Public Information Meeting Summary
NM 68-US 64 Roadway Project
La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
January 11, 2018
Taos County Commission Chambers

Meeting Announced in: The Taos News
Dates announced: December 27, 2017 & January 10, 2018
Mail outs sent: December 27, 2017 to 176 addresses

Meeting Attendees

Forty-four people attended the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Joe Zupan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Phillip Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Anita Briscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dennis Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fred Robbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jose Lovato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jim Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tom Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jerry Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Polly Raye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 John Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ramon F. Pacheco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Amy L. Pacheco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Andrew Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Councillor Fritz Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Christy Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 John Briscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pam English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Paula Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Don Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Jeff Stradler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Patrick Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Fred Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Cid Backer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Rick Bellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Stacey McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Keith Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Daniel Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Bobby Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Leandro Cordova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Walter Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Mayor Daniel R. Barrone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following project team member were present:

- Anthony Lujan, NMDOT
- Antonio Jaramillo, NMDOT
- Lawrence Lopez, NMDOT
- Jennifer Mullins, NMDOT
- Angela Valdez, Souder Miller
- Matthew Nighbert, Souder Miller
- Eric Johnson, Marron and Associates

**Presentation**

Antonio Jaramillo introduced the project team and reviewed the meeting purpose. His presentation included the following: project intent, roadway typical sections, major intersection improvements, proposed bio-swale locations, other improvements, and project updates.

**Question and Answer Session**

*(Project team responses are in italics)*

Anonymous: Anthony, I told you Phase A has never been brought before this community, and you said that was before your time. George Herrera in December 2016, and you were at that meeting, when I pressed him on that question, he said no, it had never been brought to this community. If you can’t explain that, maybe the deputy secretary has an answer. How did you leap frog over the Phase A study?

*Phase A is an opportunity to come up with alternatives. When you go into the Phase B, it is a more detailed analysis, and we did have multiple meetings with Phase B.*

Anonymous: But the alternatives, that you describe in great detail, the Phase A alternatives were never brought to the community.

*We can look at that. If we don’t answer your question tonight, we will follow up in written form.*

---

**Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 Paul Bryan Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Mark K. Kemper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Cindy Spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Larry Mapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Pat Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Boyd Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Danielle Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Michael Santistevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Roy Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Mrs. Roy Cunningham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous: Right now, the point of constriction is just yards north of La Posta Road. What’s the transportation engineering logic? My concern is you are moving that constriction north, and greater constriction, and the stage is being laid for one-way pairs in the future.

We are moving the four-lane section further north to allow for more capacity. We did a traffic model, and projected the traffic up to 20 years and see how it reacts. Because of the restriction of the right-of-way, we moved it as far north as we can for the traffic flow.

Roy Cunningham: Why haven’t property owners been notified before?

We will be conducting property owner interviews, at the end of this month and beginning of next month. We’ve had multiple public meetings, advertising, and that’s how we get the word out to the public.

Roy Cunningham: I am talking about the property owners that will directly be affected.

You guys will get individual meetings with the design team to look at your specific needs at the end of this month or early next month.

Roy Cunningham: Then you are actually going to contact us, and we will get to meet? Better late than never.

Daniel Pritchard: Can you summarize the comments you received and the actions taken since last meeting?

There are some suggestions we did incorporate. At Siler, to have dedicated left turn lane, and shared right turn lane. Towards Albright. We did incorporate that. Another suggestion was about reducing locations of where we have dedicated left turn lanes, and raised medians. We won’t get rid of the medians, but will stripe them out. Still channelizing traffic through there. Also suggested adding sidewalks/crosswalks, and we are still looking into that.

Daniel Pritchard: Was that the crosswalk at Quesnel? I know you mentioned that was problematic from the ADA standpoint. Can you go into that more?

That location there are ADA challenges. On the east, some existing steps going up, and people with disabilities can’t traverse that. Because of the restrictions with the right-of-way, we are trying to channelize the pedestrians to the west side. Because we are providing an ADA compliant sidewalk on that side, people will do the path of least resistance. We understand that. But due to the operations of the signal and the geometry of the roadway that is why we are channelizing the pedestrians.

Anonymous: What is the likelihood of getting better lighting? We keep having pedestrian deaths. It’s like four a month. Smart light/LED, we can have those functions to turn off, turn on.

The lighting is going to be at the signalized intersections currently, but we are working with the city to incorporate light along the corridor. That has not been finalized yet.
Anonymous: Wouldn’t the (electric) cooperative be involved in that discussion?

*With the plans, we will obviously put conduit in there to accommodate any services we will need. But we would definitely need to consult with the power company. Our utility section will probably be contacting you.*

John Miller: Can you talk more about the storm drains you will have on the streets?

_We are looking at storm drains along the corridor. It stops at Quesnel. We have it on the south, and it drains into the Rio Fernando._

John Miller: I know you are going to clean it first? Not just dump it into the Rio Fernando?

_We have these catch basins, oil water separators. We will get the floatables and allow for the cleaner water to dump into the Rio Fernando. It will be a little more maintenance for the city and DOT, but it is a good expense, to allow cleaner water into the Rio Fernando. There have been issues with E. coli, and we are trying to mitigate that as much as possible_

John Miller: How many will you have?

_We are looking at three, one directly into the Rio Fernando, but we are adding a series of storm separator manholes, so it will act in a series._

Cid Backer: I am concerned about the drainage on the north side. Now, when it rains, from Allsups down, a river forms. What is the plan to catch this water? We have two holding ponds on our property, and they fill up quickly.

_The termini at the project will be accommodating that. We will be capturing the water that is in that termini. Some of that water will go into this bio-swale, and catch basins along the corridor, and then dump it into the appropriate location._

Jeff Stadler: Following up about the bottleneck, what are the priorities of the study? As you eliminate the center left turn, and go from four to two lanes, is it moving traffic the fastest to the next bottleneck the goal? Or is it making it safer from the current bottleneck to the future bottleneck?

_With the study we did, we are trying to accommodate as much traffic as we can, with the minimal amount of right-of-way that we have. Is it going to help? It will help some, will not get rid of all the congestion, but some of it. Not only will it help geometric wise but also with the introduction of new traffic signals that will help the flow of traffic._

Don Peters: Will that work into the model of the existing road set up? Maybe that alone would make the difference, instead of going to four lanes, and restricting access to some businesses. People being forced to do U-turns, because they don’t have the access they want. I keep thinking about the center turn lane. It seems that it is being utilized well, and the current configuration is best and will get better with signalization.
There was a lot of feedback that a lot of people did want those raised medians in this community, for safety, and the channelized lanes. Some people like them, some people don’t.

Jeff Stadler: Medians didn’t even show up until the meeting last month.

And that is because of these meetings. Medians have been in since the Phase B study. They were not as refined at that time.

Jeff Stadler: So, my understanding now is the medians are going away, and you’re just going to restripe it?

No, that is not necessarily true. There are some of them that will be re-striped, because of access issues, but those will be done on an individual basis. During interviews with property owners that can be discussed at that time for extenuating circumstances. The intent is to provide safety, and that is paramount with the DOT.

Jeff Stadler: So, I guess you did track accident studies and know where those locations are?

That is under consideration. We looked at access and uses of certain properties. We did that on a case by case basis, and changes can happen. Nothing set in stone. That is the purpose of these meeting. We are here to listen to you guys.

Cristy Holden: Going back to the intersection at Quesnel and NM 68, can we have four crosswalks there? You stated safety is the most paramount. Why not just have four full crosswalks there?

One of the major issues, on NM 68 at this location, is the north/south grade. We are required by ADA standards, that those crosswalks be 2 percent. We can’t get that here. So rather than have two, non-compliant crosswalks, we have one, non-compliant crosswalk.

Cristy Holden: You forcing everyone through is not going to work. People are still going to come down that area. I understand the restrictions that you have, and I am suggestion the solution is to have four crosswalks.

This did come up in the last meeting, and we did put in the crosswalk. We will look at that further.

Cristy Holden: The follow-up to that, on Bent Street and NM 68, there is a crosswalk on the north side, but people cross on the south side to go to the Inn. With so many tourists in our community, that’s where they cross. Can we have two crosswalks there, one on the south, and one on the north?

Typically, we do not like to have mid-block crosswalks that are not at a signalized intersection. We will look at that further. We may put it to the south rather than the north.

Polly Raye: I second what she said about Quesnel. The businesses on Quesnel are on the north side, except for the brewery. People coming down from the plaza are just going to cross to the
north side of Quesnel. They’re not going to go down. Put the crosswalk where the people are going to go.

*We will look at that further, and take that into consideration. There are ways around that 2 percent issue, but we try not to violate that because the federal government puts these mandates out, along with the state. And the funding is coming from ½ to ¾ from the state, and there are federal monies as well. We have to follow guidelines.*

Danielle Freeman: Can’t you just say which ones are ADA safe?

*I am not familiar if there is a sign that we can put there, but we can look into that.*

Anonymous: In regard to signalized lighting, and lights that talk to each other. For the audience’s benefit, all of us, driving north on NM 68 just yards beyond La Posta is the point the bottleneck begins. The bottleneck will move just about a mile north, and appear again, just south of Quesnel. Why haven’t you gotten the lights to talk to one another, and see how traffic moves? Why hasn’t this been the first thing done?

*When I built the signal model, it was built with existing traffic, and existing scenario as it exists today. Then the next step is optimizing the signals, and interconnect them. That was done, but it wasn’t enough. We moved the four-lane point closer to Quesnel.*

Anonymous: Yeah, you have moved that bottleneck closer to the center of town.

*There is a little bit of time after the intersection, and people have time to get over. We did what we could to extend the four-lane, but couldn’t take anymore. We made the merge point as far north as we could without taking businesses and buildings.*

Anonymous: I don’t want it to move. That’s the point. I don’t understand why getting the lights to talk to each other isn’t going to make a difference? And with what you’re doing now it’s not going to make a difference.

Roy Cunningham: So, we will have four-lanes with no center lane?

*There is a center lane. Two lanes in each direction with a center turn lane, there is the opportunity for medians. These are proposed. We are here for your feedback.*

Cid Backer: So, we are going to go from five-lanes, to three-lanes?

*Yes sir.*

Cid Backer: Is that going to depend on the courtesy of the drivers who merge?

*Basically, it’s two lanes merging into one.*

Cid Backer: and that’s going to happen at Siler?
South of Siler, yes.

John Miller: Is Conrad here? When you cross floodplains, don’t you have to size the roadway for the 100-year flood plan?

We’ll make sure that Conrad gets in touch with you.

Anonymous: I’m interested in knowing where the pedestrian bump outs are going to be, and I am concerned that those are going to represent a hazard for bicycle riders.

The locations will be where you have existing crossings, the bicyclists will have the opportunity to go straight through.

Anonymous: So the bicyclists will have to move into the traffic lane with cars?

No. They will have their own dedicated lane.

Walter Cox: What mechanism is in place for unintended consequences through neighborhoods adjoining the 68 corridors, Los Pandos/Siler intersection? Siler gets used a lot more than Los Pandos to get through that intersection. If you make that an easily negotiable intersection, you will increase traffic on Los Pandos. In the absence of speed bumps, they will go a lot faster, and you will double up traffic down Los Pandos. What do you do then?

That is something we will have to work with the city on. We don’t have jurisdiction down Los Pandos, but we can work with the city with coming up with ideas on how to mitigate that.

Keith Randall: I am curious where you guys may be taking property on this really closed in area where there is minimal parking in front of businesses and the town has a requirement for the amount of parking. How are the town and you guys going to address that for the landowners because they have a requirement to be able to rent your buildings or run your own business?

We are working with the town on coming up with alternatives for parking. We haven’t hammered that down yet, which is why it was not on the presentation. We are looking at additional facilities for parking opportunities in some of the areas. Not all of the corridor will have that opportunity, but we know that is a concern, and we are looking at mitigating that.

Keith Randall: So, is the town going to issue some kind of documentation that that requirement is waived?

I can’t answer that. We can bring that up to them.

Danielle Freeman: The cottonwoods and crabapple trees, do they get to stay?

We are looking at trying to save as many as possible. Some of the improvements will be taking out some of the infrastructure, such as trees. If we do take them out, we are required to compensate for that, to plant new trees and to provide some additional planting in the area.
Rick Bellis: Thanking secretary of staff and Representative Gonzales for finding money for this project. Costs have gone up several times. And appreciate what this represents. Thank the DOT, and representatives for working on this project, very receptive.

This project is important to the state. Taos hasn’t had improvement for years. We want to make sure your small town stays small town.

Anonymous: Where Placita and Paseo crossing, there is an historic acequia that needs repair, are you aware of that?

We are aware, Conrad has been looking into that.

Bobby Gonzales: Thank you everyone. There is a lot of support from the Governor. We see hundreds of requests for improvement statewide, and we are grateful that we have the funding. Anytime that we develop a plan that will be hard to implement, the funding will get snapped up immediately. This is the beginning, but we are thankful to the department. In the 24 years that I have served, the DOT is one of the agencies that I take my hat off to. The DOT has not had an increase in 27 years, so they do excellent work. Thank you.

Written Comments

Comment 1: Carl Colonius

Very much appreciate the inclusion and emphasis on alternative transportation infrastructure, specifically the consistent emphasis on creating bike lanes and bike signals. The improvement of pedestrian facilities with consistent, regular cross walks is fantastic.

This proposal aligns with the recently completed “Enchanted Circle Travel Plan” where the inclusion of bike lanes along this route was the #1 priority for the region.

Where possible, bike lanes at 5’ should be accompanied with a 2’ buffer. In a community with a propensity of trucks (wider) giving bikers a buffer zone would be considerate of public safety.

Comment 2: Mark K. Kemper

Leave the basic format as it is, coordinate lights. Forego the four-lane TOTALLY. The bottleneck will remain or worsen.

Make Paseo one-way North from Placita/Quesnel to Placita/Rivali and make Placita one way south.

NO RAISED MEDIANS!!

Leave center turn lane alone.

Comment 3: Cristy Holden

Landscape and parking plans.
Crosswalk needed at intersection of 68 & Bent St. for pedestrian traffic crossing to Taos Inn at south side to east/west walkers. A crosswalk on the north side of intersection will not serve pedestrians.

Crosswalk needed on north side of 68 & Quesnel to serve pedestrians. This is where people cross, not on the south side.

Is it necessary to have four crosswalks at this very congested and dangerous intersection?

Bump out at Martyr’s Lane area are safety hazard for bicyclists.

**Comment 4:** Joe Zupan c/o Amigos Bravos

On behalf of the Rio Fernando de Taos Revitalization Collaboration

We request the DOT research and consider storm runoff minimization techniques within the existing Right-of-way. Where NM 68 crosses the Rio Fernando de Taos just north of Taos County Courthouse.

We appreciate the proposed bioswales and urge they be implemented.

**Comment 5:** Paul Bryan Jones

After attending January 11, 2018 meeting, I suggest more mid-break crossing with tree, shrubs, and native plants. Low maintenance for the first two years with native trees, piñon trees, native serviceberries, native wafer ash, sensation box-elders, native choke cherries, native big-tooth maples, or rocky mountain maples from Central New Mexico. Other species; new elm species, emerald sunshine elm, and frontier elm to name two.

My email is listed below, I can supply a list of trees, shrubs, and native plants that does well in Taos County.

Mid-break crossing should have a natural flow of cub water that enters one side and moves through the planting.

Email: pbjtrees@gmail.com or taostreeboard@gmail.com. I am presently the chair of the Taos Tree Board.

**Comment 6:** Danielle Freeman

How will the small, shallow, overgrown Rio Fernando handle so much run-off? Will the state pay to maintain it at all times lest it flood? (my home).

It is unclear to me how the intersection of Albright and Tewa will be handled. Lots of arrows for turning I suppose?
To have mobility-impaired people having to cross three streets to get from NE and NW corners on Quesnel/64 seems like a burden on them as well as the unimpaired.

**Comment 7:** Pam English

Thank you for the Public Information Meeting on the NM 68-US 64 Roadway Project held on Thursday, January 11, 2018 at the Taos County Commission Chambers. The meeting was informative and well run. I appreciate the expertise of the technical staff that was on hand. My questions were answered comprehensibly and I left with a good understanding of the project.

I commend the difficult work you have all done to bring this much needed project to Taos and am in support of the improvements as presented. These types of infrastructure improvements will help Taos now and in the future.

As you start to finalize the details for the project, please consider the use of patterned asphalt at the pedestrian crosswalks as 64 passes through the area around the Historic Taos Plaza (from Quesnel St. to Montecito St.). This type of detail would enhance the pedestrian experience and help to identify the character of Taos. This type of detail would act as a traffic calming and add to the safety for pedestrians.

The patterned asphalt process occurs after all standard paving is completed (new or existing asphalt). The asphalt is heated and a rebar grid form is pressed into the re-heated asphalt after which sealant and color is added. Thus, no disruption of standard paving procedures for the project and no different paving materials or underlay requirements. Using standard highway specification white reflective striping on either side of the colored asphalt meets safety standards for visibility. I have attached a sample photo for clarity. Also below is a link to one of many websites that show detailed specification.

[http://www.patternpaving.com/stampedasphalt.html](http://www.patternpaving.com/stampedasphalt.html)

Thank you again for helping to bring this important infrastructure improvement to Taos and I hope that you will consider the above as an enhancement for the benefit of Taos.

**Comment 8:** Maura

I had last minute changes and had to miss the meeting last week. My comments are to emphasize bike lanes. A well thought out, safe bike lane will also provide walkability. Taos should absolutely be taking action towards a safe, bikeable/walkable community.

**Comment 9:** William Christmas, Commissioner, Historic Preservation Commission of the Town of Taos

This is in answer to your request for input from citizens of Taos as the planning goes forward on this project. I have three suggestions?

1. Do NOT eliminate the turn lane of Paseo between Los Pandos and Placitas/Quesnel. It will create utter pandemonium for turning traffic if that is done.
2. Put in a full complement (4) cross-walks at the intersection of Paseo and Placitas/Quesnel. Currently both visitors and Taosenas struggle with trying to figure out where, when and how to get across Paseo with its heavy traffic. Most folks want to cross Paseo on the north side of the intersection where the distances are shorter, but there are no crosswalks there. If the Town is trying to make the downtown more pedestrian friendly, then the current arrangement does not qualify.

3. Do NOT put in (or plan to put in the future) a so-called “one-way pair” through the downtown Historic District. This is a bad idea for many reasons, e.g., lack of adequate cross streets, need for more traffic through the plaza, and increased confusion for visitors who already have difficulty finding their way around our narrow, winding streets.

Thank you for your attention.

Comment 10: Lawrence Baker

I have written before and still say the same thing (like so many others):

- We DO NOT want a one-way pairs in Taos. You have heard the reasons ad nauseam.
- We DO NOT want to lose the crab apple trees in front of Randall’s.
- We DO NOT want just asphalt but trees and vegetation. All of this asphalt makes us hotter and with climate change warming us, even hotter. Asphalt is ugly, it’s out of character. We are and want to remain a quaint, funky town. We don’t want to live in a place that looks like ABQ. If we did, we’d live in ABQ. Don’t assume everyone wants to live on wide paved streets devoid of vegetation.
- LISTEN to all of the people you’ve heard over the years. We’re really getting tired of saying the same old thing only to have the State try to shovel down our throats what they think is best for us when we know what’s best for us, at least the majority of us and that doesn’t include the current Mayor, his Town Manager and a Councilor or two, all of whom we’re trying to get rid of.
- We want roundabouts. Those of us who have traveled in Europe know that roundabouts are the fastest way to get from Point A to B. Even anyone who has been to Aspen and seen the roundabout that solved the traffic problem to the Marron Bells would understand why roundabouts work.
- Traffic lights do nothing but make you sit, idling your car, spewing fumes and then we start fuming because it’s so ridiculous to sit at a light when there’s not a car in sight. If you put those 5 lights on Placitas, at $1M a pop, it will take forever to get through town. Consider the fact that Placitas belongs to Taos, NOT the State.

Please don’t make me do this yet another time!

P.S. Anybody who says we have wicked traffic has never lived in Baltimore or Denver as I have. Our traffic is child’s play compared to the traffic jams there. Here, we may spend an extra 5-8 minutes getting through town. There, you’ll spend extra hours trying to get around. It’s only busy here during the times when kids go to school and leave school. Locals know how to avoid the main roads and if they don’t because they would have to drive an extra 1/8th mile, they deserve to sit in traffic that extra 5-8 minutes.
Comment 11: Polly Raye

Thanks for being such good listeners.

In addition to the attached I’m concerned about losing trees and I think that concern is widely shared among others. The crabapples in front of Randall’s are special.

Create beautiful entryways into town along Paseo del Pueblo Sur and Norte. This was agreed between Taos businesses and NMDOT during the many NMDOT/Taos meetings in the 1990’s and “promised” when funds were available. They are now! See the attached 1990’s illustrations.

1. Use the millions from the State to beautify and improve Paseo del Pueblo, not recreate the unsafe wide swath of unbroken pavement we have now.
2. Create a landscaped median with the designated turn lanes for ease of access to businesses on both sides of the road, and for beauty and safety.
3. Build sidewalks and bike lanes along both sides of the road. If there are locations where bike lanes can be off the road, that is much better. Children need off-road bike paths.
4. Where possible, plant trees and other vegetation in a buffer strip between the sidewalk and the road to create shade and increase pedestrian safety and enjoyment. Add benches where possible

Practical matter: We suggest starting at the south edge of town and improving and beautifying the road as far north as possible with the available millions. Once people see the improvements it will be easier to raise the money to complete Paseo to the northern boundary. Let’s do SOME of it RIGHT rather than ALL OF IT in a hurry.

Eliminating the turn lane between Los Pandos and Quesnel would create traffic back-ups. Imagine trying to enter a business on the opposite side of the road with 4 lanes of traffic and no turn lane. Your maneuver: Get in the left lane and stop, watch traffic backup behind you, wait for both lines of traffic going the other way to stop for you to cross, turn across two lanes of traffic. This is unrealistic.

Don’t build one-way streets through the historic district. They would make it harder to navigate downtown and make most locations less accessible. We have too few cross-streets for easy traffic flow if the main arteries were one-way.

- Time-synchronized lights.
- Visible perimeter parking (including the proposed parking garage on Placitas).
- Re-routing large trucks away from the historic district or limiting their hours downtown.

These improvements will not only improve traffic flow, they will also make the historic more pedestrian-friendly. The Taos Historic Walking District will invigorate the Plaza and all downtown activities and businesses. This is much less expensive than one-way roads and these improvements need to be done in any case. Do this first. If is doesn’t create good traffic flow, THEN consider other alternatives.

No engineering studies have shown that one-way streets would move traffic more smoothly. Molzen-Corbin’s studies showed that one-way streets would slow downtown traffic by 11%.
Create roundabouts wherever possible instead of more stop lights. Stop lights create traffic back-ups and are much less safe than roundabouts. Two locations where there appears to be enough space for roundabouts, and they would work well, are:

1. Paseo del Sur and Albright/Tewa.
2. Paseo del Norte/Montecito and the road to the Pueblo, opposite Allsups.

Create safe and user friendly crosswalks at Paseo/Placitas/Quesnel.
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 provide an update on the Phase I-C Environmental Documentation and discuss the revised project design plans. 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.

ADA: To request ADA-related accommodations for the meeting, contact Eric Johnson at (505) 898-8848 at least two days before the meeting.
NM 68 US 64 Taos Roadway Project Phase 1C

Control Number: 5100750

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

Public Meeting Purpose: To provide an update on the Phase I-C Environmental Documentation and discuss the revised project design plans.

Proposed Improvements include the following:

- Road reconstruction and widening from 3-lanes to 4-lanes from La Posta Road to south of Los Pandos
- Reconstruction of 3-lane road from south of Los Pandos to La Placita/Queznel
- Pavement reconstruction of 2-lane road from La Placita/Queznel to Martyr's Lane
- Pavement rehabilitation of 2-lane road from Martyr's Lane to La Placita/Rivali Lane
- Realign four major intersections in this corridor
- Coordinate traffic signals
- Construct new sidewalks and repair existing sidewalks
- Storm drain improvements
- Access management
- Mid-block pedestrian crossings north of Martyr's Lane
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) enhancements
- Addition of bike lane and/or bike-share lanes
- Drainage improvements
- Potential enhancements, such as landscaping

Meeting Handout

Open House: 6:00 pm
Presentation: 6:15 pm
Comments and Questions: * 7:00 pm

* Please show numbered card and state number when asking questions or giving comments.
Project Roadway Sections:

- **2-lane road, rehabilitation**
- **2-lane road, reconstruction**
- **3-lane road, reconstruction**
- **4-lane road, reconstruction**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>7511 Fourth Street NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip Code</td>
<td>87107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please mail or send your comments by January 25, 2018 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
Marron and Associates, Inc.
7511 Fourth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107

Attention: Eric Johnson
NM 68–US 64 Roadway Project
La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
Control Number: 5100750
Comment Form