



MPO SPECIAL
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
WORKSHOP AGENDA

April 26, 2016
10:00 a.m.

MPO Office
100 West Broadway
2nd Floor
Farmington, New Mexico

AGENDA
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SPECIAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORKSHOP
April 26, 2016 10:00 AM

This special Technical Committee workshop will be held in the MPO Office, 100 West Broadway, 2nd Floor, Farmington, New Mexico.

ITEM	PAGE
1. Call meeting to order	
2. Approve the minutes from the March 16, 2016 Technical Committee Special Workshop.	2
3. Complete the review of the draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines Document. Presented by: Duane Wakan	1
4. Business from Chairman, Members, and Staff	
5. Business from the Floor	
6. 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 Administrative Aide at the Downtown Center, 100 W Broadway, Farmington, New Mexico or at 505-599-1466 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 Administrative Aide if a summary or other type of accessible format is needed.

FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Agenda Item #3

Subject:	Complete Streets
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	April 19, 2016

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- Complete Streets are a means of designing a roadway so that it accommodates all modes of travel, including driving, walking, biking, and transit.
- Staff has worked with the Complete Streets Advisory Group (CSAG) on content, and design guidelines for the FMPO planning area.
- The Advisory Group held its last meeting on October 1, 2015 and reviewed the draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines document.
- Staff made editorial revisions based on input from CSAG members. Works cited and minor grammatical errors will be corrected or updated on an ongoing basis.
- Special Technical Committee Workshops were held on February 24 and March 16 to review and provide edits to the draft Design Guidelines document.

CURRENT WORK

- Complete the final draft review of the Design Guidelines document.
- Seek recommended approval by the Technical Committee on May 11, 2016.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Provide editorial updates per recommendations from the Technical Committee.
- Seek approval by the Policy Committee on May 26, 2016
- Publish final document and distribute to entities
- Create a regional Complete Streets resolution for regional consideration and adoption.

ATTACHMENTS

- The updated draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines document will be available for review on April 22, 2016 on the MPO website <http://www.fmtn.org/DocumentCenter/View/6835> . Latest edits are shown in red text.

INFORMATION ITEM

- Complete the final review of the draft Design Guidelines document.

MINUTES
FARMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SPECIAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORKSHOP
March 16, 2016

Technical Members Present: Cindy Lopez, City of Farmington
David Sypher, City of Farmington
Paul Brasher, NMDOT District 5
Andrew Montoya, Red Apple Transit
Fran Fillerup, San Juan County

Technical Members Absent: Bill Watson, City of Aztec
Teresa Brevik, City of Bloomfield

Staff Present: Mary Holton, MPO Officer
Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
June Markle, MPO Administrative Aide

Staff Absent: None

Others Present: Larry Hathaway, San Juan County
Terri Kennedy, Citizen, Place Matters Member
Anngela Wakan, Safe Routes to School Coordinator
& San Juan Safe Communities Initiative (SJSCI)
Larry Hathaway, San Juan County

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sypher called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2. APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 24, 2016 SPECIAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2016 Special Technical Committee workshop. Mr. Montoya seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

3. COMPLETE STREETS

Subject:	Complete Streets
Prepared by:	Duane Wakan, MPO Planner
Date:	March 9, 2016

BACKGROUND or PREVIOUS WORK

- Complete Streets are a means of designing a roadway so that it accommodates all modes of travel, including driving, walking, biking, and transit.
- Staff has worked with the Complete Streets Advisory Group (CSAG) on content, and design guidelines for the FMPO planning area.
- The Advisory Group held its last meeting on September 3, 2015 and reviewed the draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines document.
- Staff made editorial revisions based on input from CSAG members. Works cited and minor grammatical errors will be corrected or updated on an ongoing basis.
- The Technical Committee reviewed Pages 1-19 of the draft document at their Special Workshop on February 24.
- Staff will report to the Policy Committee on April 28, 2016 and seek final approval at that meeting.

CURRENT WORK

- Finalize the design guidelines document with the Technical Committee.
- Seek recommended approval by the Technical Committee on April 13, 2016.

ANTICIPATED WORK

- Provide editorial updates per recommendations from the Technical Committee.
- Seek approval by the Policy Committee on April 28, 2016
- Publish final document and distribute to entities
- Create a regional Complete Streets resolution for regional consideration and adoption.

ATTACHMENTS

- The draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines document is available on the MPO website. <http://www.fmtn.org/DocumentCenter/View/6835> . Latest edits are shown in red text.

ACTION ITEM

- Complete the review and edit of the draft Design Guidelines document and prepare for final review at the April 13, 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: The Technical Committee began their discussion of the Complete Streets Design Guidelines on Page 20. Mr. Wakan noted that changes to the Intersection Design section had been recommended by the Technical Committee and Mr. Charlie Trask, Traffic Engineer for the City of Farmington, rewrote this section.

Page 20

- Section is too technical for what this type of document requires; speak generally about intersections for developers and lay audience;
- Introduce concepts but not the detailed technical aspects;

- Good headings and need to touch on all aspects, but provide a brief definition;

Mr. Sypher thought this section was revised because the previous draft focused too heavily on bicycles and pedestrians. Mr. Sypher thought that Mr. Trask was able to address all the aspects of intersections as they might relate to a complete street in just a few pages. He agreed that edits could be made and wondered if a section on intersection design was needed in a document about complete streets.

Mr. Fillerup thought some additional figures or standards that might need to be included in this section. In order to do the links and draw cross sections for roadways of all sizes, he thought it was necessary to touch on what would happen at intersections and give guidance on how to treat multi-modal transportation at intersections. He believed it was necessary to include a level of detail equivalent to other sections of the document.

Mr. Brasher asked what aspects of the section were deemed too technical. Ms. Lopez clarified that discussion of signalized intersections, signal phasing, and what happens with a left turn were unnecessary and these details would be left to the traffic engineer to develop. Ms. Lopez state what is important to know is the “why” for these items, not the specific engineering details of each. Mr. Wakan agreed and said that the original intention of this section was to discuss the differences and the potential advantages of one over the other.

- If detail desired, add not to “Refer to the design standards”;
- Include why these items are important, but exclude the technical details and reference where the details can be found.

Mr. Sypher talked about the need to emphasize both the traditional components as well as complete streets components. Mr. Fillerup added that the document cannot overemphasize pedestrians and bicycles to the exclusion of vehicular movement. If there are complete street links then are there not also complete street intersections? We need to plan for complete streets intersections or are they addressed by the current development code.

Mr. Wakan said this section was originally introduced to focus on the larger intersections on the principle corridors of the region. He said there are numerous occasions where the region’s highways converge multiple times and they are not designed to provide safe passage for all users. This section was to try and balance and bring into perspective the idea of safety and multi-modal use.

Ms. Lopez added that she did not suggest this section be eliminated, just that the language was too technical for most to understand. This section also needs to address an intersection in a rural setting as well as those in more urban settings. Mr. Lopez recommended discussing what is trying to be accomplished in different scenarios.

Mr. Sypher recommended a possible sub-heading of, Safe Accommodations for Bikes and Pedestrians so this section addresses multi-modal transportation. Mr. Brasher said if the design standards provided more detailed and specific information, then maybe all that was needed in this section was a mention of bicycles and pedestrians.

Mr. Sypher agreed that this was one way to approach this section. Each city has their design standards and this document is an attempt to develop a complete streets design concept. He reiterated that the first draft of this section focused heavily on bicycles and pedestrians and the re-write by Mr. Trask is now perhaps too weighted on the side of vehicles. Ms. Lopez suggested showing some of the examples that have been used elsewhere to accommodate all modes of transportation.

- Provide specific comments/edits to Mr. Wakan; or if want to do a rewrite, provide that;
- 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence; "...too small or too large have disadvantages for vehicles and pedestrians";
- 1st paragraph, last sentence; "...while also maintaining the existing street type and land use context..."
- Add to 1st paragraph; Language referencing the design standards to promote a seamless design intervention...but the details of intersection design refer to existing design standards but do so applying the principles in this guideline.

Page 21

- Include paragraph on safety accommodations for bikes: add headings for both bike and pedestrian safety before The Dutch Junction heading;
- Add references to existing design standards;
- Clearside triangle, ADA compliance, and radii crossing - include these into design standards;
- Create section for underground power and street lighting; City of Farmington's UDC makes this a requirement for new developments; consider having this in the design guidelines for new and retrofit developments;
- Recommend get input from fire, police, utility departments, school district, and all who deal with streets (all contacts who sign off on a plat) at all the entities and county.

Page 22

- Include more detail on modern roundabouts;
 - City of Farmington has two planned plus as many as eight proposed for the future - valuable to have some explanation about a two-lane roundabout and not only the single lane;
 - Highly misunderstood currently;
 - High-speed application for a roundabout;
 - Reduces delay;
 - Explain how a roundabout provides for traffic calming;
 - Capacity of roundabout vs. signalized intersection;
 - Image on Page 23 shows that large trucks can move through a roundabout; use of mountable skirt;
- Include a picture (Artesia example) of what is planned locally, project scale, and how it will address climate and landscaping;
- Point out the benefits, when it is usable, and the potential conflict points.

Page 23

- Mega-intersection pictured and says it is an “overbuilt arterial intersection” . All the lanes in the picture are being used, so is it truly overbuilt? Creates confusion; do not use this picture or show something local to demonstrate what is meant by overbuilt;
- Large intersections are difficult for bicyclists and pedestrians because the distances are great;
- Facility design for US 64 and US 550 made the large intersection necessary, but congestion problems were created by the widening; heavy truck traffic necessitated the design.

Page 24

Mr. Wakan said the original draft did not include equity in complete streets. The Advisory Group asked to see some elements on equity and the fair distribution of complete streets.

- 1st paragraph, 1st sentence; “...principles also means...”
- Where does this section really belong - multi-modal? Public health? Safety?
- Would the issue of equity get lost if included in other sections?
- With this heading, the multi-modal, safety, and public health sections are getting additional emphasis that other sections are not; topics here are already discussed elsewhere in the document;
- 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence tries to point out why this is on its own;
- Multi-modal addresses the variety of modes, but not necessarily the spectrum of users;
- Entire document is about equity; include in each section a discussion of equity;

Mr. Wakan explained that equity in this section has a demographic element that is not addressed elsewhere in the document. He noted the differences in streetscapes between North Dustin and Hutton Avenue. This equity is more about environmental justice and knowing how a project will impact lower income areas.

- The equity issue of providing similar amenities for an entire community is not clearly stated in this section;
- Is making a roadway safe, beautiful, wide or narrow based on whether the neighborhood is poor or rich?
- How do we choose where the funding for retrofits is spent? Is it equitable? That is a totally different topic than what is currently discussed in this section;
- Level of service and equity in the community is a real concern in the prioritization of projects (i.e.: portions south of Murray Drive that are still county neighborhoods that will not be annexed while the county-owned Foothills area was annexed);
- Move most of this section to multi-modal, public health or safety;
- For the Equity in Complete Streets section, keep the map and expand on why and where projects are selected;
- Address equity in general;
- New development can address all these issues while an older neighborhood that is already built would be a retrofit and thus might look neglected;
- Concept of new urbanism (Stapleton Airport);

- This document was careful to include residential/rural/urban roads as well as collectors; when spending funds look at equity and consider where is the greatest need (budget-driven);
- Strengthen the language on disproportionality/project prioritization/geospatial elements across region;
- Stress all users (child on bike vs. adult on bike) to help provide context;
- Think regionally in considering equity (emphasize retrofits);
- Where money is spent is oftentimes determined by the elected officials;
- Keep equity foremost when making decisions.

Page 25

- 3rd paragraph, last sentence; states the number one reason for kids not walking to school is distance; this is different from the earlier Safety section where traffic danger is cited as the number one reason;
- Would like to add contributions on land use side on coordinating land use and transportation; impact on cities/entities; acknowledge but not highlight negative aspects;
- Article that discusses how comprehensive plans are being reviewed and combining land use and transportation;
- Land use drives water/sewer and transportation; what one community does affects another;
- Move this section closer to preface;
- Use simple language and say why it is important and that the policies put into place consider the coordination of land use and transportation.

Page 26

- 4th line: "...hazardous undertaking in all areas."
- 7th line: "...the National Highway System (NHS) can render..."
- 9th line: "...to move toward a full balanced approach, it would need..." ; not what we're trying to move away from anything, trying to balance approaches;
- 2nd column, 3rd paragraph; delete all in red font; tired words/cliché;
- How can the use of non-traditional methods be stressed to planning staffs;
- Complete streets have little to do with complying with conventional systems; has to do with finances; projects were not done the way they were done to be conventional;
- The chart should explain why this document was designed the way it was and why the different nomenclature was decided upon; show what the final outcome was, not the draft process; delete chart
- 2nd column, last paragraph; delete reference to pre-WWII; say "...the CSAG selected street nomenclature common in historic US cities..."
- The image shown on the right side of the page is good, but without an explanation of what it is trying to depict, it is too difficult to understand; describe the process and speak to why these things are important.

Page 27

No comments

Page 28

- Column heading should be changed to FHWA from NMDOT;
- 3rd sentence: "...from a high speed high volume setting, in the bus stop location, designers should create pull-outs..."
- Road typologies chosen for complete streets document will not play into the naming of a particular street.

Page 29

No comments

Page 30

No comments

Page 31

- Gutter - Blvd. & Parkway - should be 1.5' and not 6"
- Sidewalk Zones - Street & Blvd. - need an * and delete the word "Cond"
- Add footnote to explain the *

Page 32

- Sidewalk Zones - Street & Avenue - need an * and delete the word "Cond"
- Add footnote to explain the *

Page 33

- Sidewalk Zones - Avenue & Blvd. 2 Lanes - need an * and delete the word "Cond"
- Detached Multi-Use Trail - add * for Boulevard 2 Lanes
- Boulevard 4 Lanes should say Boulevard 4-5 Lanes
- Parkway 4 Lanes should say Parkway 4-6 Lanes
- Add footnote to explain the *

Page 34

- Gutter - Blvd. & Parkway - should be 1.5' and not 6"
- Buffer Zone - Avenue - 3' or 5'; 3' is more flexible with considering a retrofit project in a constrained ROW; avenue and street should be the same minimum of 5'; change back to 5'
- Sidewalk Zones - Boulevard & Parkway - need an * and delete the work "Cond"
- Add footnote to explain the *

Page 35

- Sidewalk Zones - Avenue, Boulevard & Parkway - need an * and delete the word "Cond"
- Add footnote to explain the *

Page 36

Mr. Sypher noted these were great option pages, but thought some pictures did not depict traffic calming tools.

- 1st row, 1st picture - Pedestrian Countdown Signals - safety tool for pedestrians, but not traffic calming tool;
- 3rd row, 2nd picture - Lighting Improvements - safety tool, but not traffic calming.

Page 37

- 2nd row, last picture - Shared Streets, Plazas, and Pedestrian Malls - not traffic calming.

Mr. Sypher and the Technical Committee recommended some pictures to add to the Toolkit section:

- Street trees (this along with the Lighting Improvements picture on Page 36 help to slow down traffic because they are close to the roadway and give the perception of narrower travel lanes)
- Restriping
- Narrow lanes
- Painted medians
- Bulbout plantings (this is demonstrated on the Choker picture on Page 37)
- Rumble strips
- Narrow street parking

Mr. Brasher asked if the design guidelines discussed storm water conveyance, street drainage, and construction materials. Mr. Wakan replied that green storm water, plantings and landscaping were not being included in the document at this time. Mr. Sypher added that the complete streets design guidelines would not get into discussion of these specific items but leave them to engineering standards.

4. BUSINESS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Fillerup thought it was important to have input from all the utilities, police and fire departments, and schools especially when presenting the document to the local governments. Once the draft document is completed, he recommended that the Technical Committee members plan to meet with their local governments, as well, to explain what complete streets is about and the discussions and process that took place in developing the design guidelines. Mr. Fillerup thought these were important steps to take before presenting the design guidelines to the Policy Committee for approval.

There was no additional business from the Chairman, Members and Staff.

5. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the Floor.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sypher adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m.

David Sypher, Vice Chair

June Markle, Administrative Aide