Public Information Meeting Summary
NM 68-US 64 Roadway Project
La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
December 1, 2016, 6:00 pm
Taos Council Chambers

Meeting Announced in: The Taos News
Dates announced: 11/17/16 and 11/24/16
Mail outs sent: 11/17/16 to 183 recipients

Meeting Attendees

Sixty-five stakeholders attended the meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1           Stella M McGormin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2           Gabriel Sanchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3           Chris Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4           Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5           Mayor Daniel R, Barrone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6           Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7           Alfred Finelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8           Jake Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9           Annette Seina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10          Khaled Khweis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11          Paula Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12          Karlis Viceps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13          Kevin Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14          John Koller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15          Louis Fineberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16          Jeff Stadler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17          Rebeca Romero Rainey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18          Stacey McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19          Jennifer Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20          Vernon G Lujan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21          Robert Clawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22          Jean Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23          Darren Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24          Elida Finelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25          Ben Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26          Dante Chacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27          Brandon Trujillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28          Charles E Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29          Joel Serra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30          Geody Madden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31          Carly Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32          Morten Nilissen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33          French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34          Fritz Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35          Leroy Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Judy Mangina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Andy Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Brenda Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Oscar Palacios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 John Taschek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Tom Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Billy Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Pat Randall, Rio Valley Enterprises, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Keith Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Emelie Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Amarante Choea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Rick Bellis, Town of Taos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 David Mapes, DAFA/Taos Marketing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Adam Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Cory Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Paul Bryan Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Polly Raye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Bell Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Mark Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Raquel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Dean Koop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Jim Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Darion Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Robert Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Elizabeth Palacios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Rita Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 T.D. Haldiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Jean Admire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following project team members were present:

- Antonio Jaramillo, NMDOT
- Stephen Lopez, NMDOT
- Paul Brasher, NMDOT
- Jennifer Mullins, NMDOT
- William Hutchinson, NMDOT
- Ron Shutiva, NMDOT
- Damian Segura, NMDOT
- George Herrera, Souder Miller
- Matthew Nighbert, Souder Miller
- Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates

Presentation

George Herrera gave a presentation on the NM 68-US 64 project. He reviewed existing conditions and presented the latest iteration of the proposed alternative.

Question and Answer Session

(Project team responses are in italics)

Will you be doing traffic counts and all that?

Yes

Will there be left turn lane?

Yes, at the signals there will be left turn lanes for all four directions.

Is there any way we can be in contact, or help in developing those (traffic signals and signs)?

What we’ll do is we’ll work with you on that. We have to follow certain guidelines concerning traffic control devices. And that gives us some indications of what we can and cannot do. That doesn’t necessarily mean that we can’t do what you are proposing, other states have done that, but we would work with you on that. However we have to conform to the regulations. As far as the way finding signs, we did, that was expressed in previous meetings and that is something that we are going to incorporate. We have to make sure that it meets our requirements, but that’s something that we are working with the town on.

Yes, I am with the Taos Valley Safety Association. I am a member of their board. And I am also a treasurer of my local acequia (association), and we’re very concerned about the water quality of the Rio Fernando. Which has the highest E. coli in the valley. And a lot of people irrigate of the Rio Fernando, and when you say the storm drains may drain into the Rio Fernando, we get a little concerned about water quality. Because of the acequias and the riparian areas when we’re around Baca Park towards the Rio Grande, I wonder how you might mitigate any poisons that could get into the Rio Fernando.
We were looking at options, that wasn’t actually covered in our presentation today, but we were looking into the water quality and capture some of the run off and so forth. We have met with David Royal and we know that that is a concern.

Steven Hawk: You talk about the possibility of going northbound to Rivali Lane. Are new options, or improvements being considered that will return from Rivali back to 68?

Are you talking about the Camino de la Placitas?

Steven Hawk: Yes

Not with this project. We did take a look at Camino de la Placitas as part of the study, and we did get some information. There are definitely some problems, and that is not a state route, so that would have to be taken care of by the Town of Taos.

Steven Hawk: And the second question, follow up on the Rio Fernando. You spoke about having to acquire permanent easement for draining storm water into the Rio Fernando, later on you said quote, basically a good part of that storm water would be going into the Rio Fernando. Is there no way that you can direct storm water into an artifice, a storm water system that carries storm water to something other than the Rio Fernando? To an arroyo, to a drainage far south of town? Tell me specifically why that can’t be done. When you look at the intakes at Quesnel and at 68 from there south towards La Posta, anywhere along there. What are they capturing there? Where are the outfalls?

The only other options are detention ponds, acquire more property.

Steven Hawk: So this is all service? In other words if we live on Siler and Rio Fernando, there is no underground capture?

There is nothing there today.

Steven Hawk: Nothing at all?

My name Chris Ellis, I’m just wondering if we’re just ignoring the elephant in the room here? We’re talking about building a four-lane highway all the way up to Quesnel and Placita, and then it’s going to go to a two-lane road. Have you really, completely analyzed how you’re going to get that bottleneck taken care of?

Well you know, this project isn’t going to solve all the traffic problems in this community. There’s just a lot of traffic, but we feel with the additional capacity, the additional signals at Albright, that’s going to create some gaps. And readjusting the signal timing, the realignment of the intersection is really going to help. And as I said before, its not just about, its safety issue, its drainage.

Chris Ellis: And the baby elephant is one-way pairs.
We know that that’s still uh, maybe sometime in the future, but that’s not what we are working on.

As I was looking at those drawings, is there any consideration as to where you’re putting those turning lanes? As to the businesses, to limit the left hand turn coming out of here? At the four lane section of the project, just seems like some of those pictures there don’t show, uh, there’s a lot more businesses than that either north or south of where the four lane start. As you look at it, it limits the access to turn lane into businesses, and it would impact them at some point. And then we’ve also got the consideration of the some of the delivery trucks into restaurants and so forth, and as the light and right of way impact the businesses that are currently here.

That’s a good point, what we did here is this is just for initial design. As we get more into the design, we’ll be able to accommodate some of the medians.

So will we be allowed to comment?

Yeah, we’ll be talking to all the property owners, so maybe I can get your name, and your information, and we can talk to you as we go through the process. Yeah, we know that we have to talk to the community to some degree.

That was actually my comment also. We are actually right there where that drawing is. That would be our property location. And my main concern would be the left hand turn. Currently we have a small parking lot as it is, so if our consumers have no option to turn left, I think that would severely impact our business. Because if I’m driving over there, and I have to come all the way, if I’m headed south, and I’m going to turn in from say Quesnel. Now I’ve got to continue on south, maybe until I hit a stop light, or somewhere else in order to get back to my original place.

And again, these are not set in stone. These are just drawings, and as it’s developed, the consultant will contact you, and take all your stuff into consideration. During the public meeting, it was expressed that the community wanted these medians in there, so that’s why they were incorporated. As it’s developed, then to modify those to accommodate whatever your concerns are.

And then another question. The survey, done with traffic, I mean obviously I’m sure it was done with traffic headed both directions, because in my experience, what I see is traffic is always backed up heading north. It’s rarely backed up headed south. So almost in mind, it appears to be better to have maybe one lane headed, two lanes headed north and a median, I mean a center lane. And that would be the four lanes. It’s hardly ever backed up heading south. Unless, I don’t know, there’s a semi-truck turning into Wendy’s or some delivery. But other than that.

During peak hours is when you see the backups.

I have a question, because if you have a four lane, and then you’re going into a two lane, you know what, people are impatient. You know, you’re going to have more wrecks than you’ve ever seen.
With the data right now, what we want to do is make sure it is done right, it striped right, and signed right and so forth, so.

I still, well, I told you so.

I was just curious, did you, I know with other medians before, there was a question at the Smith’s median about roundabouts?

So at the intersection of Quesnel, and Camino de la Placita, its really tight as far as right of way, and getting a roundabout to fit in there, and then you could look at topography, right through there it is really steep. I’m sure everybody knows to get a roundabout in there on top of that, with the right of way, and the building, it just wouldn’t work. Then you’d have some busses trying to make their way around that roundabout, going upgrade, and it really wouldn’t work in that location.

Also, you have to take into consideration the amount of traffic at that location, and the limits on when a round-a-bout is useful. And so, because of the volumes of traffic, a roundabout wouldn’t function at that location either.

You have proposed on, several proposals to widen the sidewalks, north of the plaza? You’re proposing to widen the sidewalks, which is a great idea, but you’re doing so at the expense of safety of bicyclists, which is a bad idea. You want to look at alternatives for example, try to create bike lanes north or south of that area, so the bicyclists would have a better path to get around.

Actually the lanes would be a lot wider than what a normal lane would be. There’s some things we could do, we could eliminate bikes on one side, could have bikers on just one side, but another option would be to re-route the bicycles.

I guess that's what I’m asking.

Vernon Lujan, Taos Pueblo Transportation Planner: Somebody mentioned Quesnel, that intersection, you mentioned that there might be a wall being designed or planned for that southwest corner. We’re concerned that that might impede future economic development that the Pueblo might want to pursue at that location. And also there’s drainage issues there, because if anybody remembers the history of Taos there used to be like a lake back there for fishing, and there’s a high water table, so there’s a lot, even if you go there now. There’s cattails and things like that growing back there, so um, any kind of drainage, or drainage design you need to consider that areas a high water table. And then, we’re still concerned about the intersection designs, or proposed designs at the Allsups intersection because you mentioned you have Montecito egress and ingress there, just before that Y, and I think that that’s still will add to the confusion instead of clearing it up. Because you also have the Kachina Lodge north entrance/exit right there too, within feet of Montecito and so you might need to use that blue space that you had created there to design something better for that intersection. Yeah, we’re just concerned that you’re going to have to continue to coordinate with the Pueblo, because I hate to remind you, but all those roads are Pueblo jurisdiction as far as we’re concerned.
Right, we plan to continue working with the Pueblo.

Have you concluded surveying the right of way?

That is getting pretty close to being done.

Will that data be available? Prior to the funding?

Well, it will be available, we’ll know exactly where those lines are at, who the owners are and so forth. At some time we’ll actually go and get titles. Are you a property owner?

No, I work for the town, I’m just interested in seeing where the right of way is at.

We can share that information with you.

I’m a little confused, in listening to comments. I’ve been coming to these meetings for a long time, and as far as the historic area, and downtown, people are very concerned about forms of transportation other than vehicles, particularly pedestrian and bicycles. And I feel that you’ve clearly included that in the planning. Even though it’s not on purpose, and there’s some design issues, I understand the design, and I really appreciate that you have heard what people are saying, Thank you.

Early on you were talking about two different types of signalization. One was tied, and sends out to all of them, and then one was more innovative. When you are doing these proposals, I am wondering which of these two systems are you planning on?

We are pretty much thinking of a standard interconnects system that is used statewide. There are some new systems that the department is considering, that have been used effectively in other cities and towns have a form of communication between signals and so forth. I think the department is still considering it.

Yeah, we are. On a separate project, we are doing some, and as we finish up investigations along this corridor, we don’t want to include just this segment. We also want to include the first segment that’s going to be built here in the spring, so it’s going to be a bigger system, bigger coordinated system, so that will help traffic flow a bit better throughout the entire corridor. So we may be able to incorporate some of those aspects into this project, but it may just be a separate project that we do along this corridor so that it’s one big consolidated project.

One other question, on the entrance to the Pueblo there, I know you’ve looked at roundabouts at a lot of different intersections, but I’ve never seen that proposed there, and I’m wondering is that a possibility? Because of so many roads coming in different angles and such.

Well, it’s a possibility; we are looking a little closer at that location. We drove again, through that area today, and it doesn’t have a lot of access points on it itself, so it might be something to think about. So we’re still thinking about those types of issues.
I wanted to congratulate you on your fortitude. I don’t think there’s anybody in this room here who doesn’t see that we have grand four-lanes going into two, as we go through center of town. Unfortunately, towns that were built 75, 100, 150 years ago didn’t anticipate the early part of the 21st century. And people come up from Texas, they come down from Colorado and they have cars. Whether they’re hybrids or whether they’re big gas guzzlers, and I think that you did a wonderful job in laying out for us the members of the town, the difficulties that you faced to try and get a design that is manageable for the budget allowed, and for the aesthetics of your proposal. I would like to think that all of us are grateful on your behalf of working so diligently. And my question is would there be work for people in Taos?

*We don’t know who the construction contractor is going to be. It goes through a bidding process. It could be an in state contractor, It could be a local contractor, and out of state contractor. More than likely, for my team in the past, for projects usually the local bidders are fairly competitive, but um,*

For a true American, if I see a budget of 11-20 million, I'd like to see a little bit filtered into the town. Me, I’m retired, I don’t need a job, but thank you very much for all your hard work, you are a very professional staff.

Yeah, I am interested in the Fernando easement that you need. Where exactly do you need the Fernando easement?

*It’s going to be more than likely it’s going to be on the west side of the road.*

And just one other comment. I think you hit the nail so square on the head when you said alternative routes, because it’s going to back everything up during construction. That’s what we need more than a four-lane through there is alternative routes. Unfortunately that would take cooperation of the county and town working together quite closely. Oh well, it’s a nice thought.

My concern is emergency services getting in and out through downtown. Is there going to be a way that fire trucks and ambulances, police cars so they can get through the intersection better?

*Yeah, the signals will have signal transfers, which allows the emergency vehicles, that they’ll get the green, so it kind of clears the way, so it blocks out the other phases in the signal.*

I wonder if you’ve considered the aspect of wetlands as an alternative to filtering the water? Before it goes into the Rio Fernando? I realize there are a lot of complications with property owners and right of way, but it seems the town should not allow the street contaminated water to enter directly into the natural water source.

*Yeah, I think that is the possibility if we have the room for it. We talked about detention ponds which is a little bit about that same scenario, so that is something again we could look at. And we have done bioswales elsewhere, so we may consider that.*

The realignment of La______? and the highway? What would become of the portion of the village going to abandon?
More than likely it will revert back to the town.

How often does a community get funding for a project of this magnitude?

It varies, however this is special funding that was allocated for this specific reason. So it varies on how many years. It can be from ten years to twenty years. It just depends on when funding is available.

I am glad the DOT and the administration through our governor currently has appropriated this money, and we just want to make sure our community gets the best bang for their buck. This is what we’re going to live with for the next 15-20 years, so the younger people in the audience here are the ones that are really going to take the brunt of it you know. I might not be, in 25-30 years when there is funding again, I might not be around, but they will, and we want to make sure, you know that their coming up with a lot of bikes, pedestrians, and that’s the kind of the way of the world, trying to get away from the use of cars in the downtown area, incorporating the bikes, and walking lanes. One of the things that I did see is there is an acequia that crosses the Casa Fernanda, I kind of point to you, because you’ve been spearheading and just working on the acequia at Kit Carson Park, and the acequia that actually crosses the road there. And I didn’t see that anywhere on the map. That’s one thing that needs to be addressed in this type of thing. Because we want to be sure our acequia stay alive especially in the down town area.

One more thing to add to that. The Department has committed additional funding, currently we only have a little over 7 million dollars that we have appropriated so the District has graciously appropriated those extra funds to fund this so we are committed to this area as well.

And I want to thank you guys, because I mean this is something we’ve been working on a long time, been partnered working county to county and one of the things that we did realize is this was going to happen and so the town took the initiative to take on Salazar. Trying to get that extension through, to repave Salazar and what’s the other one? And we’ll try to use that as alternatives during the construction phase of this so that people in our community have some place to go. And we’ve worked along with you guys we’ve tried to address some of those issues because we know we’re going to have a problem, a traffic problem, come construction. You know, those are ways or avenues, we want to make sure that Salazar extension gets pushed through so that the people can get off the main road during that construction phase. Because we’ve got a lot of excitement going on in the community, you know we are having more and more events, and we’re going to have more and more traffic, so these are things that we want to address. So thank you.

Some places will channel run off into planting areas or trees, and I’m wondering to what extent you would consider those things? In addition to wetland?

I think as the design evolves, we can see what we might need up there.

(Comment about a parking structure). It would solve the problem, and make the whole area much more attractive and solve some of that traffic, and walk.
That would be more the Town, than the DOT. Our concern mainly is for the intersection, obviously traffic is part of that, but as far as a structure is concerned that would be the town.

Will you be posting the progress on the website?

We could potentially do that on the District 5 website. That’s whose district this is. So we can post some updates, we may be able to post the presentation here as well. We also have additional meeting scheduled, so you’ll have another opportunity to see as the design progresses.

Was there any money appropriated for maybe upgrading or relocating some of these utilities that are going to fall under this project? During construction phase of this, or is that?

That is specifically the responsibility of the building company. We’ll be working with the public and the Town of Taos to see what those effects might be. We are putting in underground storm drains. So there is a good potential that some of the utilities will be impacted. Option one is to always try and avoid but sometimes you can’t. So we will be working with the Town of Taos.

Is there any possibility at this stage in the game of putting some of the utilities underground? Have you considered that while there is construction going on?

That is a possibility but that’s a high cost.

Is there any history of snow removal? And what happens with the snow, on left turns? After the truck has gone through.

That could be a potential. We work very hard to clear that, and the District works closely with others to clear that area, but right now they have fair range, so they don’t have the impacts to that. We’ll have to look at the District and how that is coordinated.

Is there any possibility in the bottleneck between Quesnel and Civic Plaza Drive to kind of move it along? It would really impact those businesses. Between that area, and there now an additional one.

There’s a possibility, I don’t know the ordinance here in Taos.
Written Comments

Comment 1: Lawrence Baker

Are there pictures of what everything is going to look like? Are there landscaped median strips between La Posta and Los Pandos? Are there bike lanes the whole way? Is there a turning lane?

The New Mexico Department of Transportation will hold a public meeting for the US 64/NM 68 Project on December 1, 6:00 pm. At the Taos Council Chambers. A meeting notice is attached.

Thank you for your interest in the US 64/NM 68 Project.

Lawrence Baker: Thank you for sending me this document. One of the pictures I was particularly interested in was how US 68 would actually look from La Posta to Placitas/Quesnel. Maybe I missed it. If so, please tell me the page number. We want three lanes from Los Pandos to Quesnel with the middle one as a turning lane and bike lanes one each side. We want median landscaping below Los Pandos/Siler. I hope you have included those suggestions.

Also, I will tell you again that I drive Placitas every day, several times a day, at all hours and stop lights would lengthen my trip enormously. There is absolutely NO reason whatsoever, at this time, to go to the expense of putting more stop lights along that length of road. Those of us who live here know how to get around and if any local gets caught in traffic in the middle of town more than 5 minutes, it’s their own fault and they deserve to sit there. We want our visitors to go slowly through the historic district so that they can see that they need to see and then go park and walk about…and patronize the shops. We don’t want them zooming through town putting pedestrians at risk.

On another note, all of these plans are predicated on the current parking situation and lack thereof. If we had the parking lots that the administration keeps promising us, there wouldn’t be so much traffic because the visitors would already be parked and not going round and round trying to find a place to park. So, your plans need to consider the development of parking lots.

I believe the figures you are interested in are the top two figures on page 35 and the top figure on page 38 (see attached). We will discuss more at the public meeting.

Comment 2: Paul Richard

I was going to attend the December 1 Public Meeting in Taos, but have to go to Texas for a Memorial Service.

I would encourage any future plan to include a bicycle or multi-use lane. I would also suggest that any bicycle or multi-use path be separated from the road by the sidewalk or two foot planted median. Given the limitations of widening, due to historic buildings, a bicycle/multi-use path can be on one side of the road only.

In the last Taos News article about some of the options, one of the town’s leaders was proposing a wide median in the middle of the road with planted trees. I would not be in favor of
that as it would limit access to the many businesses on both sides of the road and would take any additional space away from a possible multi-use path.

Also, can you point me to the person that decides how traffic lights are programmed? The intersection of Paséo del Canyon and Highway 68 has a traffic light that does not turn green going east or west if a car is not in the straight lane. If a car is in the turn lane, it gives the green arrow for the turn, but does not give the straight on a green. This intersection has bike lanes and it is frustrating to sit at an intersection waiting for a car to come.

**Comment 3:** Chris Ellis

Until you fix the traffic light issue, making four lanes on Paséo del Pueblo is a waste. You’re just going to pile up the traffic closer to the Plaza.

Fix lights at:
- Kit Carson Rd
- Civic Plaza
- Siler
- Hail Creek

Fact: Going north out of town in evenings, traffic sometimes backed up at Civic Plaza drive all the way to Hail Creek.

**Comment 4:** Beth Barnum Robinson

Can you please send me the time and events schedule re: the improvements project in Taos.

The following is our schedule:

- **Environmental Investigations & Documentation**
  - Complete by July, 2017

- **Design**
  - Complete by December, 2017

- **Right-of-Way Appraisals and Acquisition**
  - Start by August, 2017

- **Construction**
  - 2018

No other tasks or events have been scheduled at this time.

Thank you Eric for your prompt reply.

Are public notice/input meetings scheduled, or is it too early for that? Please advise.

We, in Taos, appreciate that DOT takes the time to inform the public about the aspects of projects planned for our community. We are even more appreciative that the Department considers the citizen comments in the decision-making process!
It's no secret that there is considerable public interest and participation in Taos as we strive to improve our infrastructure, while preserving the unique character of our community for the enjoyment of both residents and visitors. It is, of course, the unique character of Taos that attracts visitor dollars, which help both the local and State economies; a challenge to balance the old with the new.

Again, I thank you.

We have not scheduled any future public meetings at this time.

Thank you for your comments.

Comment 5: Shannon Romeling

Eric, I was given your info for sending comments to on the Hwy 64 and 68 project in Taos. So maybe you can help me with the questions number 1 below that I sent to the project manager just a minute ago? What do I comment on? This is the link someone gave me but it doesn’t have your info or anything about comments.

http://dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/ProjectsD5.html

Thank you for any help you can give with this.

Hi Stephen, I was recently reached out to by several people who are concerned about the effects of the upcoming road work on US 64 and 68 on the Rio Fernando’s water quality. I currently manage our Rio Fernando water quality projects, including a three year water-shed based planning process that just started.

In addition to these general concerns, I am also concerned about the timing of this work and the timing of my water sampling. I will be sampling the river for E-coli for the next two years, and filtered releases from the road work will affect my results.

So I have a few questions:

1. Is there a document to review and comment on? One person told me I have until December 15 to comment, but it’s not clear on the website what I should comment on, or when due dates are.
2. Is there a road work schedule yet? When will that be made? It will be important that I know the dates and times of discharges so that I can understand how they are effecting my samples. And also to avoid sampling at locations and times I know you are discharging.

Thank you for any time you spend on this. And please feel free to give me a call to chat.

My name is Antonio Jaramillo and I ma the Project Development Engineer for the NM 68-US 64 project. The department is currently working on two projects along NM 68/US 64 corridor in Taos. The first phase is from NM 518 to La Posta Road with an anticipated construction start time in the spring of 2017. The second phase is more than likely the one that you are concerned with is from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita/Rivali Lane. You may submit your formal
comments to Mr. Eric Johnson from Marron and Associates, he is copied on this email (eric@marroninc.com). The presentation that was presented at the public meeting can be found on the district 5 website which can be accessed via our official NMDOT website.

The answer to your second question is as follows:

The proposed roadway construction will begin after the project has been submitted for production. Currently the schedule has the completion of the design plans to be the first quarter of 2018. Please note that the drainage system is in its infancy stage so we are still evaluating our options and how we will be discharging the drainage and handling water quality. If you have any additional questions please submit those in writing to Mr. Eric Johnson. Thank you.

Thank you all for your promptness and information! I will be sending an official comment in later today or tomorrow. The main purpose will be to put in writing the details of our watershed based planning project and the potential overlap between our projects. We agree with the need for the roadwork and support your work. I will definitely be in touch more as your project approaches to discuss timing of discharges in relation to our E-coli sampling. Thanks again.

Comment 6: Jeff Stadler

Below are my opinions and suggestions on the referenced CORRIDOR STUDY following the meeting on December 1, 2016, for which I was speaker #16 and questioned which Adaptive Signal System was planned and whether a round-a-bout was being considered at Paseo del Pueblo Norte as it enters Taos Pueblo.

CORRIDOR/ALIGNMENT STUDY REPORT SECTION 3.6 CRASH DATA has the following summation:

“The cause of a lot of the crashes along NM 68 and US 64 can be attributed to a number of factors, including: lack of left-turn lanes, undesirable intersection geometry, and traffic congestion”. “Corridor improvement alternatives should specifically include counter-measures to mitigate these problems”.

Alternative 2a calls for four lanes with a media-defined left-turn lane from Albright/Tewa to Los Pandos/Siler, which has the potential to be more restrictive than the current left-turn lane, and therefore contrary to “mitigate the lack of left-turn lanes”. I suggest keeping the existing lane configurations from Albright/Tewa to Los Pandos/Siler.

Alternative 2a has mitigated ‘undesirable intersection geometry’ by the re-alignment of the Los Pandos/Siler intersection and the Paseo del Pueblo Norte intersection as it enters Taos Pueblo.

Alternative 2a included Traffic Signal Coordination along with new signals at Albright/Tewa and Paseo del Pueblo Norte as it enters Taos Pueblo to mitigate ‘traffic congestion’. I suggest the most Adaptive Signal System available.

Alternative 2a includes extending four lanes north and south from the current four lane/two lane transition which is north of La Posta and Cervantes to a new transition north of Los
Pandos/Siler. By moving the transition from the Town of Taos Zone C-2 to Zone CBD, which allows for higher business and residential density, you will be forcing two lanes of northbound traffic to merge into one lane in an area that by its zoning has been designed to be substantially more crowded, which is totally contrary to ‘mitigate traffic congestion’. Because the current location works well due to a good NMDOT design in a less dense area, along with the width needed for a wider shoulder to provide for an increased margin of safety for northbound traffic. I strongly suggest keeping the four lane/two lane transition where it currently exists.

In summary, I strongly believe that with the proposed Traffic Signal Coordination, the two new signals, and the two intersection re-alignments, that the current lane configuration should be retained from La Posta to Placitas/Rivali as the best Alternative for this Corridor Study.

Thank you for any consideration to my opinions and suggestions.

Comment 7: Ben Wright, Taos Tree Board Chair

Thanks for the public information meeting back on December 1st. As a member of the Taos Tree Board I was pleased that trees and landscaping are being considered as part of the planning for the project. At this point, it seems that it will be up to the town to step forward to agree to at least partially maintain any landscaping that goes in. I will be working on that aspect.

I am writing today to try and address some of the problems with water runoff from the roadway being channeled into ditches and rivers such as the Rio Fernando. There are ongoing efforts to restore the Rio Fernando to a healthier and less contaminated condition. The runoff from the roadway needs to be considered carefully as a strong source of perpetual water pollution. Taos Pueblo spoke up at the meeting with the same concerns.

There are many green infrastructure solutions to help with this problem. It is hard to offer specific solutions without knowing the details, but constructed wetlands, bio-swales, and rain gardens are some options. I spoke with Bill Hutchinson about some of this at the meeting. His answer let to the same question of the town accepting responsibility for the long-term management. I will work on that, but for now, please consider the reality of this problem in the design of the roadway drainage system. If you are anyone at your office can provide specific examples of these kinds of solutions working in NM, it would help my case in persuading the town to take some responsibility.

Comment 8: Shannon Romeling

Thank you again for your communication regarding this project. I look forward to working with you and NMDOT as the work progresses. Attached are Amigos Bravos’ comments concerning this work.

We fully agree and support the Taos Tree Board and Ben Wrights comments that were sent today. Our comments site a specific example of a green infrastructure method during roadway construction that worked in Santa Fe.
We also provided other useful resources for methods that can be used by NMDOT
(https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/gi-munichandbook_green_streets_0.pdf)

A couple of questions I have that are not included in the comments are:

1. What is a “water quality inlet” as stated in the PowerPoint’s on your website?
2. Could you please direct me to the written regulations that NMDOT will be following for
   this construction? Nathan Sanchez at the County informed me that since it is a State
   project, the Taos County Land-Use Regulations do not have any authority. Our attached
   comments however, do include some language from the regulations that we hope
   NMDOT will consider. And I am curious as to how these Taos County recommendations
   align with the regulations that NMDOT will be required to follow.

Thank you very much for your time, and for the opportunity to submit the attached comments.
Re: NMDOT NM 68 and US 64 Roadway Project

Amigos Bravos is a statewide river conservation organization guided by social justice principles. Amigos Bravos’ mission is to protect and restore the rivers of New Mexico, and ensure that those rivers provide a reliable source of clean water to the communities and farmers that depend on them, as well as a safe place to swim, fish, and go boating. Amigos Bravos works locally, statewide, and nationally to ensure that the waters of New Mexico are protected by the best policy and regulations possible.

Below, we provide comments on the New Mexico Department of Transportations upcoming NM 68 and US 64 Roadway Project.

1. Amigos Bravos questions the use of developing drainage methods that are for 50-year storm events. We recommend the use of 100-year storm event control when possible.
2. Amigos Bravos is in support of enhancements to comply with the American Disabilities Act, and any improvements to bike lanes that may occur.
3. We encourage the use of Green Infrastructure (GI) and Low Impact Development (LID) Approaches such as rain gardens, bio-retention cells, vegetative swales, permeable pavements, etc.
   a. The benefits of Green Infrastructure include: recharging groundwater,
      preventing pollution, reducing storm water volume, reducing impervious cover,
      and decreasing and delaying peak discharge
      9http://njaes.rutgers.edu/pubs/fs1197/intro-to-green-infrastructure.asp)
   b. A specific example of GI that we encourage in this case can be found here:
   c. For more information on examples of Green Infrastructure that can be utilized
      by NMDOT for the NM 68 and US 64 Roadway Project, please see
4. We support the protection of the Spring Ditch during this construction and use of GI/LID to protect its water quality from roadway runoff.

5. We encourage the NMDOT to review the Taos County Land Use Regulations, specifically Appendix 3, Section 4, to utilize methods encouraged by Taos County under the current Land Use Regulations. Appendix 3 Section 4 is included below. The full Land-Use document can be found at: http://www.taoscounty.org/index.php/government/taos-county-ordinances-resolutions

6. Amigos Bravos recently began a NM State Environment Department Watershed Based Planning Process for the Rio Fernando de Taos. This state-funded project will work with landowners and the community to determine sources of E. coli contamination along the entire stretch of the Rio Fernando.
   a. Sampling will begin in January 2017 and continue every month for two years. Approximately ten locations will be sampled each month.
   b. Amigos Bravos has been in touch with NMDOT project coordinators and we are looking forward to keeping in communication with NMDOT as their project progresses.
   c. The NMDOT Roadway project will directly affect this planned E. coli sampling, making communications with NMDOT vital to the success of the state funded Watershed Based Planning Process.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this work, and for your continued communication as the Roadway project develops. Please contact me at any time with questions concerning these comments of the Rio Fernando Watershed Based Planning Process in general.

Comment 9: Paul Figueroa

Potential enhancements with design, initial phase must include opportunities for public art within the Town and its historic overlay zone. The Town, Marke Taos and Taos Arts Council are working towards improvements-permanent-way finding pedestrian ‘map’ Taos Blue Line Trail. This includes design-directionals-on side-walks along NM 68 –US 64 from Quesnel to Plaza Garcia (Taos Art Museum @ Fechinhorse). Crosswalk enhancements – mid block crossings provide opportunities for public art as do raised medians along La Posta – Los Pandos with surface designs. Furthermore, the Town Taos will implement a public art program in 2017. Please share estimates on “limited funding” for “potential enhancements” such as landscaping, public are/design, at the next meeting.
Public Information Meeting
The Federal Highway Administration and New Mexico Department of Transportation announce a public information meeting

**NM 68-US 64 Roadway Project**
*La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita*
CN 5100750

**Date:** Thursday
December 1, 2016

**Location:** Taos Council Chambers
120 Civic Plaza Drive
Taos, New Mexico

**Time:** 6:00 pm – Open House and 6:15 pm – Presentation

**Project Summary:** The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) is proposing improvements to NM 68/US 64 (Paseo del Pueblo) from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita in Taos, New Mexico.

**Public Meeting Purpose:** To initiate Phase I-C Environmental Documentation and discuss the status of project design and environmental studies. Information will be presented on the proposed Build Alternative: Signal Coordination and Roadway Widening of Paseo del Pueblo from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita. Proposed improvements include road reconstruction and widening of Paseo del Pueblo from 3-lanes to 4-lanes between La Posta Road to south of Los Pandos, 3-lane reconstruction from south of Los Pandos to La Placita/Quesnel, pavement reconstruction of 2-lane road from La Placita/Quesnel to Martyr’s Lane, pavement rehabilitation of 2-lane road from Martyr’s Lane to La Placita/Rivali Lane, realign four major intersections, coordinate traffic signals, construct new sidewalks, repair existing sidewalks, storm drain improvements, access management, mid-block crossings, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) enhancements, bike lane and/or bike-share lanes, drainage improvements, and potential enhancements, such as landscaping. The public is encouraged to attend and provide comments on the proposed improvements. Additional project information can be obtained on the NMDOT website: [http://dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/ProjectsD5.html](http://dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/ProjectsD5.html).

**ADA:** To request ADA-related accommodations for the meeting, contact Eric Johnson at (505) 898-8848 at least two days before the meeting.

Comments: Written comments will be accepted at the meeting or they may be sent by December 15, 2016 to:

Eric Johnson
Marron and Associates
7511 Fourth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107

phone: (505) 898-8848
email: eric@marroninc.com
fax: (505) 897-7847
NM 68 US 64 Roadway Project
La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
Control Number: 5100750

Project Summary: The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) is proposing improvements to NM 68/US 64 (Paseo del Pueblo) from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita in Taos, New Mexico.

Public Meeting Purpose: To present Phase 1-B recommendations.

Proposed Build Alternative: Signal Coordination and Roadway Widening of Paseo del Pueblo from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita. This alternative includes the following components:

- Road reconstruction and widening of Paseo del Pueblo from 3-lanes to 4-lanes between La Posta Road to south of Los Pandos
- 3-lane reconstruction from south of Los Pandos to La Placita/Quesnel
- Pavement reconstruction of 2-lane road from La Placita/Quesnel to Martyr’s Lane
- Pavement rehabilitation of 2-lane road from Martyr’s Lane to La Placita/Rivali

Other proposed improvements include realigning major intersections, coordinating traffic signals, constructing new sidewalks, repairing existing sidewalks, new storm drain, access management, mid-block crossings, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) enhancements, bike lane or bike-share lanes (or both), drainage improvements, and potential enhancements, such as landscaping.

Additional project available on the NMDOT website: [http://dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/ProjectsD5.html](http://dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/ProjectsD5.html)
Meeting Location:
Taos Council Chambers
120 Civic Plaza Drive

Alternative 2a Roadway Sections:
- 2-lane road, rehabilitation
- 2-lane road, reconstruction
- 3-lane road, reconstruction
- 4-lane road, reconstruction

NM 68/US 64
Project Area
Comment Form

NM 68–US 64 Corridor Study, La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
Control Number: 5100750

- Please provide comments on this form—letters and email messages also accepted.
- Fold form and place in Comment Box or mail comments to address on other side.

Date

Name

Address

City/State/Zip Code

Please mail or send your comments by
December 15, 2016 to:

Marron and Associates, Inc.
7511 Fourth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107
Attn: Eric Johnson

Phone: (505) 898-8848 Fax: (505) 897-7847
Email: eric@marroninc.com
Public Involvement Meeting

December 1, 2016

Taos Council Chambers

NM 68/US 64 Alignment Study
La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
CN 5100750
PURPOSE OF MEETING

- Project Update > Present Alignment Study Results & Recommendations
  - Project Purpose and Need
  - Summary of Alternatives Evaluated
  - Summary of Public Input
  - Decision Making Process & Preferred Alternative
  - Features of the Preferred Alternative
  - Major Project Issues
  - Schedule & Budget
- Obtain your Comments, Suggestions, Concerns
NMDOT Location Study Process

**Phase A**
- Establish Purpose & Need
- Establish Existing Conditions
- Identify Potential Alternatives
- Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives
- Eliminate Unfavorable Alternatives
- Prepare Phase A Report

**Phase B**
- Detailed Engineering Evaluation
- Detailed Environmental Evaluation
- Conceptual Design
- Select Alternatives for Advancement
- Prepare Phase B Report

**Phase C**
- Prepare Environmental Documentation
- Prepare Study Summary
- Prepare Findings/Record of Decision

**Design**
- Right-of-Way Acquisition
- Construction

**Public and Agency Involvement**
**PROJECT STATUS**

- **Alignment Study**
  - Completed Phases A & B; identified Preferred Alternative
  - Need to complete Phase C (Environmental Documentation)
    - Environmental Investigations
    - Public Involvement
    - Agency Coordination
    - Environmental Documentation
    - Obtain Project Clearance

- **Preliminary Design Phase**
  - Data Gathering (Topographic & Property Surveys, Utility Investigations, Pavement Design, Drainage Studies, etc.)
  - Development of Preliminary Design
PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

- Improve traffic operations
- Correct major intersection deficiencies
- Maintain business access and manage access along the corridor
- Manage street drainage flows
- Correct pavement deficiencies
- Provide for lacking Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities. Compliance with ADA requirements
BASE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN PHASE B

- **Alternative 1** - Coordinated Signal System
- **Alternative 2** - Coordinated Signal System plus 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68
- **Alternative 2a** - Coordinated Signal System plus Combination 4-lane & 2-lane Improvements on NM 68
- **Alternative 3** - Coordinated Signal System plus 4-lane Improvements on NM 68 plus One-Way Pair
- **No-Build Alternative**
PHASE B PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS TO PRESENT INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Local Government Stakeholders Meeting 2/24/16
- Local Business Stakeholder Meeting 2/24/16
- Meeting with Taos Pueblo 3/17/16
- Public Information Meeting 4/28/16
- At that time - Recommended Alternative 2
PUBLIC COMMENTS/CONCERNS

- Pros and Cons of a One-Way Pair
- Pros and Cons of 2 lanes versus 4-lanes
- Automobile, Pedestrian, and Bicyclist Safety concerns
- Need to maintain Left-turn capabilities along NM 68
- Need to address Signal timing
- Emergency Response
- Accessibility to Downtown businesses
- Need for project enhancements/landscaping/art
- Needs for maintaining side-street parking, providing Off-street parking, and Wayfinding
- Flooding and water quality issues
- Accessibility to Tourist destinations (i.e. Taos Pueblo, other Taos destinations)
- Right-of-Way requirements
- Pros and Cons of Traffic Roundabouts
- Need for By-pass
- Overall project support
### Evaluation Criteria/Selection of Preferred Base Alternative

#### Table 7.2: Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Alternative 1: Signal Coordination</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Signal Coordination + 4-Lane Improvements</th>
<th>Alternative 3a: Signal Coordination + Combination 4-Lane &amp; 2-Lane Improvements</th>
<th>Alternative 3: Signal Coordination + 4-Lane Improvements + 1-Way Pair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Function, Operations, &amp; Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fits within Right-of-Way</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matches Land Use Context</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrates Context Sensitive Design Objectives</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriate &amp; Accessible Public Transport Access</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roadway Capacity is Appropriate for AADT</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accommodates Truck Movements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides Adequate Level of Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Addresses Pavement Deficiencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manages Drainage Flow &amp; Addresses Water Quality</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Improves Major Intersection Geometry</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Can be Constructed Without Major Disruptions</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fits Construction Budget and Can Be Phased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Sub-total</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Addresses Actual Crash Data</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Addresses Potential Crashes (i.e. Near Misses)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Accommodates Volume of Turning Movements</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provides Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provides Shorter Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Reduces Incidents of Speeding</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Sub-total</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Complies with Local Plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Provides Economic Development Opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Acceptable to Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Considers Livability</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Provides Infrastructure for Landscaping Opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Impacts to Cultural and Natural Resources</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Provides Continuous Median Left-Turn Access</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Sub-total</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Meets Bicycle/Pedestrian Demand</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Complies with ADA</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Integrates Transit Accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Sub-total</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Road Diet through portions of Downtown
- Major Intersection Re-alignments
- Drainage Improvements & Address Water Quality Issues (Spring Ditch)
- Pavement Reconstruction/Rehabilitation
- Further Assessment of Off-Street Parking Needs and Wayfinding
- Landscaping Improvements
ALTERNATIVE 2a - PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
SEGMENT 1
LA POSTA ROAD TO QUESNEL
SOUTH OF LOS PANDOS TO CAMINO DE LA PLACITA

LA POSTA TO SOUTH OF LOS PANDOS

ALTERNATIVE 2a COMBINATION 4-LANES AND 2-LANES
SEGMENT 1 - LA POSTA ROAD TO QUESNEL

La Posta to South of Los Pandos

South of Los Pandos to Quesnel
SEGMENT 2 - QUESNEL TO MARTYR’S LANE
SEGMENT 2 - ROAD DIET

QUESNEL TO US 64

US 64 TO MARTYR’S LANE
SEGMENT 2 – VICINITY OF MARTYR’S LANE
SEGMENT 3 - MARTYR'S LANE TO CAMINO DE LA PLACITA/RIVALI LANE
SEGMENT 3 - NORTH OF CIVIC PLAZA DRIVE
MAJOR INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

- NM 68/ La Posta Road
- NM 68/ Albright
- NM 68/ Siler/ Los Pandos
- NM 68/ Camino de la Placita/ Quesnel
- NM 68/ US 64 (Kit Carson Road)
- US 64/ Civic Plaza Drive
- US 64/ Allsup (Taos Pueblo turnoff)
- US 64/ Camino de la Placita/ Rivali
MAJOR INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (cont.)

- Geometric Improvements
- Signalization Upgrades & Interconnect
- New Signal at NM 68/Albright
NM 68/ SILER/ LOS PANDOS INTERSECTION

NOTE: ALL RIGHT OF WAY (R.O.W.) AND PROPERTY LINES ARE APPROXIMATE.
NM 68/ QUESNEL/ CAMINO DE LA PLACITA INTERSECTION
NM 68/US 64 (KIT CARSON) INTERSECTION
OTHER MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS

- Storm Drain - La Posta Road to Quesnel
- Pavement Reconstruction or Rehabilitation
- Pedestrian and Bicyclist Improvements
- Limited Lighting
- Limited Landscaping
- New Signing
- Limited Wayfinding
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- ADA Considerations
  - Limited ROW
  - Historic Structures
  - Need for Design Exceptions
  - Possible Re-routing of Pedestrian Traffic
**PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)**

- **Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation**
  - Need for Acquisitions (17)
  - Possible Relocation (1)
  - Construction Maintenance Easement for Drainage (1)
  - Numerous Temporary Construction Permits – Driveways (149)
  - Encroachments
  - Need for Property Owner Contacts
  - Coordination with Taos Pueblo
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- **Hazardous Materials**
  - Initial Findings
  - Need for Detailed Investigations
  - Design Considerations
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- **Utility Relocations**
  - Need Designating and Locating Information
  - Need Coordination meetings with Utility Companies
  - Design & Construction considerations
  - Costs to Town of Taos
Storm Drain and Water Quality

- Need for Storm Water Management
- Water Quality Considerations (Vicinity of McDonald’s)
- Outfall and Rio Fernando considerations
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- **Signalization and Lighting**
  - Need for Upgrades
  - Signal Interconnect
  - Geometric Improvements
  - Need for Temporary Signal Spans
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- Maintenance of Traffic
  - Lack of Alternative Routes
  - Tourist Season considerations
  - Working Hours
  - Contract Time considerations
  - Pedestrians & Bicyclist considerations
**PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)**

- **Landscaping**
  - Strong Public Support
  - Budget limitations
  - Maintenance Agreements
  - Need follow-up with Town of Taos
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

Transit

- Coordination with North Central Regional Transit District
- Need to assess needs
PROJECT ISSUES (cont.)

- Project Agreements
- Signalization
- Lighting
- Storm Drain
- Landscaping
- Utilities
PROJECT SCHEDULE

- **Environmental Investigations & Documentation**
  - Complete by July, 2017

- **Design**
  - Complete by December, 2017

- **Right-of-Way Appraisals and Acquisition**
  - Start by August, 2017

- **Construction**
  - 2018
ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

- Estimated Cost
  - $11.8 Million
Questions/Comments

- Verbal & Written Comments Accepted Today
- Written Comments Accepted Thru 12/15/16

Address to:
Marron & Associates, Inc.
7511 4th Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107
Attn: Eric Johnson
Phone: (505) 898-8848
Fax: (505) 897-7847
E-Mail: eric@marroninc.com