

**MINUTES
COMPLETE STREET ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
JULY 9, 2013**

MEMBERS/ATTENDEES

Linda Barbeau	City of Farmington Downtown Association & MRA Commission
Joyce Cardon	San Juan County Homebuilders Association & City of Farmington Planning & Zoning Commission
Larry Hathaway	San Juan County & MPO Technical Committee Alternate
Virginia King	City of Farmington Public Works
Cynthia Lopez	City of Farmington Community Development & MPO Technical Committee
Joe Kozimor	Consolidated Constructors
Sam Montoia	City of Farmington Community Development
Roshana Moojen	City of Aztec & Alternate on MPO Technical Committee Alternate
Christa Romme	Aztec Chamber of Commerce & Four Corners Economic Development
Anngela Wakan	Safe Routes to School Coordinator

MPO STAFF

Joe Delmagori	MPO Planner
Duane Wakan	MPO Associate Planner
June Markle	MPO Administrative Aide

WELCOME

Mr. Delmagori welcomed the members and thanked them for their attendance and participation.

Mr. Delmagori recapped some of the highlights from the June 5 Advisory Group meeting. At that meeting, Advisory Group members reviewed the values, the supporting goals, and made several modifications. Using the goals and the values, several Advisory Group members drafted potential vision statements. Then the Advisory Group as a whole revised and reworded the sample statements to develop their own draft vision statement.

Mr. Delmagori said that today's meeting would provide an opportunity for a final review of the goals and the draft vision statement. If they are satisfactory, Staff will be seeking recommended approval by the Advisory Group. The second part of the meeting will be focused on the land use context areas and road types.

Mr. Delmagori asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 5, 2013 meeting. Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Wakan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Delmagori asked the Advisory Group to review the Complete Streets goals for possible changes to wording and to consider any new ideas. Staff distributed a side-by-side comparison table of the original Advisory Group draft goals and the MPO final draft goals. The changes made at the June 5 meeting were noted with either red text or yellow highlighting.

Multi-Modal

Mr. Delmagori noted the addition of a sixth goal for the Multi-Modal value which the Advisory Group on June 5 decided to include: "Encourage the local governments to develop a mechanism for constructing sidewalks for infill and vacant lots".

The Advisory Group accepted the goals for Multi-Modal as amended.

Connectivity

Mr. Delmagori reviewed the Connectivity changes discussed at the last meeting:

Add a fourth goal to say; "Encourage the local governments to develop a mechanism for constructing sidewalks for infill and vacant lots".

Mr. Delmagori asked if this goal needed to be included under Connectivity as well as the Multi-Modal value. Ms. Lopez thought it was good to have this duplicated under Connectivity. The Advisory Group agreed that it should be a goal under both values.

Mr. Delmagori said the new fifth goal related to respecting natural land formations when developments are constructed. The Advisory Group was given an example of natural arroyos that were disregarded in the construction of a new subdivision and the resultant flooding that occurred. The new Connectivity goal is to ensure natural land formations are identified and taken into consideration when development occurs.

The new fifth goal read: "Integrate and enhance natural land forms and topographies into the design and construction of roads and neighborhoods".

The Advisory Group agreed that all the Connectivity goals were good.

Health

Mr. Delmagori said there had been no changes or additions to the Health value.

The Advisory Group members had no additional comments or recommendations for the Health value.

Safety

Mr. Delmagori explained there was a slight change in wording to the third goal under the Safety value to allow for better understanding by the public: "Provide context appropriate safety measures in urban and rural settings and for paved and impervious surfaces".

The Advisory Group discussed this and recommended the word "impervious" be changed to "pervious". After additional discussion, the word "pervious" was changed to "unpaved".

Economic Vitality

Mr. Delmagori explained the change in the first draft goal which was the addition of: "(see Safety value)". This was to help ensure understanding of what was meant by traffic calming measures yet did not require repeating the entire list of those measures that was shown in the first goal for the Safety value.

The second goal explained that the words "especially in commercial zones" were added to clarify this goal. Ms. Lopez said that this goal actually only referred to commercial areas and not to residential areas. She recommended the word "especially" be deleted. The Advisory Group agreed with the revision.

Mr. Delmagori read the new fifth MPO draft goal which was actually originally developed by the Advisory Group. This goal addresses having a design that is appropriate in scale and references the desire to have open spaces. The goal is "Develop design guidelines that can be flexibly designed to the scale of development considered; encourage the development of open spaces that attract pedestrian activity and use of the space".

The Advisory Group discussed revising this goal for clarity. The final agreed upon revision was: "Develop flexible design guidelines that can be applied to the scale of development considered; encourage the development of open spaces that attract pedestrian activity and use of the space".

Aesthetics

Mr. Delmagori explained the wording change in the third goal. The words were changed from "San Juan County governments" to "the local municipalities and San Juan County". The Advisory Group wanted to clarify that this goal was meant for all the local entities and not only San Juan County.

FINAL DRAFT VISION STATEMENT

Staff provided a document that detailed the development of the Complete Streets Draft Vision Statement at the June 5 Advisory Group meeting. Mr. Delmagori asked the members to review the final draft vision statement to see if they wanted to make any changes. The final draft vision statement is:

Plan, design, and construct connected, multi-modal, and context-sensitive (appropriate) transportation networks that consider the needs of all users and (which) integrate community values of health, safety, and economic vitality in an aesthetically pleasing way.

Mr. Delmagori explained that the words in parentheses were meant to indicate possible replacement of the word prior to them to ensure the vision statement read more easily. The Advisory Group agreed that the words in parentheses were the most appropriate for making a clearer vision statement.

The Advisory Group agreed that the vision statement was lengthy but they wanted to ensure all six of the values were incorporated. Ms. Cardon said that a vision statement can be wordy whereas a mission statement should be condensed into one concise

sentence. The members agreed that they believed it was important to include all the identified values.

The Advisory Group discussed several possible revisions to the vision statement and the following was the final revised draft version:

The Farmington MPO region will plan, design, and construct connected, multi-modal, and context appropriate transportation networks. These will address the needs of all users and integrate the community values of health, safety, and economic vitality in an aesthetically pleasing way.

After finishing their review, Mr. Delmagori asked the Advisory Group members if they were ready to recommend approval of the values, goals, and vision statement to the MPO Technical and Policy Committees.

Ms. Wakan moved to recommend Advisory Group approval of the values, goals, and vision statement. Ms. Moojen seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Delmagori said Staff will take this recommended approval to the MPO Technical Committee on July 25 and to the Policy Committee on August 7.

LAND USE CONTEXT AREAS & ROAD TYPES

Mr. Delmagori said that now that the values, goals, and vision statement have been developed, the Advisory Group will begin to look at land use context areas and road types. Once these have been defined for the MPO area, work can begin on design guidelines for Complete Streets. The guidelines are the heart of Complete Streets and address how the streets are going to look and the elements they will have as they are planned, designed, and constructed.

Mr. Delmagori gave a presentation to explain the concepts of land use context areas and road types and to show what other cities and departments of transportation have accomplished.

Mr. Delmagori referenced design guideline material from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) and the City of Roanoke, Virginia. Roanoke uses the traditional road classifications of arterials and collectors while PennDOT uses overlay concepts that go beyond the traditional classifications. The road types they have defined are used as a planning and design "overlay" for their road corridors, and do not actually replace the traditional functional classification system.

Mr. Delmagori provided some information from the PennDOT Smart Transportation Guidebook that said "land use context and roadway type comprise the **organizing framework** for the selection of **appropriate roadway design values**". A context area is "a land area comprising of a **unique combination** of different land uses, architectural types, urban form, building density, roadways, and topography and other natural features". Mr. Delmagori noted these were some key words and concepts to consider as the Advisory Group begins developing land use contexts and road types for the MPO area.

The development patterns in the City of Roanoke are described by eight character districts. The character districts provide a general perspective of how land is developed over time by grouping land uses according to building style, development form, and land purpose.

Mr. Delmagori noted that the PennDOT Smart Transportation Guidebook says that, in practice, "land uses do not always fit neatly into the defined context areas, or the boundaries between context areas may be fluid. The planner or designer should use their best judgment in selecting the context that most closely matches the existing and proposed land uses".

Mr. Delmagori showed several photos and descriptions for different land use areas from PennDOT and Roanoke. The photos provided a clear visual image of what the land use area might look like when a road type is linked to it. Roanoke's guidelines have a "preferred multimodal option" for their road cross-sections along with a variety of other options for their planners and engineers. PennDOT uses a tabular approach likely due to the fact that they are looking at an entire state rather than one community. Mr. Delmagori explained PennDOT's tabular approach which lists the road characteristics when the road types and land use areas are linked.

Mr. Delmagori explained how these ideas and approaches might be applied to the MPO region. He said the land uses here include the broad categories of residential, commercial, industrial, and open space. Within each of these land use categories there are many different styles or characteristics. Mr. Delmagori showed pictures from the MPO area that depicted these varying styles within each of the categories.

Residential

- Kirtland area - sparsely populated, spread out, many mobile homes
- Foothills area of Farmington - larger homes, acreage is larger, spread out
- Northeast area of Aztec - housing is denser/closer together, meandering roads
- Dustin Avenue - traditional, grid style neighborhood; compacted housing

Commercial

- East Main corridor - big box stores surrounded by large parking lots
- Downtown Farmington - condensed, buildings close together, parking is consolidated to particular area or is on-street,
- 20th Street - more suburban, mix of commercial uses

Industrial

- Bloomfield along US 550 - sparse, very low density
- CR 350 - businesses clustered closer together
- South of Farmington - buildings close together, smaller properties

Ms. Lopez said there is also a category for Agricultural and believed these agricultural areas should be included in the Advisory Group's discussion of land use context areas and road types. It was agreed that Agricultural would be included.

Mr. Delmagori stated that there was also a variety of road types within the road classifications in the MPO area. The principal arterial is the roadway that gets people across town, through town, and to other towns. The principal arterial will have

different looks and provide different elements (raised median, shoulders, multiple lanes, and oftentimes a speed classification) as it travels from one land use area to another. The minor arterials also look different when comparing Apache Street, Dustin Avenue, and 20th Street. Mr. Delmagori noted some of the different variables on these three streets: sidewalks, bike lanes, two-way left turn lanes, raised medians, and two or four lanes of travel.

Mr. Delmagori said that the collectors are primarily for access to take neighborhood traffic to the arterial system. Similar to the minor arterials, he provided examples of collectors with different looks and varying elements and styles.

Mr. Delmagori presented a virtual tour along NM 516 to show how the corridor transitions as it travels through the different land use context areas from Farmington to Aztec. He also showed pictures of how 30th Street changes as it transitions from west to east through Farmington. Mr. Delmagori said these images can be used to assist in developing the area's land use context areas, the road types, and in linking the two. Staff also provided some pictures of the area showing different current land use characteristics and existing road classifications. Mr. Delmagori also provided a handout showing the New Mexico Department of Transportation's functional classification guideline which provides the current road classifications along with descriptions of the roads.

Ms. Lopez asked if the Advisory Group would be considering any local streets. Mr. Delmagori said they would not because the MPO cannot use federal dollars for local roads. Ms. Lopez said she thought that the Complete Streets discussion should consider local streets and have them included in the design guidelines. The Advisory Group is working on guidelines for the region and, to be all encompassing, local streets should be included. Mr. Delmagori said that because the focus was at the MPO level, the roadways considered would be only down to the collector level. From here, the cities would then have the ability to determine and control how their local streets would look.

Ms. Lopez restated that since the Advisory Group is developing design guidelines for the community, all aspects and roadways should be considered. Ms. Wakan said the cities will ultimately choose what they want anyway, but believed recommendations from the Advisory Group were important. Ms. Lopez added that in many of the rural settings, the street classifications are either collector or local and only the major highways are classified as arterials. She noted that these rural roads do transition, and since the Advisory Group's vision statement refers to all contexts, the local streets should be included in the design guidelines. Mr. Delmagori said this was a good point and asked the members to consider local streets as they answered the questions in the exercise on land use context areas and road types.

INDIVIDUAL EXERCISE & GROUP DISCUSSION

Following the land use context area and road type presentation, the Advisory Group worked individually for about 25 minutes to answer three questions each about land use context areas and road types that were posted on the wall. Their ideas and concepts will assist in developing this region's context areas and road types.

At the conclusion of the individual exercise, the Advisory Group gathered together to discuss collectively the responses to the questions about land use context areas and road types. The following is a summary of those responses and the Advisory Group discussion:

Developing and Defining Land Use Context Areas

1. What characteristics define our land uses?

- Urban & Rural
- Density & scale (setbacks)
- Types of Residential and Commercial (big box store/downtown)
- Industrial & Agricultural Use
- Neighborhood Access
- Natural topography
- Visions - Owner, Planner, Citizen

The Advisory Group discussed who brings the vision forward and the need to have a plan in place for the future. Ms. Lopez said there was a difference between established zoning and when the need arises for a zoning change or special use permit.

2. How do we know we have transitioned from one area to another?

- Street size - Section
- Lighting - pedestrian vs. roadway
- Curb/gutter/sidewalk or shoulder
- Setbacks
- Traffic control devices (stop signs) vs. roadside (commercial) signage
- Mobility and accessibility
- Changes in speed
- Increase in number of travel lanes

3. What will be the names and definitions of our Land Use Context Areas? How do these look and what are their characteristics? What currently exists and what do we want in the future? How can the street enhance the character of the area?

- Urban
- Rural
- Suburban - town center
- Central Business District
- Urban core
- Historic District

During their discussion, the collective group identified more potential names for context areas:

- Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Agricultural
- Mixed use
- Recreational/Open space
- Traditional neighborhood
- Village neighborhood

The Advisory Group members discussed expanding the list to include the many areas of the MPO. They asked how the transitions might connect the different hubs or nodes. The following existing areas were identified:

- Suburban Agricultural
- Rural Agricultural
- Agricultural Commercial
- Agricultural Residential
- Industrial
- Rural/recreational
- Historical Corridor
- Neighborhood Commercial

Developing and Defining Road Types

1. What features of a street help determine its road classification?

- Traffic volume and speed
- Lane widths and number of lanes
- Signage (roadside) - overheads or along the side of road
- Ingress/Egress
- Medians
- Striping - define where vehicle is to be on road
- Traffic lights -
 - one-half mile spacing on arterials
 - progression of signals
 - future use of adaptive traffic control that recognize traffic volume and flow

The Advisory Group discussed typical lane widths and how narrowing them can provide for the addition of bike lanes or sidewalks, as well as providing the visual perception that speeds are slower.

2. How do we know we have transitioned from one road class to another?

- Lane widths
- Pedestrian amenities
- Speed changes
- Landscaping
- Sidewalks

3. What names and definitions will we use for our Road Type system?

Since the Advisory Group did not list any specific names, Mr. Wakan referred to page 28 of the PennDOT Smart Transportation Guidebook which listed road type categories of Regional Arterial, Community Arterial, Community Collector, Neighborhood Collector, and Local. Mr. Delmagori explained how these definitions could fit the MPO area: Regional Arterial would be NM 516 where the speeds are at least 45 mph and have four lanes of traffic; Community Arterial would be in the downtown Farmington area where the traffic lanes are narrowed and more multi-modal amenities are provided; and the Community Collector would be roadways that serve schools, the mall, or other destination places.

The Advisory Group noted that many of their suggested road type names were already listed under the land use context area. Ms. Cardon said the road types and land use context areas are tied together with not much distinction between the two. Ms. Moojen said that guidelines require that efficiency and functionality of the roadways are addressed followed by character and context issues.

The Advisory Group addressed establishing rights-of-way that will accommodate future changes over time. They believed that any standard needs to be able to be applied flexibly. Ms. Moojen said that in most instances, 50 feet of right-of-way is sufficient, but the new Main Street extension in Aztec will have 100 feet so that it can maintain the area's character by incorporating trails and landscaping. Ms. Lopez said that setbacks could be considered when the purchase of additional right-of-way becomes necessary at a later date. Ms. Lopez believed that the rural connections between the communities will become more commercial in character and they could even require less right-of-way.

Ms. Barbeau added that the wide rights-of-way either put a burden on the developer to landscape the area or, if not landscaped, the area fills up with weeds and trash. She added that this is what destroys the character of a community. The question is how to balance the community's desires for beautiful landscaping and the costs for that landscaping and upkeep incurred by either a developer or a local government.

MEETING WRAP-UP

Mr. Delmagori said that Staff would compile the information and ideas generated during the Advisory Group meeting and send them out to the members for their review. He noted that now that the values, goals, and vision have been approved by the Advisory Group, Staff will present this information to the MPO Policy and Technical Committees for their review and approval. Upcoming Advisory Group meetings will focus on defining our own land use context areas and road types.

After discussion, the Advisory Group decided to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, September 10, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

To show support for their Complete Streets recommendations, Mr. Delmagori invited the Advisory Group members to attend the MPO Technical Committee meeting on July 25 at 10:00 a.m. at the San Juan County Commission Chambers or the MPO Policy Committee on August 7 at 1:30 p.m. at the MPO Office.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.