanimously 5-0.

3. BUSINESS FROM:

- A. Chairman: None
- B. Business from Members: None
- C. Business from Staff: None

4. BUSINESS FROM FLOOR: None

5. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Christensen adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Secretary, Virginia Turney

Chair, Steve Christensen

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	Access Management
Prepared by:	Joe Delmagori, MPO Planner
Date:	January 4, 2008

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- Access Management policies have been finalized with the Technical Committee.
- Eight road classifications and their respective definitions, functions, and purposes have been completed.
- Ongoing development of standards and objectives to support the policies.

CURRENT WORK

- Staff will review typical road sections that show ROW, travel lanes, medians, and bike/pedestrian facilities with the Technical Committee on January 14.
- Access management policies and standards that relate to bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be reviewed in conjunction with the report on the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Development of standard driveway and intersection spacing, corner clearance, and speed limit ranges.
- Access management standards for medians.

BACKUP MATERIAL

- A summary of road section data collected from existing NMDOT and entity documents, which also includes suggested dimensions that were used to develop the road sections.
- Draft diagrams of typical road sections for each classification.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Technical Committee review and revise typical road sections for access management.

**FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item**

Subject:	Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
Prepared by:	Robert Messenger, MPO Associate Planner
Date:	January 7, 2008

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- The Technical and Policy Committees have reviewed evaluation criteria and policies.
- A list of proposed walking and biking improvements has been developed.
- The Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Group (BPAG) selected an initial list of 27 priority projects at the December 3 meeting.

CURRENT WORK

- Finalizing evaluation criteria to rank and prioritize proposed projects.
- Access management policies and standards that relate to bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be reviewed in conjunction with this report.
- Refinement of cost estimates for proposed projects.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Development of bicycle/pedestrian standards for all road classifications as well as for new commercial and residential developments.
- Work with entity staff to evaluate and prioritize projects into short, medium, and long range lists.

BACKUP MATERIAL

- List of proposed walking and biking projects.
- Maps of pedestrian and bicycle networks for the MPO and the entities (will be available at the meeting).
- Draft evaluation criteria
- Draft policies:
 - a. Policies that apply to Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan and Access Management Plan.
 - b. Policies that only apply to Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- It is recommended that the Technical Committee:
- a. Review the list of proposed walking and biking improvements.
 - b. Review the criteria to be used to rank and prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements.
 - c. Review policies that apply to access management and bicycle/pedestrian plan development.