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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION, PROJECT BACKGROUND, AND PURPOSE AND NEED

1.1 Introduction

This report documents the findings, investigations, analyses, and recommendations of the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives phase for the proposed NM 68 and US 64 improvements project located in the Town of Taos. The proposed improvements are located between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita. The Project and Control Number for the Corridor Study is 5100750. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 illustrate the project location and study limits.

The Corridor/Alignment Study has been prepared by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Input received to date from local public entities, including the Town of Taos, Taos County, Taos Pueblo, Taos Downtown Merchants, the NPRPO, and other major stakeholders to assess the need for and type of improvements, has been considered in the analysis, findings, and recommendations.

This alignment study is being prepared following the latest edition of the NMDOT Location Study Procedures. The Location Study Procedures outline a structured process for the preparation of alignment and corridor studies. Alignment studies are generally conducted in three distinct phases—commonly referred to as Phases A, B, and C. The first two phases serve to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of possible alternatives to achieve the need for the proposed action. The third phase involves the preparation of an environmental document and subsequent processing in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
The Initial Evaluation of Alternatives phase (Phase 1A) was used to identify alternatives that would best achieve the need for physical, operational, and safety improvements along NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita, while avoiding or minimizing environmental and community impacts and addressing issues identified by the major stakeholders. Various alternatives were evaluated in the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives phase, including a baseline alternative that would require minor roadway and intersection widening and/or realignment and which may require the acquisition of additional right-of-way to accommodate improvements, a One-way Pair concept, the addition of traffic signals and/or signal timing improvements.

The Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives phase (Phase 1B) will further develop and evaluate the alternatives, and incorporate "context sensitivity" into the project development process. The successful completion of the Alignment Study process will allow for the selected alternative to be advanced to the Preliminary Design phase.

### 1.2 Context Sensitive Design/Context Sensitive Solutions

In conjunction with the Alignment Study process, this project has incorporated a context sensitive solutions approach. The Public Involvement and Context Sensitive Solutions Management Plan for NM 68 - US 64 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita dated September, 2013 outlines how the NMDOT will incorporate “context sensitivity” into the project development process. The objective of the plan is to assure that:

- The project satisfies the purpose and need while establishing a range of “stakeholder values”
- That the safety requirements of NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita are addressed, that the project is in harmony with the local communities and preserves the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, and natural resources of the area; that the project meets the expectations of the stakeholders.
- That the project is built with minimal disruption to the communities, businesses, and facility users, and
- That the project adds lasting value to the local communities.

The current version of the Public Involvement and CSS Plan is on file with the NMDOT and at the offices of Souder, Miller and Associates. CSS techniques were utilized in Alignment Study and will continue through the remainder of the project development process. Major stakeholder issues addressed in Phases 1A include:

- Need to improve signal operations
- Concerns that past studies have not resulted in any major improvements through central business area
- Need to assess options that redirect traffic, such as one-way pair or one-way on Paseo del Pueblo Norte
- Impacts to existing businesses
- Concerns with speeding along NM 68
- Concerns with safety at major intersections
- Need for continuous pedestrian and bicycle facilities and signage for safety reasons
- Concerns about loss of parking if roadway is widened and the need for additional parking facilities
- Consideration of limited right-of-way
- Consideration of traffic roundabouts
- Consideration of a relief route
- Need to consider the location of emergency responders
- Consider the number of driveways along the corridor and the possibility of driveway consolidation
- Need for drainage improvements
- Pros and cons of a one-way pair

The formulation of the project development teams as shown in Figure 1.3 provided the structure for public and agency coordination to occur throughout the corridor study process. This is defined as the Management Structure for the study. This structure allowed for input from all stakeholder interests, a forum to educate all participants of the challenges, and involve them in a collaborative decision-making process to narrow out the unfeasible alternatives and agree to a feasible set of alternatives that can be carried forward. Many of the difficult decisions and project commitments will be made during Phase 1B of the Alignment Study. The approach was developed with an in-depth understanding of the context, the controversies and the environmental considerations to achieve NEPA compliance, which can be summarized as follows:

- Correctly characterize the issues
- Identify creative alternatives
- Resolve competing agency missions and goals
- Select the alternative that best reflects the full range of stakeholder values

Meeting the range of stakeholder needs required coordination, results oriented agendas and a sensitivity for time management. The clearly defined Management Structure facilitated addressing these issues and building appreciation and understanding of these issues among all the stakeholder groups.

![Figure 1.3](image-url)
The Management Structure for this project is made of three teams, which operated as follows:

Project Management Team (PMT) – regular PMT meetings were held as required during the course of the Alignment Study. The PMT consisted of key staff from NMDOT, FHWA (advisory), and the Souder, Miller and Associates team. These meetings were used to track the CSS Process, scope, establish design criteria, public involvement needs, budget and scheduling issues, but more importantly to monitor project development.

Stakeholder Group (SG) - SG meetings were held to satisfy input evaluation criteria development and alternatives analysis needs. Members of the SWG included staff representatives from the NMDOT, FHWA (advisory), Town of Taos, NPPRO, Taos County, Taos Pueblo, Downtown merchants, Town of Taos Emergency Response, and community representatives. The overall goal of this group was to collectively understand and reflect community and environmental values in the alternatives analysis and provide input and feedback on the purpose and need, and solutions development process.

Project Steering Group (PSG) - this team is comprised of policy-level decision-makers from the NMDOT and FHWA including the NMDOT Chief of Infrastructure Engineer, NMDOT District 5 Engineer, and the regional FHWA director. The PSG is the body that added in resourcing existing processes that could not be resolved at the lower levels of the PMT and SG. They ensured that resources were available and policy decisions were made to keep the project moving forward. They provided assurances that the project will be funded, permits would be streamlined and policy issues would be easily resolved.

Project kick-off meetings were held with members of the PMT, SG, and PSG members to understand the project purpose, components and timeframes, the flow of the decision-making process, and each group’s general roles and responsibilities.

1.3 Project Area and Background

NM 68 originates in Española and is the main Arterial roadway providing a connection to and through the Town of Taos. US 64 is a major east/west arterial originating at the state line west of Shiprock continuing to the state line east of Clayton. From the entrance into Taos, NM 68 is a 4-lane roadway with a 2-way turn-lane through the La Posta Road intersection. The road transitions to a 2-lane roadway with a 2-way left-turn lane north of La Posta Road, continuing to just north of its intersection with Camino de la Placita. The segment of NM 68 south of the central business area has paved shoulders, however no pedestrian facilities. US 64 ties into the central business area just north of Camino de la Placita. Throughout the central business area, the roadway narrows, however there are sections that are wide enough to accommodate side-street parking and bicycle lanes. US 64 north of Camino de la Placita was recently upgraded and provides for a 2-lane roadway with a continuous 2-way left-turn lane, paved shoulders and sidewalks. Camino de la Placita parallels NM 68 and is a 2-lane roadway with narrow shoulders, curb & gutter, and sidewalks on either one or both sides. All of the aforementioned street segments provide access to or are located within the central business area, and provide for multiple access points to intersecting streets and businesses.

The Town of Taos and surrounding area has experienced traffic congestion on its existing roads and highways for many years. As this area continues to grow, traffic volumes have also increased and have resulted in failing levels of service. This is quite evident as one drives through the main streets in Town. The traffic problems exist year round and throughout the day, however are worse during the Noon and PM peak hour periods. The main streets in Taos are provided only limited relief by the remainder of the existing roadway network since most of the major streets are limited in capacity and have a lack of connectivity. Most of the major streets in Taos have limited right-of-way available. In addition, most of the street intersections operate at a low level of service due to limited capacity and insufficient intersection alignment. There are many older structures adjacent to the existing streets and intersections, that are considered of a historic nature, many of which are located in designated Historic Districts, and are protected by State and Federal historic preservation laws. The Town of Taos is also bordered by Taos Pueblo lands, which must be taken into account when considering improvements of any kind in the area.

Non-standard intersection alignments result in conflict points resulting in crashes. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are not continuous, creating potential safety hazards. Insufficient drainage facilities increase the potential of flooding during storm events.

Based on current traffic volumes, the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) ranges from 11,000 to 22,000. Traffic volumes are projected to increase to 15,000 to 26,600 within the 20-year time frame, which reflects a continued increase in the traffic volumes. Traffic operations are already operating at a low Level of Service (LOS), resulting in significant traffic delays and congestion, therefore any increases in traffic volumes will only worsen the LOS and associated delays.

Based on crash data obtained from the NMDOT for Years 2009 through 2011, this roadway segment experienced a total of 241 crashes. The majority of the crashes involved general disregard for traffic control devices, following too close, speeding, driver inattention, and improper driver action. The highest crash locations include the intersection of La Posta Road, Camino de la Placita/Quemal, and Kit Carson Road. The crash rate on NM 68/US 64 reflects an injury rate of 10.93, which is higher than the State Crash Rate of 2.17 for those same years.

A number of past studies have been conducted over the last 40+ years in an effort to address the growing congestion issue. These include the following:

- Taos By-pass Study – 1974, NMDOT
- Town of Taos Traffic Master Plan – 1990, Town of Taos
- Taos Traffic Network Improvement Study – 1997, Town of Taos
- Taos Relief Route Corridor Study – 2004, Taos County
- Taos Congestion Relief Route Study – 2008, NMDOT

Typical Traffic Backups

Offset Intersection at Siler/Los Pandos
In addition, other planning studies and associated documentation have established the need for transportation improvements in Taos; these include:

- Vision 2020 Master Plan
- US EPA Corridor Study
- Arts and Cultural District Cultural Plan
- Acequia Restoration Plan
- Smart Code Charrette Report
- Safe Routes to School Action Plans and Engineering Reports

The need for improvements to NM 68 and US 64 has been identified through the local agency and NMDOT planning process. There is a need to address safety, projected increase in traffic volumes, and roadway deficiencies along the corridor.

An Alignment Study is required to identify existing operational and safety issues along the corridor, evaluate potential alternatives to address the purpose and need of the project, identify a preferred alternative, obtain the required Environmental clearances, and identify a project(s) to include in the NMDOT’s short or long range program for construction.

Improvements to NM 68 and US 64 are currently not included in the current NMDOT STIP. However, based on the findings and recommendations of the Alignment Study for this corridor, a project or projects will likely be programmed, taking into account budgetary constraints.

1.4 Purpose and Need

In general, roadway and intersection improvements, along with other physical, operational and safety improvements are needed on NM 68 and US 64 to help ensure that travel on these segments is safe and efficient and meets current and future needs. Based on input received from the Study Team and the Stakeholders, a Purpose and Need Statement was developed for the project as follows:

“The purpose of the proposed improvements is to correct existing physical deficiencies, facilitate traffic flow and operations, improve traffic safety conditions, manage access to adjoining properties, and develop appropriate facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.”

There are seven factors listed in the NMDOT Location Study Procedures guidebook for establishing the purpose and need for a transportation improvement. The applicability of these factors to the NM 68/US 64 project are summarized as follows:

1. System Connectivity – Roadway connectivity is needed to maintain connectivity between NM 68, US 64, Camino de la Placita and major street crossings in the Town of Taos to maintain access to major destinations. Connectivity is also needed to provide for more timely emergency response services for police and fire, as well as for access to local schools.

2. Physical Deficiencies – There are a number of physical deficiencies along NM 68 and US 64 including: poor and insufficient drainage facilities; deteriorated pavement conditions; deficient intersection geometrics; lack of continuous facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists; and lack of parking facilities.

3. Travel Demand and Congestion – Projected traffic volumes for NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita indicate that there is a need for intersection improvements, including auxiliary turning lanes to address projected increases in traffic volumes and to maintain a satisfactory level of traffic operations. In addition, traffic operational improvements will provide for improved response times for emergency vehicles.

4. Safety – Safety improvements are needed to address complicated intersection alignments, safety hazards created by inadequate drainage facilities, as well as the lack of adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

5. Access & Mobility – Enhanced access and mobility is needed on NM 68 and US 64 to provide for more orderly traffic operations along these roadways. Access management is required to better define ingress and egress at business locations.

6. Economic Development – Improvements to NM 68 and US 64 are needed to maintain an environment conducive to economic growth and development in the Taos area, as Taos is an important tourist destination.

7. Legislative Mandate – At this time, there are no Legislative Mandates for this project.
CHAPTER 2 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION

Coordination with other agencies and involvement of the public is an ongoing element of the NM 68/US 64 Alignment Study. Accordingly, an Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Plan (PIP) and Context Sensitive Solutions Plans were prepared for the project and will be followed over the course of the alignment study.

The PIP presents the process to be followed and activities to be conducted to: (1) make the stakeholders aware of the project, (2) provide stakeholders salient and meaningful information, and (3) involve stakeholders in the evaluation and decision process. Stakeholders for this project include, but are not limited to: federal and state resource agencies having jurisdiction over the natural and cultural resources potentially affected by the roadway improvements, local agencies, including the Town of Taos, Taos County, Taos Pueblo, Taos Downtown merchants, Emergency response personnel, Taos School District, business owners, and property owners. Because the needs of stakeholders may change over time, the PIP is intended to be a dynamic process that is updated and revised as necessary as the project advances. The PIP is also an important part of the Context Sensitive Solutions Plans (CSS) process described in Section 1.2 of this document. The current version of the PIP and CSS Plan (dated January, 2013) are on file with the NMDOT and at the offices of Souder, Miller and Associates.

The PIP and CSS elements conducted to date as part of Phases A have focused on activities to make stakeholders aware of the proposed project and gather information from them with regard to issues of importance, concerns, and possible improvement concepts. To achieve this objective, the activities conducted and input received are as follows:

2.1 Public Involvement Meeting No. 1 – October 23, 2013

The first public involvement meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on Wednesday, October 23, 2013. The meeting took place in the Taos Convention Center, Coronado Hall, Teoselio Room. 18 stakeholders attended the meeting, excluding Study Team members. Written comments were also received after the meeting. The public involvement meeting summary is on file at the NMDOT and at the offices of Marron and Associates and Souder, Miller and Associates.

Public comments, concerns, and questions included the following:

- Question the existing Right-of-way that was presented; have a difficult time finding accurate Right-of-Way information.
- Comment that signs are too close to the road.
- Comment that there is a need for paved shoulders south of Albright.
- Comment that speed limits are unrealistic and vary too much. Need to balance speed with traffic volumes.
- Comment on need to coordinate traffic signals and who is responsible. Is cost a problem?
- Comment regarding skepticism with prior studies, does NMDOT respect different results, and need to implement improvements.
- Comment that pedestrian intersection design such as that used in Durango, Colorado, San Francisco, and in the East be considered.
- Suggestion that left-turns be prohibited during certain times of the day and that NM 68 be made one-way and Camino de la Placita remain as a two-way street.
- Comment to consider Traffic Roundabouts, especially at Albright.
- Comment about the concern with degrading sidewalks and need to address them.
- Comment that roadway connectivity needs (too many dead ends) to be looked at, would like to have option of getting on main roads and being able to take alternative routes.
- Comment to look at reconnecting Acequias and improving existing culverts, so as not to impact traffic.
- Look at prior studies, including those that involve Safe Routes to School and Noise (i.e. Jake brake use needs to be prohibited).
- Comment for need to consider Emergency vehicles/boulevard connectivity.
- Comments that there are too many driveways.
- Comment that there is redundant signing.
- Comment that business access needs to be addressed.
- Question if study will consider pedestrian tunnels and how would that affect study.
- Comment about the need for continuous bicycle lanes and need for safe driving surface.
- Comment that a Relief Route should be considered to decrease congestion.
- Comment that it would be difficult to improve Camino de la Placita due to excessive traffic.
- Question on how project funding is prioritized and how high is this project in the NMDOT’s priority system.
- Comment on the need to consider prior studies completed in Taos.
- Comment of strong support for bike lanes and signage throughout the corridor. Local Youth Corp group is working to enhance a Recreational transportation systems.
- Comment from business owner concerned with Speeding, Pedestrian Safety, and potential loss of parking if the roadway is widened.
- Suggestion to convert NM 68 and Camino de la Placita to a “One-Way Pair” to improve traffic operations. Would improve walkability and Parking.

2.2 Local Government Stakeholders Group Meeting No. 1 – December 20, 2013

The first Local Government Stakeholders Group meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on December 20, 2013. The meeting took place in Taos Convention Center, Coronado Hall, Teoselio Room. Besides the Study Team members, 6 individuals participated in the meeting, including representatives from: Town of Taos and Taos County. Input received from the Stakeholders Group included:

- Suggestion that a traffic roundabout be considered at Siler/Los Pandos, even a single lane one.
- Suggestion that a traffic roundabout at Albright could be positioned differently to avoid impacts. Also consider use of traffic lights. Coordination to improve roundabout operations.
- Suggestion that a traffic light would work better at Albright than a roundabout.
- Question on what the findings are with respect to truck volumes and projections.
- Question on lane requirements south of Camino de la Placita.
- Comment that trucks go through Plaza area due to limitations on Blueberry Hill Road. Question on how trucks would maneuver from US 64 to NM 68 under One-Way Pair concept.
- Comment and Question – Turning south on NM 68 from Camino de la Placita is Pueblo land (Pueblo owns a small sliver of land at that location), would you need to go through Pueblo land to make improvements.
- Comment that under past Molzen-Corbin Study, they proposed the opposite approach for the realignment of Siler/Los Pandos (realign opposite side). Statement that both properties on East and West side are for sale.
- Question asking what kind of feedback and format would have the greatest impact for the purposes of the study.
- Comment that there is a growing interest in access for pedestrians and bicyclists, but there are Right-of-Way limits. Comment that roundabouts are awesome.
- Comment that in European countries, roundabouts work well.
- Question if study will consider pedestrian tunnels and how would that affect study.
- Comment about the need for continuous bicycle lanes and need for safe driving surface.
- Comment that is prohibited.
- Comment that in European countries, roundabouts work well.
- Question about how the community can better influence how this corridor study evolves and doesn’t just become another study.
- Questions if there are any efforts to engage comments on-line.
- Comment that an on-line survey could present some options for commenting and that it would be good for public officials to see how people responded.
- Comment that Taos News could be used for people to comment.
• Comment that there were a lot of business and agency Christmas parties on day of Stakeholders meeting which kept people from attending.
• Question on what will happen next.

2.3 Local Business Stakeholders Group Meeting No. 1 – December 20, 2013

The first Local Business Stakeholders Group meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on December 20, 2013. The meeting took place at The Coors Convention Center, Coralillo Hall, Taos Zoom Room. Besides the Study Team members, 3 individuals participated in the meeting, including representatives from some of the local businesses. Input received from the Stakeholders Group included:

• Comment that the Sieler/Los Pandos left-turn signal does not work; faster to drive to the Smiths and turn there.
• Question if all cross-streets would remain 2-way with One-Way pair option.
• Question if a signal would be needed at Viveres.
• Question if the intersection would be realigned at Camino de la Placita/Quensal.
• Comment that the street is very narrow between North Plaza and Bent; difficult to make improvements in front of Taos Inn.
• Comment that there are a lot of pedestrians in Plaza area.
• Question if One-Way Pair option includes 4-Lanes south of Camino de la Placita.
• Comment that the character of the Town would change with One-Way loop; not best option.
• Question if there are problems with One-Way Pair along residential area along Camino de la Placita; how would it affect them?
• Question if encumbrances to properties have to be changed with One-Way Pair; would they have to stop?
• Question on what has been feedback from residential property owners.
• Comment on how traffic engineers would look at multiple signals within a short segment.
• Comment from Business Owner:
  ▪ Want to make historic district easy to visit and find businesses.
  ▪ Want to make historic district beautiful.
  ▪ Molzen-Corbin Study proposed many solutions, but One-Way Pair was not high on their list. Found biggest problem was intersections because of signal malfunctions. Recommended more modern traffic lights. Recommended eliminating truck traffic from historic district. Recommended a new roundabout in the middle of the Plaza area.
  ▪ Believes One-Way Pair makes it harder to find historic district.
  ▪ Doesn’t want higher speeds.
  ▪ Stated studies have found that 30% of traffic are people looking for parking lots; parking lots are hard to find. Need street lights in parking lots.
  ▪ Metering lots would help eliminate traffic looking for parking. Need bigger lots.
  ▪ Parking lots should be implemented before putting in 1-way streets.
  ▪ One-Way streets create a lot of left-turns. UPS design their routes to avoid left-turns (more dangerous). People will have to drive four times as far and make more left-turns.
  ▪ Limited cross-streets; one-way pair will not work.
  ▪ Comment that adding more traffic lights is not very persuasive.
  ▪ Comment that a rotary at Quensal and Albright would help, questioned if that has been looked at.
  ▪ Comment that they don’t understand the truck thing, if you are a business the trucks have to get to you.
  ▪ Comment that NM 68 and US 64 is a State Highway and cannot limit trucks.
  ▪ Comment that One-Way pairs would be a disaster without signals and additional lanes.
  ▪ Question on how long it would take to get approvals to move project ahead and how long it would take to complete.
  ▪ Question if there is any interest in improving signals and would it not be the best thing to do.
  ▪ Comment that the biggest problem is lack of parking and people can’t find Plaza because it is hard to find. Need Town support for additional parking. In Vail, Colorado they put in roundabouts and underground parking which he heard the situation, suggestion that a two-story structure (part underground) be placed.
  ▪ Comment that existing parking lots are rarely full. Need to create a new environment to get people out of the car. Need more signage. Coordinate traffic signals.
  ▪ Comment that the problem is the 4-lanes south of town and now we want four lanes everywhere, what was the thinking.
  ▪ Comment that by adding red lights changes the culture of the community. Need to fix traffic in long term. Difficult to get around town. We are deteriorating without buses on weekends. Have employees and guests that need buses on weekends. Buses need to be consistent. People don’t want to get out of their cars because they need to get around. Don’t go from south to north because the traffic piles up, don’t have the time. Locals know how to get to the middle of town.
  ▪ Comment that locals go through the middle of town. Luckily they let you in to make a left-turn. Need to focus on what will work. The One-Way Pair is the best option.
  ▪ Question – on the northern portion of proposed 4-lane improvements, where are you going to get land to accommodate widening.
  ▪ Question if there are maps that show existing right-of-way.
  ▪ Comment that there is parking at Siler, don’t want people backing onto highway.
  ▪ Comment that individual is willing to sit and wait in traffic rather than turning road into a loop.
  ▪ Comment that emergency vehicles can get through traffic.
  ▪ Comment that if project moves ahead, what would be done in stages, with worst problems addressed first.
  ▪ Comment that the first project should focus on downtown traffic lights; need to fix now.
  ▪ Comment that the problem is a funnel and just coordinating signals will not solve the problem. It will always be an issue, the biggest complaint I have is traffic.
  ▪ Question if project moves ahead, would it be done in stages, with worst problems addressed first.
  ▪ Comment that the first project should focus on downtown traffic lights; need to fix now.
  ▪ Comment that the intersection would drastically reduce traffic.
  ▪ Comment that you cannot put 2,000 cars at lot at Quensal.
  ▪ Comment that traffic problem only exists 5 to 10% of time during tourist season and that mostly there are no traffic jams.
  ▪ Comment that traffic is just as bad during off-season.
  ▪ Several questions on how traffic model works.
  ▪ Comment that modeling was done based on how people drive now but that could change in the future. May get around differently in 20 years.
  ▪ Comment that Convention Center is turning into UNM facility; need to consider how this traffic will impact Camel de la Placita.
  ▪ Comment about who is responsible for traffic lights – State or Town.
  ▪ Comment that the light at Siler is not working correctly.

2.4 Taos Pueblo Stakeholders Group Meeting No. 1 – January 17, 2014

The first Taos Pueblo Stakeholders Group meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on January 17, 2014. The meeting took place at Taos Pueblo CMS Conference Room. Beside the Study Team members, 12 individuals representing various Taos Pueblo interests participated in the meeting. Input received from the Stakeholders Group included:

• Comment that there were a lot of business and agency Christmas parties on day of Stakeholders meeting which kept people from attending.
• Question on what will happen next.
Comment that the feedback from the Taos Pueblo attendees did not necessarily reflect the final opinion of the pueblo.

Comment that NM 68/US 64 is unsafe due to lack of street lighting, have experienced close calls.

Comment that people using intersection to Pueblo are forced to use Allsup's parking lot which is very congested.

Question on how the NMDOT can assist Taos Pueblo in planning and funding efforts for needed roadway improvements on Pueblo land. Request for Taos Pueblo community meeting.

Comment for need to consider movement of water from paved areas into the streams. Comment that traffic patterns will change and other areas will be impacted, such as Hall Creek Road.

Comment that Taos Pueblo intersection is major ingress and egress point and want to see detailed analysis with regard to impacts to Taos Pueblo community if traffic patterns change. Comment that Taos Pueblo (since they own roads) has granted an easement to the Town of Taos and need to adhere to agreement, need for Government to Government coordination, cultural properties. Need for public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Placitas/Quesnal intersection.

Comment that one-way pair would have big impact on the pueblo, as a lot of people are going to Post Office or center of town. Would also impact tourist traffic into Pueblo.

Comment that with One-Way pair, egress needs to be improved or re-done.

Comment that more collaboration is needed with the pueblo. There is a need to meet with pueblo government. Need for a public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Pueblo Highways and Hall Creek Road. Need for independent study of Taos Pueblo regarding feasibility and impacts.

Comment that bike lanes would benefit Camino de la Placita.

Comment about agreement that if Placitas/Quesnal intersection is shifted, excess right-of-way should revert to the Pueblo.

Comment that One-Way pair, travel to Post Office would be circuitous.

Comment that One-Way pair would have big impact on the pueblo, as a lot of people are going to Post Office or center of town. Would also impact tourist traffic into Pueblo.

Comment that one-way pair has already been created as people are using Hall Creek Road to go south.

Comment that bicycle lanes are needed for safety.

Comment on need for traffic control at Allsup's intersection, big problem during feast days.

Comment that individual witnesses wrong turn at Allsup's intersection.

Comment that weaving is needed on Hall Creek Road to design the road to handle additional traffic with one-way pair.

Comment that Taos Pueblo roads do not have much shoulder.

Comment that Casino needs to be considered.

Comment that if a Bypass is still an option.

Comment that Taos Pueblo has tribal lands within the Town of Taos.

Comment that on Traditional Cultural properties, there will be a need for consultation requests, however, most areas within existing right-of-ways have already been disturbed. There is a standard letter if cultural features are discovered, need to stop work.

Comment that Pueblo would like to review NEPA documents.

Comment that concerns with Taos Pueblo needs to occur at several levels.

Comment on concerns with emergency vehicles finding their way around town with one-way pair.

Comment what is the general feeling of Taos residents regarding one-way pair.

Comment that a prior study had looked at a separate entrance into the pueblo (i.e. Canyon), emergency vehicles could take back roads.

Comment that there are big issues at Hall Creek intersection, and the need for significant improvements.

Comment on need for traffic control at Allsup's intersection, big problem during feast days.

Comment that individual witnesses wrong turn at Allsup's intersection.

Comment that work is needed on Hall Creek Road if traffic is re-routed. Improvements planned for main road into Pueblo.

Comment that Aerials of Pueblo area are needed for next meeting to assess impacts. Need to see how roads will be impacted and are concerned with additional funding needed to address needs.

Comment – with one-way pair roads will have to change. Question - will the NMDOT provide funding for needed changes?

Comment that there are only 3 ways into the Pueblo, but one very north. Need to look at Hail Creek, Ranchitos, Kit Carson, Burt Street, and Nolan Street. People use these streets as relief routes to get around the pueblo. Even Blueberry Hill.

Comment that the Taos Pueblo intersection is major ingress and egress point and want to see detailed analysis with regard to impacts to Taos Pueblo community if traffic patterns change. Comment that Taos Pueblo (since they own roads) has granted an easement to the Town of Taos and need to adhere to agreement; egress needs to be improved or re-done.

Comment that more collaboration is needed with the pueblo. There is a need to meet with pueblo government. Need for a public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Pueblo Highways and Hall Creek Road. Need for independent study of Taos Pueblo regarding feasibility and impacts.

Comment – with one-way pair roads will have to change. Question – will the NMDOT provide funding for needed changes?

Comment that there are only 3 ways into the Pueblo, but one very north. Need to look at Hail Creek, Ranchitos, Kit Carson, Burt Street, and Nolan Street. People use these streets as relief routes to get around the pueblo. Even Blueberry Hill.

Comment that the Taos Pueblo intersection is major ingress and egress point and want to see detailed analysis with regard to impacts to Taos Pueblo community if traffic patterns change. Comment that Taos Pueblo (since they own roads) has granted an easement to the Town of Taos and need to adhere to agreement, need for Government to Government coordination, cultural properties. Need for public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Placitas/Quesnal intersection.

Comment that one-way pair would have big impact on the pueblo, as a lot of people are going to Post Office or center of town. Would also impact tourist traffic into Pueblo.

Comment that with One-Way pair, egress needs to be improved or re-done.

Comment that more collaboration is needed with the pueblo. There is a need to meet with pueblo government. Need for a public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Pueblo Highways and Hall Creek Road. Need for independent study of Taos Pueblo regarding feasibility and impacts.

Comment – with one-way pair roads will have to change. Question – will the NMDOT provide funding for needed changes?

Comment that there are only 3 ways into the Pueblo, but one very north. Need to look at Hail Creek, Ranchitos, Kit Carson, Burt Street, and Nolan Street. People use these streets as relief routes to get around the pueblo. Even Blueberry Hill.

Comment that the Taos Pueblo intersection is major ingress and egress point and want to see detailed analysis with regard to impacts to Taos Pueblo community if traffic patterns change. Comment that Taos Pueblo (since they own roads) has granted an easement to the Town of Taos and need to adhere to agreement, need for Government to Government coordination, cultural properties. Need for public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Placitas/Quesnal intersection.

Comment that one-way pair would have big impact on the pueblo, as a lot of people are going to Post Office or center of town. Would also impact tourist traffic into Pueblo.

Comment that with One-Way pair, egress needs to be improved or re-done.

Comment that more collaboration is needed with the pueblo. There is a need to meet with pueblo government. Need for a public meeting with Taos Pueblo community. Need to address all concerns. Need to look at the Pueblo Highways and Hall Creek Road. Need for independent study of Taos Pueblo regarding feasibility and impacts.

Comment – with one-way pair roads will have to change. Question – will the NMDOT provide funding for needed changes?

Comment that there are only 3 ways into the Pueblo, but one very north. Need to look at Hail Creek, Ranchitos, Kit Carson, Burt Street, and Nolan Street. People use these streets as relief routes to get around the pueblo. Even Blueberry Hill.

Comment that there are big issues at Hall Creek intersection, and the need for significant improvements.

Comment on need for traffic control at Allsup's intersection, big problem during feast days.

Comment that individual witnesses wrong turn at Allsup's intersection.

Comment that work is needed on Hall Creek Road if traffic is re-routed. Improvements planned for main road into Pueblo.

Comment that Aerials of Pueblo area are needed for next meeting to assess impacts. Need to see how
Public Involvement Meeting No. 2 – April 1, 2014

The second public involvement meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on April 1, 2014. The meeting took place at the Taos Convention Center, Compadre Hall, Taosioo Room. Approximately 33 people attended the meeting, excluding study team members. Written comments were also received after the meeting. The public involvement meeting summary is on file at the NM DOT and at the offices of Marron and Associates and Souder, Miller, and Associates.

Juan Rael introduced project and project team. George Herrera reviewed the agenda and meeting purpose. He discussed the project corridor, traffic volumes and projections, traffic operations, safety issues, project purpose and need, project development process, and activities completed to date. George went through the stakeholder input and major factors considered. George presented information on the three alternatives that have been identified. Alternative 1 is the coordinated signal system. Alternative 2 is the coordinated signal system and 4-lane improvements. Alternative 3 is the coordinated signal system, 4-lane improvements, and one-way pair. George presented information on intersection level of service and delays for the no build and build alternatives. Alternative 3 provides the most traffic improvement. George discussed other potential improvements such as intersection improvements, traffic roundabouts, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, parking, and transit. He provided preliminary cost estimates for each alternative and other costs such as sidewalk and parking lot improvements. He presented the project schedule and project programming.

Public comments, concerns, and questions included the following:

- Comment that the State Main Street Program would have concerns with Alternative 3 because some towns have converted one-ways back to two-ways. Las Cruces and Tor C Have one-way pairs and there is concern with speed and businesses. Would like more information on Alternative 3 and more analysis and cross-sections. People tend to speed up with perceived wide right-of-way. Consider a roundabout at US 64/Camino de la Placita intersection. Sidewalks wider than 6 feet would be nice in historic district.
- Comment that locals know how to maneuver around town and question on what happened to southern bypass for trucks.
- Comment on the need to maintain access and provide for signing for emergency vehicles to Taos Health Center.
- Comment that one-way traffic would affect emergency traffic.
- Comment that Hale Creek intersection is included in the corridor study.
- Comment that after 6:00 p.m. streets are deserted. Congestion is caused by stores on the south side of town.
- Request that NMDOT, Town, and County put past studies on their web sites.
- Question on if the Alignment Study will stop at Phase A. Question on who decides if Phase B proceeds.
- Question on if the Alignment Study will stop at Phase A. Question on who decides if Phase B proceeds.
- Comment that the intersection by Smiths and others look awful; need for aesthetics; need to make Taos beautiful.
- Request that NM DOT, Town, and County put past studies on their web sites.
- Question on how one-way traffic would affect emergency traffic.
- Question on whether pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle. Stated that some tourists say they are never coming back to Taos. Very supportive of proposals presented.
- Question on what is time frame between Phases B and C, and when could lights be programmed.
- Question on if there is anyway to divert traffic.
- Request that NMDOT, Town, and County put past studies on their web sites.
- Question on how one-way traffic would affect emergency traffic.
- Comment that the intersection by Smiths and others look awful; need for aesthetics; need to make Taos beautiful.
- Comment that the intersection by Smiths and others look awful; need for aesthetics; need to make Taos beautiful.
- Comment that improvements should focus on locals to enjoy; if tourists don’t like it they don’t need to come.
- Comment that sidewalks should be widened and maintained to help pedestrian traffic. Also that maps should show major thoroughfares.
- Comment that a number of Taos Pueblo leaders also participated, however did not sign in. Input received from the Stakeholders Group included:

2.7 Taos Pueblo Stakeholders Group Meeting No. 2 - April 29, 2014

The second Taos Pueblo Stakeholders Group meeting for the NM 68/US 64 Improvements Project was held on April 29, 2014. The meeting took place at the Taos Pueblo Community Center. Besides the Study Team members, 20 individuals representing various Taos Pueblo interests and the community participated in the meeting. In addition, a number of Taos Pueblo leaders also participated, however did not sign in. Input received from the Stakeholders Group included:

- Comment that the State Main Street Program would have concerns with Alternative 3 because some towns have converted one-ways back to two-ways. Las Cruces and Tor C Have one-way pairs and there is concern with speed and businesses. Would like more information on Alternative 3 and more analysis and cross-sections. People tend to speed up with perceived wide right-of-way. Consider a roundabout at US 64/Camino de la Placita intersection. Sidewalks wider than 6 feet would be nice in historic district.
- Comment that locals know how to maneuver around town and question on what happened to southern bypass for trucks.
- Comment on the need to maintain access and provide for signing for emergency vehicles to Taos Health Center.
- Comment that biggest concern on corridor is from the Plaza area north to the Pueblo turnoff.
- Comment that there is concern with the safety of the Alluvium intersection.
- Comment that Hale Creek intersection is included in the corridor study.
- Comment that one-way pair would require circumspect travel, for instance to go to the Post Office.
- Comment that after 6:00 p.m. streets are deserted. Congestion is caused by stores on the south side of town.
- There is a need for retail outlets on the north side to relieve congestion.
- Question on how one-way traffic would affect emergency traffic.
- Question on what is time frame between Phases B and C, and when could lights be programmed.
- Comment that a large percentage of tribal people will not like one-way pair. Problems with Emergency vehicles. Should consider other alternatives.
• Comment that there is a need to improve signage at Allsups intersection, that section is neglected and some people make wrong movements. Some people go through Allsups parking lot.

• Question if there have been attempts to correct signal timing, there is no consistency as you travel through the corridor. Have studies been done? Should look at doing signal timing as first project, other alternatives would create a lot of impact to the Pueblo, business owners, and community.

• Comment that there have been a number of studies in the past, and need to be considered. Priority should be a traffic light at Allsups intersection.

• Question if anyone has studied traffic during Fiestas and would one-way pair cause more chaos.

• Comment that individual has participated in past studies, including CAC. 2030 Plan was developed and nothing has been done by Town. Studies have not benefited Taos Pueblo to date. Town is not a good neighbor, they need to mitigate dust and trash.

• Comment that much of Pueblo traffic is using Hale Creek Road to avoid Paseo del Pueblo.

• Comment from Governor that Pueblo was not in support of one-way pair, and would do a survey.

• Comment from War Chief that Pueblo does not support one-way pair and would like to see a bypass.

• Stakeholder mentioned that she did not support a bypass, due to business impacts.

• Written comment opposing one-way pair.

• Written comment requesting traffic light at Allsups intersection.

• Written comment to consider routing traffic around town.

• Anonymous written comment that Town should VOID One-Way alternative. Heavy traffic flow only during ski and summer seasons. Concerned about impacts to Chile Line as used heavily by Pueblo residents.

• Written comment on more need for community input from Taos Pueblo residents. Support the one-way pair. Only a handful of people spoke or commented. Emergency vehicle access was focus, but not everything considered. No consideration of access during the Taos Pueblo “make-over” which results in greater delays than one-way pair option. One-way pair may allow for better traffic flow during ceremonies and other Pueblo activities.

• Written comment that traffic congestion has been an issue of concern for many years and now time to come up with a new approach. Instead of treating traffic as a problem, should feel lucky to have traffic at all. Time to turn traveling around Taos into a good experience; provide for paved streets, well-maintained sidewalks and curbs and gutters, provide for attractive trees and landscaping, good drainage, instructional signage, and proper access to commerce, services, cultural resources, and available parking. Need to make a “Big List” of items and prioritize them. Need to begin now. This individual provided an exhibit with suggested changes, which included the following items:
  - One Way Pair: This is a very unpopular option. All other improvements should be implemented first. The congestion problem might be corrected very easily without such a heavy-handed method. Research has shown that one-way pairs have not worked in other areas and they have been reversed in most cases

- Paseo del Pueblo Sur & Siler Intersection:
  - Issue: This intersection is very dangerous for east and west turn lanes crossing across Paseo del Pueblo Sur.
  - Solutions: Relocate the intersection so there is no jog on the east/west sides. If this is impossible – then update the streetlights to include left and right turn signals for the east and west turning traffic.

Make a more defined turn lane for the northbound traffic to turn right onto Los Pondos at the intersection.

• Paseo del Pueblo Sur around Albright St:
  - Issue: This area is poorly marked for pedestrian traffic.
  - Solution: Where it is possible, install sidewalks along this route. If there is a wide business strip, and a sidewalk is impossible, then mark the walkway with two stripes instead of one next to the traffic. This would create a wide marked area on both sides of the pedestrians. It might offer more security for them.

• Paseo del Pueblo Sur between Siler & Quesnel:
  - Issue: This area is poorly marked for pedestrian traffic and the traffic movement into businesses is un-directed.
  - Solution: Where it is possible, install sidewalks along this route. If there is a wide business access strip, and a sidewalk is impossible, then mark the walkway with two stripes instead of one next to the traffic. This would create a wide marked area on both sides of the pedestrians. It might offer more security for them.

Where there is a large stretch of open access area (such as by the Enchanted Florist and Blue Sky Pet Supply) install planters similar to the Big 5 variety. This would create a landscaping opportunity to soften the streetscape and it would help direct the access onto Paseo del Pueblo Sur from these businesses.

• Paseo del Pueblo Sur & Camino de la Placita Sur:
  - Issue: This is where north and south traffic gets slowed down. It might be a great area for an entrance statement into the historic district.
  - Solution: This is a prime area to direct traffic to the north, east and west so that all the traffic does not head into the Kit Carson Plaza intersection.

This is the perfect place for a roundabout or some other multi-directional traffic treatment. The vacant property on the SW corner could be filled in and used as an additional traffic area. This lot belongs to the Taos Pueblo and collaboration with them is possible. Perhaps a sculpture or fountain honoring their culture might be appropriate at this site.

Directional markers could help direct traffic onto the side streets.

For example: Quesnel - Course Parking Lot and a turn for Angel Fire Traffic, Pueblo Norte - Museums & the Plaza, Placitas - Parking Lots & Town of Taos, Pueblo Sur - Business District.

The main intention of this intersection would be to direct traffic to the Parking Lot sites and to other sites that may not require someone to go through the center of the Historic District. In other words – get people parked and out of their cars.

• Paseo del Pueblo Norte & Kit Carson Rd.
  - Issue: This is where north and south traffic gets slowed down.
  - Solution: One option to help the north bound traffic get through this spot faster, would be to create an east turn lane onto Kit Carson Rd. This would require cutting into the existing parking lot and Kioks site. The Kioks could be moved over and the lot site could be used for the east turning lane.

Once again, if traffic can be redirected at the south intersection of Pueblo Norte and Placitas the number of cars coming up the hill might be limited.

- Paseo del Pueblo Sur between Siler & Quesnel:
  - Issue: This area is poorly marked for pedestrian traffic and the traffic movement into businesses is un-directed.
  - Solution: Where it is possible, install sidewalks along this route. If there is a wide business access strip, and a sidewalk is impossible, then mark the walkway with two stripes instead of one next to the traffic. This would create a wide marked area on both sides of the pedestrians. It might offer more security for them.

• Paseo del Pueblo Sur around Albright St:
  - Issue: This area is poorly marked for pedestrian traffic.
  - Solution: Where it is possible, install sidewalks along this route. If there is a wide business strip, and a sidewalk is impossible, then mark the walkway with two stripes instead of one next to the traffic. This would create a wide marked area on both sides of the pedestrians. It might offer more security for them.
• Paseo del Pueblo Norte to Camino de la Placita Norte
  - Issue: Area merchants have mentioned that pedestrians have a difficult time crossing Paseo del Pueblo in this area. Traffic tends to speed up along this route.
  - Solution: Make a very strong visual statement at the crosswalk sites. This could be achieved with permanent heated crosswalk markers or raised bumps on each side of the crosswalks. This might slow down the traffic a bit and create a safe place for the pedestrians to walk within. Plus some kind of public arts totem sculpture could highlight each walkway on both sides of the street. This would enhance the walkway for pedestrians and for traffic too. There could be an artists competition to create these sculptures. Note: It would also generate public interest in the beautification of the Taos Historic District.

• Paseo del Pueblo Norte & Camino de la Placita Norte
  - Issue: Traffic needs to be re-routed away from the congested travel area along Paseo del Pueblo Norte. Visitors need to be directed to the area parking lots as soon as they arrive.
  - Solution: Install signage at the southwest corner of Paseo del Pueblo Norte & Camino de la Placita intersection in order to direct traffic to the parking lots along Camino de la Placita. This sign would say: Parking Lots, Town Hall, Convention Center, etc.

• General – Taos Historic District
  - Issue: Visitors still have trouble navigating around Taos.
  - Solution: A handout directional map should be placed in a holder on all the map signs currently at the parking lots, the Plaza and by the Convention Center.

• General – Taos Historic District
  - Issue: Maintenance of the Taos Historic District must be a high priority.
  - Solution: All new and current improvements in the District must be tied to a structured Maintenance Program with a time schedule and funding allocations.

• Written comment that individual wholeheartedly supports the efforts to implement a one-way pair solution. Individual manages a hotel and frequently hears complaints from customers, who are tourists, about traffic problem in Taos. Concerned that tourists will not come back. Supports widened sidewalks and bike lanes; both badly needed.

• Written comment of need to maintain open access to Health Center as well as emergency vehicles for Taos Pueblo.

• Written comment from Consultant working on Taos Pueblo Comprehensive Indigenous Community and Land Use Plan. Provided the following comments:
  - There was discussion at the April 29 meeting with Taos Pueblo regarding safety, geometry and a desire for a traffic light at the intersection of Veterans Highway with Paseo del Pueblo Norte. Phase A of the NMDOT NM 68-US 64 Corridor Study should identify and show at least a schematic map of changes to the intersection that could be further studied in subsequent Phase B.
  - Phase A should include current and Alternative 3 (one-way pairs) estimated travel time from the intersection of Veterans Highway with Paseo del Pueblo Norte to the Post Office and the Holy Cross Hospital. The report should reference the method for time estimates, e.g. travel demand forecast modeling.
CHAPTER 3 – CURRENT AND FUTURE CONDITIONS OF THE EXISTING ROADWAY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides information about the condition of the existing transportation facilities. Information was obtained from various sources of information, including public records and databases, field data collection and surveys, field reconnaissance, agency consultation, and public meetings. The factors discussed in this chapter include:

- Existing and future traffic volumes
- Major intersections
- Existing horizontal and vertical alignment
- Crash history and safety
- Pavement conditions
- Right-of-way availability and ownership
- Drainage
- Existing utilities

The following summarizes the findings.

3.2 Existing Roadway and Traffic Operations

Existing Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) data was collected and provided by Mike Henderson Consulting in July, 2013. Data collection included:

- Volume counts, Speed summaries, and Axle classifications on NM 68 and US 64 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, and on Camino de la Placita between NM 68 and US 64.
- Turning movements and Pedestrian counts at the major and minor intersections (Signalized and Un-signalized) on NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

Traffic count, turning movement, and pedestrian count data is included in Appendix A of this report.

3.2.1 Mainline Traffic Volumes

Based on the mainline traffic volume data obtained by Mike Henderson Consulting in 2013, existing traffic volumes range significantly within the project corridor. The mainline traffic data is summarized in Table 3.1.

3.2.2 Mainline Vehicle Classification

Of the total traffic volumes, Vehicle Classification on NM 68 and US 64 are as follows: approximately 96% included cars, pickups, and motorcycles. Approximately 4% of the traffic volumes were classified as Heavy Commercial. On Camino de la Placita, the percentage of Heavy Commercial was lower at 1 to 2%.

3.2.3 Mainline Traffic Speeds

NM 68 and US 64 have a posted speed of 25 mph in the central business area and 35 mph south of the central business area. The posted speed on Camino de la Placita is 25 mph. The speeds being traveled on NM 68 and US 64 reflect that the Average Speeds are within the posted speed, while the 85th percentile speeds are above the posted speed. The speeds being traveled on Camino de la Placita reflect that south of Civic Plaza the Average and 85th percentile speeds are within the posted speed, while north of Civic Plaza, both the Average and the 85th percentile speeds are slightly higher than the posted speed.

The Average and 85th Percentile Speeds are summarized in Table 3.2.
3.2.4 Mainline Traffic Projections

Traffic projections and ESAL's reflecting anticipated growth in the area, and based on traffic data collected by Mike Henderson Consulting, were provided by the NMDOT Engineering Data Support Bureau.

Traffic projections are summarized in Table 3.3.

### Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&quot;Average Speed (mph)&quot;</th>
<th>85th Percentile Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Posted Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68</td>
<td>NM 68 to Civic Plaza</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Milpas to Brooks</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooks to Camino de Paseo</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camino de Paseo to Camino de la Placita</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3

Traffic projections are summarized in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AADT (Actual)</th>
<th>% Heavy Commercial</th>
<th>AADT (Design)</th>
<th>% Heavy Commercial</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AADT (Actual)</th>
<th>% Heavy Commercial</th>
<th>AADT (Design)</th>
<th>% Heavy Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13,347</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Counts, Speed Study Summaries, Basic Axle Classification Summaries, Intersection Turning Movements, Pedestrian Counts, Traffic projections, and ESAL's data is included in Appendix A of this report.

### 3.3 Traffic Operations

In order to assess the current and future traffic operating conditions, the Level of Service (LOS) for NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita mainlines and major intersections was evaluated.

LOS is defined as a qualitative measure for describing the operational conditions within a stream of traffic, and the perception by motorists and/or passengers. A LOS definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic operations, comfort and convenience, and safety. Six levels of service are defined for each type of facility for which analysis procedures are available. They are given letter designations from A through F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Level of Service definitions are generally defined as follows:

- **LOS A** represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.

- **LOS B** is the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect the individual behavior.

- **LOS C** is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of range of flow in which the operation of
individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.

- LOS D represents high-density, but stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.

- LOS E represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to ‘give way’ to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow for minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.

- LOS F is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclical fashion. LOS F is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow which causes the queue to form, and LOS F is an appropriate designation for such points.

- The LOS analysis for NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita was conducted using Synchro software for signalized and unsignalized intersections. The following criteria was used to assess the existing and future LOS for NM 68/US 64 and Camino de la Placita:

**NM 68/US 64**
- Free-flow Speed – 30 mph
- Lane Width – 12 foot
- Shoulder Width – 4 to 6 foot outside
- Terrain – Rolling to Level
- Average Access Points/Mile - 58
- % No Passing – 100%

**3.3.1 NM 68/US 64, Camino de la Placita Mainline Operations**

Due to the significant number of existing intersections and associated heavy mainline traffic volumes, the mainline LOS is greatly influenced by the intersection operations. Therefore, in order to most accurately assess mainline traffic operations, a Synchro Traffic Model was developed for the corridor, with emphasis on intersection operations, which included an assessment of traffic delays and queuing.

The Existing and Projected LOS and Delay analysis can be found in Appendix B of this report.

### 3.4 MAJOR INTERSECTIONS

There are twenty-seven (27) intersections of significance within the project limits of this corridor. Of these, seven (7) are signalized.

Intersection turning movement data was also collected and provided by Mike Henderson Consulting in late July, 2013. 12 hour turning movement counts were obtained at each intersection. In addition, Pedestrian counts were collected at all the intersections. Based on the turning movement data obtained, a LOS and Delay analysis was performed for years 2013 and 2033 for the intersections with significant turning movements. The Synchro analysis for 2013 and 2033, reflecting LOS and associated Delays are summarized in Tables 3.4 and 3.5 respectively. The detailed traffic intersection analysis for 2013 and 2033 can be found in Appendix B of this report.

**SEE TABLES 3.4 AND 3.5 ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB Approach LOS</th>
<th>NB Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>SB Approach LOS</th>
<th>SB Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>EB Approach LOS</th>
<th>EB Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>WB Approach LOS</th>
<th>WB Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>Average LOS</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Posta/ Cervantes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siler Rd./ Los Pandos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Quesnal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Rivali</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valverde/ Lund</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Fernando Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.4: 2013 Existing Major Intersection Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Major Road</th>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68</td>
<td>La Posta/ Cervantes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siler Rd./ Los Pandos</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Quesnal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Carson/ N. Plaza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Rivali</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valverde/ Lund</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Fernando Street</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NM 68 US 64 in Taos - La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita**

**Phase 1A - Initial Evaluation of Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2013 AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>2013 Mid-Day Peak Hour</th>
<th>2013 PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Posta/ Cervantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Carson/ N. Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Fernando Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.5

#### 2033 Major Intersection Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay (sec.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay (sec.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay (sec.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average LOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay (sec.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2013 AM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 La Pista/ Cervantes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Siler Rd./ Los Pandos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Cam. La Placita/ Quesnal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Kit Carson/ N. Plaza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Cam. La Placita/ Rivali</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Don Fernando Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2013 Mid-Day Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 La Pista/ Cervantes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Siler Rd./ Los Pandos</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Cam. La Placita/ Quesnal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Kit Carson/ N. Plaza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Cam. La Placita/ Rivali</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Don Fernando Street</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2013 PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Minor Road</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 La Pista/ Cervantes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Albright/ Tewa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Siler Rd./ Los Pandos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Cam. La Placita/ Quesnal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 68 Kit Carson/ N. Plaza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 64 Cam. La Placita/ Rivali</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Don Fernando Street</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam. La Placita/ Ranchitos Rd</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.1 NM 68/La Posta/Cervantes
La Posta Road and Cervantes Drive intersect NM 68 at a normal angle. La Posta Road provides access to commercial and residential development. Cervantes Drive provides access to Taos High School. This intersection is signalized.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS C during the AM and Noon Peak Hour periods, but drops to LOS D during the PM Peak Hour period.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will still operate primarily at LOS C during the AM Peak Hour period, but will drop to LOS D during the Noon Peak Hour period and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM Peak Hour period. The biggest delays involve the southbound through movement on NM 68 and the eastbound through movement on La Posta Road.

There are low volumes of pedestrian movements, with the highest ones during the AM Peak Hour period.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.1 and 3.2.

3.4.2 NM 68/Frontier Lane/Toalane Street
Frontier Lane intersects NM 68 at a normal angle on the east side of the street and provides a secondary access to Taos High School. Toalane Street intersects NM 68 at a normal angle on the west side of the street and primarily provides access to residential development. These intersections are offset.

Turning movements at these two intersections are currently minor, and are projected to remain minor in 2033.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.3 and 3.4.

3.4.3 NM 68/Sipapu
Sipapu Road intersects NM 68 at a normal angle on the west side of the street and primarily provides access to residential development.

Turning movements at this intersection are currently minor, and are projected to remain minor in 2033.

There are low volumes of pedestrian movements, with the highest ones during the Noon Peak Hour period.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.5 and 3.6.

3.4.4 NM 68/Tewa/Albright
The Tewa Road/Albright Road intersection was recently realigned to bring the two intersecting streets closer together. This was done as a part of the Taos County Administrative/Judicial Complex development to improve traffic operations. Tewa Road primarily provides access to residential development, while Albright Road provides for the main entrance into the Taos County complex, as well as residential development to the east.

This intersection was recently assessed for Signalization Warrants; the intersection currently meets the warrants for a traffic signal, however the NMDOT has elected to postpone improvements, pending the results of the subject corridor study.

The traffic analysis for this intersection, based on a signalized condition for 2033 traffic projections reflects that the intersection will operate at LOS A, LOS E, and LOS F for the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods, respectively. The PM Peak Hour period would experience the most significant delays for NB and SB through traffic on NM 68, as well as WB through and SB to EB traffic on Albright.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.7 and 3.8.

3.4.5 NM 68/Siler Road/Los Pandos Road
The Siler Road and Los Pandos Road intersection is an offset intersection, which is signalized. The offset angle, and associated intersection horizontal geometric creates traffic operational problems. Both of these roads primarily provide access to residential development.
Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS D during the AM Peak Hour Period and LOS F during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will still operate at LOS F during the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods.

The traffic movements with the most significant delays include the NB and SB through movements on NM 68, as well as the through movements on Siler Road/Los Pandos Road.

There are low volumes of pedestrian movements, with the highest ones during the PM Peak Hour period.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.9 and 3.10.

3.4.6 NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quesnal
The Camino de la Placita/Quesnal intersection is slightly offset to the right movement for EB to SB traffic. This intersection is signalized. This intersection is located at the entrance to the central business district and is surrounded by commercial establishments.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS D during the AM Peak Hour period, LOS C during the Noon Peak Hour period, and LOS E during the PM Peak Hour period.

Based on 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will operate at LOS E during the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods.

The most significant delays are for SB through traffic on NM 68 and EB through traffic on Camino de la Placita.

Pedestrian movements are moderate at this intersection, with the highest ones during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.11 and 3.12.

3.4.7 NM 68/US 64/North Plaza Drive
The NM 68/US 64 intersection is slightly offset and is signalized. US 64 is a major East/West Arterial, which continues north from this intersection. This intersection is surrounded by commercial establishments. The west leg, North Plaza Road of this intersection provides access to the Taos Plaza. US 64 at the entrance to Taos is also known as Kit Carson Road. North Plaza Road is also known as Camino del la Loma.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS F during the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will still operate primarily at LOS F during the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods, with increased delays.

All through and left-turn movements experience significant traffic delays and operate at a low LOS.

Pedestrian movements at this intersection are high, with the highest volumes during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.13 and 3.14.

3.4.8 US 64/Bent Street
Bent Street intersects US 64 at close to a normal angle. Bent Street provides access and side street parking opportunities for businesses within the immediate area.

Traffic turning movements are fairly low during the Peak Hour periods, however, they do impact the through movements on US 64 due to the high through movement demand.

There is a high demand for on-street parking along this street.

Pedestrian movements are moderate at this intersection, with the highest ones during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.11 and 3.12.
Pedestrian movements at this intersection are high, with the highest volumes occurring during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.15 and 3.16.

### 3.4.9 US 64/Civic Plaza Drive

Civic Plaza Drive intersects US 64 at close to a normal angle. This is a signalized intersection. Civic Plaza provides for the main connection to Camino de la Placita to the west. The Taos Convention Center is located on Civic Plaza Drive between US 64 and Camino de la Placita. East of US 64, Civic Plaza provides access to the park area and parking facilities.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS D during the AM Peak Hour period, LOS E during the Noon Peak Hour period, and LOS F during the PM Peak Hour period. Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will still operate primarily at LOS F during the AM, Noon, and PM Peak Hour periods.

The most significant delays occur on the NB and SB through movements on US 64, as well as EB through movement on Civic Plaza Drive.

Pedestrian movements at this intersection are high, with the highest volumes occurring during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.17 and 3.18.

### 3.4.10 US 64/Cleveland Lane/Las Milpas

The Cleveland Lane/Las Milpas intersection is an offset intersection. Cleveland Lane primarily provides access to residential and commercial development. Las Milpas provides a secondary access to the park area as well as some commercial development. Cleveland Lane also provides a connection to Civic Plaza Drive.

Turning movements at these intersections are fairly low, with the highest movements coming from Las Milpas (left-turns and right-turns). However, they do impact the through movements on US 64 due to the high through movement demand.

The pedestrian activity at these intersections is fairly high on the Cleveland Lane and Las Milpas legs of the intersection, with the highest volumes during the Noon and Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.19 and 3.20.

### 3.4.11 US 64/Plaza Garcia

Plaza Garcia intersects US 64 at a normal angle on the west side. This street provides access to adjacent commercial development and also provides access to Civic Plaza Drive through Hinde Street.

Turning movements at this intersection are fairly low, with the highest movements coming from in and out of the west leg of Plaza Garcia. However, they do impact the through movements on US 64 due to the high through movement demand.

Pedestrian movements are high at this intersection with significant volumes on the west leg of Plaza Garcia, with the highest volumes during the Noon Peak Hour period.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.21 and 3.22.

### 3.4.12 US 64/Montano Lane/Duane Street

The Montano Lane/Duane Street intersection is an offset intersection. Montano Lane primarily provides access to residential development. Duane Street primarily provides access to commercial development. Duane Street also provides a connection to Civic Plaza Drive through Sunset Lane and Hinde Street.

Turning movements at these intersections are fairly low, however, they do impact the through movements on US 64 due to the high through movement demand.

Pedestrian movement...
3.4.13 US 64/Sunset Lane/Brooks Street

The Sunset Lane/Brooks Street intersection is an offset intersection. Brooks Street primarily provides access to residential development. Sunset Lane primarily provides access commercial development. Sunset Lane provides a connection to Civic Plaza Drive through Hinde Street.

Turning movements at these intersections are fairly low, however, they do impact the through movements on US 64 due to the high through movement demand.

Pedestrian movements at these intersections are moderate; the heaviest movements on Brooks are during the Noon Peak Hour period and the heaviest movements on Sunset Lane are during the AM Peak Hour period.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.25 and 3.26.

3.4.14 US 64/Camino del Pueblo Norte/Montecito Lane

Montecito Lane intersects US 64 on the east side as it curves to the west. It provides access to mixed development in the area. Camino del Pueblo Norte also intersects US 64 as it curves to the west, just north of Montecito Lane; the intersection is channelized to separate EB and WB traffic. Camino del Pueblo Norte provides access to Tosa Pueblo.

The major turning movements at this intersection are NB to EB, WB to SB, and WB to NB.

Pedestrian movements at this intersection are low.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.27 and 3.28.

3.4.15 US 64/Sierra Vista Lane

Sierra Vista Lane intersects US 64 on the west side. It primarily provides access to residential development.

Turning movements at this intersection are low.

Pedestrian turning movements at this intersection are low.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.29 and 3.30.

3.4.18 US 64/Theodora Street

Theodora Street intersects US 64 on the west side. It primarily provides access to residential development. It also provides a connection to Camino de la Placita.

Turning movements at this intersection are low.

Pedestrian turning movements at this intersection are low.

Turning movements for 2013 and 2034 are illustrated on Figures 3.31 and 3.32.

3.4.19 US 64/Camino de la Placita/Rivali Lane

Camino de la Placita intersects US 64 on the west side and continues parallel to US 64, tying back into NM 68 at the entrance to the central business district. Rivali Lane is a short street that provides access to primarily commercial development and dead ends just east of US 64. This is a signalized intersection.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS C during the AM Peak Hour period, LOS E during the Noon Peak Hour period, LOS F during the PM Peak Hour period.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will still operate primarily at LOS D during the AM Peak Hour period and LOS F during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

The most significant delays are experienced by the West to North movement during all three Peak Hour periods. In addition, East to West through movement experiences significa-
3.4.20 Camino de la Placita/Beimer Street
Beimer Street intersects Camino de la Placita on the east side and primarily provides access to residential development. Turning movements at this intersection are low. Turning movements and LOS for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.33 and 3.34.

3.4.21 Camino de la Placita/Theodora Street
Theodora Street intersects Camino de la Placita on the east side and primarily provides access to residential development. Theodora Street also provides a connection to US 64. Turning movements at this intersection are low. Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.35 and 3.36.

3.4.22 Camino de la Placita/Valverde Street/Lund Avenue
Valverde Street is the west leg of the intersection and primarily provides access to residential development. Lund Avenue also provides access to residential development and terminates at Hinde Street. Access to US 64 can be obtained through Lund Street, continuing on Hinde and either Plaza Garcia, Sunset Lane, or Duane Street. This intersection is Four-Way Stop control. Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.37 and 3.38.

3.4.23 Camino de la Placita/Town Hall Drive
Town Hall Drive intersects Camino de la Placita on the west side and provides access to residential development. Turning movements at this intersection are low. Turning movements for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.41 and 3.42.

3.4.24 Camino de la Placita/Civic Plaza
Civic Plaza Drive intersects Camino de la Placita on the east side and provides the main connection to Camino de la Placita to the west. The Taos Convention Center is located on Civic Plaza Drive between US 64 and Camino de la Placita. This intersection is Three-Way Stop control. Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS B during the AM Peak Hour period, LOS C during the Noon Peak Hour period, and LOS E during the PM Peak Hour period. Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will operate primarily at LOS B during the AM and Noon Peak Hour periods and LOS E during the PM Peak Hour periods. There are significant traffic movements in and out of Civic Plaza Drive, with the highest movement being North to East. Pedestrian volumes are moderate. Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.43 and 3.44.
3.4.25 Camino de la Placita/Don Fernando Street/North Plaza

Don Fernando Street intersects Camino de la Placita on the west side and provides access to existing commercial and residential development. North Plaza (Camino de la Loma) provides access into the Taos Plaza. This is a Four-Way Stop control intersection.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS B during the AM Peak Hour period, LOS D during the Noon Peak Hour period, and LOS F during the PM Peak Hour period.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will operate primarily at LOS C during the AM Peak Hour period and LOS F during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Delays can be expected for all through movements.

Pedestrian volumes are moderate, with the highest volumes during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.45 and 3.46.

3.4.26 Camino de la Placita/Ranchitos Rd

Ranchitos Road intersects Camino de la Placita on the west side and provides access to existing residential development, however also provides a loop back to NM 68 on the south side of the Town of Taos. This is a signalized intersection.

Based on the Synchro intersection analysis, this intersection currently operates at LOS C during the AM Peak Hour period and LOS E during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Based on the 2033 traffic projections, this intersection will operate at a LOS D during the AM Peak Hour period and LOS F during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Pedestrian volumes are moderate, with the highest volumes during the Noon and PM Peak Hour periods.

Turning movements and LOS of Service for 2013 and 2033 are illustrated on Figures 3.47 and 3.48.
Intersection Peak Hour Turning Movements, LOS, and Delays for Years 2013 and 2033 are illustrated in Figures 3.1 through 3.48.
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**US 64 @ Bent St.**

**Existing Peak Hour**

**Turning Movements (VPH)**

**Stop Control Analysis**

---

**Legends:**

- **Turning Movements:**
  - XX/XX: AM, NOON, PM

- **Level of Service:** (Undetermined)

---

**Traffic Counts:**

- Counted on Wednesday, 07/17/13
- AM Peak: 9:00 AM to 10:00 AM
- Noon Peak: 10:15 AM to 11:15 AM
- PM Peak: 3:45 PM to 4:45 PM

---

**Figure 3.15**

---

**US 64 @ Bent St.**

**Projected 2034 Peak Hour**

**Turning Movements (VPH)**

**Stop Control Analysis**

---

**Legends:**

- **Turning Movements:**
  - XX/XX: AM, NOON, PM

- **Level of Service:** (Undetermined)

---

**Traffic Counts:**

- AM Peak: 9:00 AM to 10:00 AM
- Noon Peak: 10:15 AM to 11:15 AM
- PM Peak: 3:45 PM to 4:45 PM

---

**Figure 3.16**
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PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
SIGNALIZED CONTROL ANALYSIS
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US64 @ MONTANO LN./DUANE ST.
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US64 @ MONTECITO LN.
PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS

FIGURE 3.28

Traffic counts were counted on Thursday, 07-18-13
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US64 @ SIERRA VISTA LN.
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US 64 @ THEODORA ST.
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US 64 @ THEODORA ST.
PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS

2.5,1
641,610,595

5,1,1,5
516,567,683

1,2,1

LEGEND
TURNING MOVEMENTS
XX,XX,XX → AM,NOON,PM
LEVEL OF SERVICE
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NOON PEAK 1:45PM TO 2:45PM
PM PEAK 4:30PM TO 5:30PM
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Figure 3.33

Figure 3.34

Legend

Turning Movements

XX,XX,XX → AM, NOON, PM

Level of Service

LOS X,X,X AM, NOON, PM

Traffic Counts were counted on Wednesday, 07-17-13

AM Peak 8:45AM to 9:45AM

Noon Peak 11:30AM to 12:30PM

PM Peak 4:15PM to 5:15PM
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FIGURE 3.38
CAMINO DE LA PLACITA @ VALVERDE ST./LUND AVE.
EXISTING PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
FOUR-WAY STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS

LEGEND
TURNING MOVEMENTS
XX,XX,XX  AM,NOON,PM
LEVEL OF SERVICE
LOS X,X,X  AM,NOON,PM
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FIGURE 3.41

FIGURE 3.42
CAMINO DE LA PLACITA @ CIVIC PLAZA DR.
EXISTING PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS
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CAMINO DE LA PLACITA @ CIVIC PLAZA DR.
PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)
STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION
LOS B.E.E

29.36,50
89,175,193

CIVIC PLAZA DR.

LEGEND
TURNING MOVEMENTS
XX,XX,XX ➔ AM,NOON,PM
LEVEL OF SERVICE
LOS X,XX AM,NOON,PM

AM PEAK 9:00AM TO 10:00AM
NOON PEAK 12:45PM TO 1:45PM
PM PEAK 2:45PM TO 3:45PM

FIGURE 3.44
**CAMINO DE LA PLACITA @ DON FERNANDO ST.**
**EXISTING PEAK HOUR**
**TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)**
**FOUR-WAY STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS**

**FIGURE 3.45**

**LEGEND**
- TURNING MOVEMENTS
  - XX,XX,XX → AM,NON,PM
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- PM Peak: 3:15PM to 4:15PM

---

**CAMINO DE LA PLACITA @ DON FERNANDO ST.**
**PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR**
**TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH)**
**FOUR-WAY STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS**

**FIGURE 3.46**

**LEGEND**
- TURNING MOVEMENTS
  - XX,XX,XX → AM,NON,PM
  - LEVEL OF SERVICE
    - LOS X,XX AM,NON,PM

**Traffic Counts Were Counted**
- AM Peak: 9:00AM to 10:00AM
- Noon Peak: 12:00PM to 1:00PM
- PM Peak: 3:15PM to 4:15PM
RANCHITOS ROAD @ CAMINO DE LA PLACITA 
EXISTING PEAK HOUR 
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH) 
SIGNALIZED CONTROL ANALYSIS
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RANCHITOS ROAD @ CAMINO DE LA PLACITA 
PROJECTED 2034 PEAK HOUR 
TURNING MOVEMENTS (VPH) 
SIGNALIZED CONTROL ANALYSIS

218,300,312 LOS A,A,A
158,231,256 LOS E,F,F
183,252,262 LOS A,A,A
133,221,215 LOS D,F,F

RANCHITOS RD.

INTERSECTION 
LOS D,T,F
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LEGEND
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XX,XX,XX AM,NOON,PM
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FIGURE 3.48
3.5 Signal Warrants

Currently, there are seven signalized intersections within the corridor limits, including:

- NM 68/La Posta/Cervantes
- NM 68/Siler/Los Penedos
- NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quesnal
- NM 68/US 64
- US 64/Civic Plaza
- US 64/Camino de la Placita/Rivali
- Camino de la Placita/Ranchitos Rd

In addition, the intersection of NM 68/Albright/Tewa recently met signal warrants and is planned for future signalization. The final improvements to this intersection will be dependent on the recommendations of the Alignment Study.

A Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis was conducted for the intersections of Camino de la Placita/Civic Plaza Drive and Camino de la Placita/Don Fernando Road.

Table 3.6 summarizes the findings of the analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Signal Warrants</th>
<th>Camino de la Placita/Civic Plaza Drive</th>
<th>Camino de la Placita/Don Fernando Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 1: 8 hour Vehicular</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A. Minimum Vehicular Volumes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. Interruption Of Continuous Flow</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. 80% Vehicular &amp; Inter Volumes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 2: Four Hour Vehicular Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. Four Hour Vehicular Volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 3: Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A. Peak-Hour Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B. Peak-Hour Vehicular Volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Four Hour Volume, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. One-Hour Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 5: School Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A. Student Volumes, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B. Gaps Same Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A. Degree of Platooning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant 7: Crash Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Civic Plaza Drive intersection meets warrants for existing conditions; Warrants 1, 8-Hour Vehicular (1A, 1B, and 1C), Warrant 3B (Peak Hour Vehicular), and Warrant 7C (80% Volumes for Warrants 1A, 1B, or 4).

The Don Fernando intersection meets Warrant 2A (Four Hour Vehicular Volumes).

Signal Warrant analysis analysis can be found in Appendix C of this report.

3.6 Crash Data

Crash data for NM 68 and US 64 was obtained from the NMDOT’s Transportation Statistics Bureau for the years 2009 to 2011. In addition, crash history for the Town of Taos, Taos County, and the State of New Mexico was obtained from University of New Mexico Division of Government Research (UNM-DGR).

NM 68/US 64 and Camino de la Placita were analyzed as one corridor for the purpose of this safety analysis. The NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita corridor experienced a total of 241 crashes during that 3 year period. Crash data can be found in Appendix D. This data was used to determine if specific safety issues are present within the study area.

Based on the crash data, a series of critical analysis factors were identified and evaluated. These analysis factors included:

- Crash Type
- Crash Severity
- Road Conditions
- Lighting
- Highest Contributing Factor
- Alcohol/Drug Involvement

Crash data for NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita for the three year study period is summarized in Table 3.7.
Figure 3.49 (following page) reflects the number of crashes at key locations along the corridor. Identified. These are discussed further at the end of this section.

Table 3.7 shows the breakdown of the major crash types for NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita for the corridor study limits. Review of the data indicates that 219 (91%) of the 241 reported crashes during the study period involved two or more vehicles. The remaining 22 crashes were single vehicle crashes. The data was also reviewed to identify crashes involving large trucks within the corridor. Seven semi-truck crashes were identified. These are discussed further at the end of this section.

Figure 3.49 (following page) reflects the number of crashes at key locations along the corridor.

Table 3.8 summarizes the number and severity of crashes within the study limits for years 2009 through 2011. NM 68 and US 64 experienced an average of 80 crashes per year between 2009 and 2011. The average crash rate for NM 68 and US 64 was 10.93, which is higher than the statewide crash rate for this period. During that time, there was an average of 21 injuries per year (27% of the average). There was one single fatality during that three year period, resulting in a fatality rate of 0.19, which is lower than the average statewide rate for this time period. Based on 2010 statewide crash data, 29.4% of crashes involve injury, and 0.7% involves a fatality. Because the corridor averages are so close to the statewide averages, this demonstrates that the severity of crashes is an issue within the corridor.
Figure 3.49
The top five highest contributing factors of crashes throughout the corridor are identified in Table 3.11. As shown in the table, following too closely to the vehicle in front accounts for 34% of the crashes within the corridor. Driver inattention and failure to yield follow as the highest contributing factors with 20% and 16% respectively. Both factors of following too closely and driver inattention likely contributed to the high number of rear end collisions, rear end collisions were involved in 34% of the total crashes. All other contributing factors which include poor driving, alcohol/drug related, and excessive speed accounted for 30% of the crashes.

Design requirements are based on information in the following reference documents and sources:


The existing horizontal alignment for this segment of NM 68 and US 64 meets current Design Criteria for Major Urban Arterial highways, based on the posted speed limit. The existing vertical alignment meets current Design criteria as well, however the vertical grade between Camino de la Placita and Kit Carson Road does pose some problems during icy conditions. Intersection horizontal geometry is not desirable at several major intersections on NM 68, including: Siler Road/Los Pandos, Camino de la Placita/Quesnal, and US 64/Camino del Pueblo Norte. In addition, intersection geometry on Camino de la Placita is not desirable at Don Fernando Street and Ranchitos Rd. The existing geo-metrics were analyzed for compliance with proposed design speeds of 35 mph south of Camino de la Placita and 25 mph north of Camino de la Placita.

3.9 Existing Right-of-Way

Preliminary Right-of-way information was obtained from existing NMDOT right-of-way mapping and from the Taos County GIS data base. The existing NMDOT Right-of-Way widths for NM68 and US 64 vary within the corridor limits significantly, as follows:

NM 68, La Posta Road to Toalane Street
The Right-of-way width through this segment is approximately 150 feet wide, with the roadway centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with some commercial development.

NM 68, Toalane Street to South of Los Pandos Road
The Right-of-way width through this segment is approximately 150 feet wide, with the roadway centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with some commercial development.
Figure 3.50

**CAMINO DE LA PLACITA**

- 5’ SIDEWALK
- 5’ SHLDR
- 4’ DRIVING LANE
- 12’ DRIVING LANE
- 4’ SHLDR
- 1.5’ C&G
- 5’ SIDEWALK

**US64 - CIVIC PLAZA TO CAMINO DE LA PLACITA**

- 4’105’ SIDEWALK
- 2.5’ C&G
- 14’+ DRIVING LANE
- 14’+ DRIVING LANE
- 2.5’ C&G
- 4’105’ SIDEWALK

**NM68/US64 - RANCHITOS RD TO CIVIC PLAZA**

- 6’ TAPER
- 8’ SHOULDER
- 12’ DRIVING LANE
- 14’ TWO-WAY LEFT TURNING LANE
- 12’ DRIVING LANE
- 8’ SHOULDER
- 6’ TAPER

**NM68 - LA POSTA TO SOUTH OF CAMINO DE LA PLACITA**

Note: Curb & Gutter and Sidewalk Exists at Major Intersections.

Note: Sidewalk not continuous on both sides.
NM 68, South of Los Pandos Road to South of Camino de la Placita
The Right-of-way width through this segment is approximately 60 feet wide, with the roadway centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with significant commercial development.

NM 68, South of Camino de la Placita to North of US 64 (Kit Carson Road)
The Right-of-way width through this segment varies from 40 to 45 feet wide, with the roadway centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with significant commercial development.

US 64, North of US 64 (Kit Carson Road) to Camino de la Placita/Rivalli Road
The Right-of-way width through this segment is approximately 60 feet wide, with the roadway centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with significant commercial development.

The Town of Taos Right-of-way width for Camino de la Placitas is as follows:

Camino de la Placita, NM 68 to US 64
The Right-of-way width through this segment varies from 50 to 60 feet wide, with the roadway approximately centered within the right-of-way. Ownership is primarily private with some commercial development.

3.10 Drainage

A preliminary assessment of the existing drainage facilities was completed to obtain an understanding of existing drainage infrastructure and drainage patterns. A more detailed evaluation of the drainage conditions and requirements will be made in Phase 1B of the Alignment Study process.

The NM 68/US 64 corridor was analyzed and information was collected for the existing roadway drainage flows and its drainage facilities. Meetings with the Town of Taos and NMDOT staff were held to discuss the drainage and any known issues. It was observed that the majority of the roadway cross-section within the corridor limits, with the exception of a segment on NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, includes curb and gutter. In the area not containing curb and gutter, drainage is allowed to flow onto private property, most of which eventually flows into local arroyos. Several property owners have taken measures to contain the flows that enter onto their property. These measures include small swales and drainage structures.

Existing drainage facilities along the corridor are identified in Table 3.12, and include facilities maintained by the NMDOT, the Town of Taos, and Private Property Owners. The ID numbers in Table 3.12 correspond to the number shown in Figure 3.51. As shown in the Table 3.12, many of the existing drainage facilities are in fair to poor condition and may not function to their proper capacity. Along Camino de la Placita is an existing storm drain system maintained by the Town of Taos. A discussion held with the Town of Taos maintenance division indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Intersection/ Business</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>La Posta Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-48&quot; RCP</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Damage to End Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-10' Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frontier Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1-49&quot;x33&quot; Arch CMP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Silted In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW *1-12&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW *1-12&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Super Save Grocery Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-18&quot; Wide Concrete Swale</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*3-3.5’x4’ Area Inlet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*3-24” RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Centinel Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Curb Cuts</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*2-Metal Drainage Grates</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Albright Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-SD Manhole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-24&quot; RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>May need to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Albright/Tewa</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>4-18” Metal Sidewalk Culverts</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-18” Metal Sidewalk Culverts</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2’x2’ Area Inlet</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rio Fernando</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-7’x10’ CBC</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Randal’s Lumber</td>
<td></td>
<td>*2” Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Multiple grates - various lengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-2’x18” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Café</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-2’x10 Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that several inlets and corrugated metal pipes (CMP’s) constantly fill with dirt and debris. Similar incidences occur for several of the State maintained facilities.

Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Intersection/ Business</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>La Posta Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3-24&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-48&quot; RCP</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Damage to End Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-10' Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frontier Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1-49&quot;x33&quot; Arch CMP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Silted In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW *1-12&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW *1-12&quot; CMP</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Super Save Grocery Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-18&quot; Wide Concrete Swale</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*3-3.5’x4’ Area Inlet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*3-24” RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Centinel Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Curb Cuts</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*2-Metal Drainage Grates</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Albright Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-SD Manhole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-24&quot; RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>May need to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Albright/Tewa</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>4-18” Metal Sidewalk Culverts</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-18” Metal Sidewalk Culverts</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2’x2’ Area Inlet</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rio Fernando</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-7’x10’ CBC</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Randal’s Lumber</td>
<td></td>
<td>*2” Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Multiple grates - various lengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-2’x18” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Café</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-2’x10 Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Intersection/Business</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Siler Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1-5' Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1-4’x28” Grate Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1-4’x28” Grate Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-24” CMP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indian Hills Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3’x4’ Area Inlet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1-2” Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Multiple grates - various lengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1- Manhole Grate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arroyo South of McDonalds</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4’x3” CBC</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3’x4” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4’x4” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Could not see pipe connecting 2 Inlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Intersection Cam. Placita/NM 68</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>2-5’x4” Inlets</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>2-10’ Inlets</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marty’s Lane/US 64</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1-4’x2” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Vegetation &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-5’x2” Area Inlet</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Civic Plaza/US 64</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-18” RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Intersection Cam. Placita/US 64</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-18” RCP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- SD Manhole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Newly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lily’s Cold Flower Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5’ Inlets</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Dirt &amp; Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Taos Law Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5’ Inlets</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Taos Vacation Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2’10” Inlets</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-24” CMP</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5’ Inlet</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2” Drainage Grate</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Multiple grates - various lengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See Figure 3.51 on the following page.**

It is important to note that there are three drainage crossings located along the corridor, two of which utilize concrete box culverts (CBC’s) to allow the flow of water to flow under the NM 68/US 64 roadway. The first crossing is at the Rio Fernando, which consists of a set of 3 – 7’ x 10’ CBC’s. The CBC at this location is full of vegetation and debris but appears to be in overall good condition. The second crossing is located just south of the McDonald’s Restaurant and north of the Indian Hills Inn. This CBC provides drainage for a small arroyo which travels west past the Smith’s Grocery Store. This crossing consists of 2 – 4’ x 3’ CBC’s and contains vegetation and dirt build up as well. The overall condition of this CBC is fair. The third water crossing is a ditch just north of Frontier Rd. which uses what appears to be a 49” x 33” arch CMP to cross under NM 68/US 64. The condition of the structure is unknown as it is silted in.

**During discussion with the Town of Taos, the NMDOT, and various property owners several locations along the corridor experience some issues which are summarized below:**

- The stretch of roadway between Tewa St. and Siler Rd. does not have curb and gutter. Roadway drainage flows onto the land of private property owners and creates ponding issues. This can become dangerous during the winter months as the cold weather causes the ponding water to freeze.
- Drainage south of the Camino de la Placita and NM 68 intersection collects along the west side of the roadway and drains into the inlets and area inlets located at ID#12 and ID#13 in Figure 3.51. However, these area inlets are known to clog easily and flooding occurs within the property directly west of the McDonald’s restaurant. To further complicate things, the inlets drain to the west to what is called the Spring Ditch. This is a historic ditch which residents would like protected from roadway runoff. It was also noted that a private drainage system has tapped into the storm drainage system to relieve their property of nuisance drainage flows.
- The northwest corner of the US 64/NM 68 intersection experiences major ponding during rainfall and snowstorm events. This eventually overflows into the plaza west of the intersection.
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FIGURE 3.51
There are no drainage facilities between Civic Plaza Dr. and just south of the US 64/Camino de la Placita intersection. Although it is relatively flat in this stretch of roadway there was no information available at this time indicating if drainage is an issue.

3.11 Existing Pavement

Limited roadway pavement information is available from As-Built plans.

The existing pavement within the corridor limits is in fair to good condition, with a few spot locations that require pavement rehabilitation.

The NMDOT’s Pavement Design Unit will need to assess the existing pavement conditions after specific design projects are determined and scheduled. For the purpose of cost estimating of any proposed improvements, assumptions will be made, in consultation with the NMDOT’s Pavement Design Unit, with respect to rehabilitation and/or pavement widening recommendations.

3.12 Utilities

There are a number of existing utilities located within the existing roadway corridor; these include: PNM Gas, Kit Carson Electric, Century Link Communications (copper and fiber optic), Comcast CATV lines, and various water facilities (with different ownership).

Utility owner and contact information is summarized in Table 3.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Company</th>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kit Carson Electric</td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>Sarah Trujillo, 118 Cruz Alta Road, Taos, NM 87571</td>
<td>575-758-2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Gas Co.</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>1110 Gusdorf Road, Taos, NM 87571</td>
<td>575-758-5873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comcast Cable</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>1546 Paseo del Pueblo Sur, Taos, NM 87571</td>
<td>575-758-3569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Link</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Jim Mesta, Taos, NM 87571</td>
<td>575-751-4056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Taos</td>
<td>Town Utilities - Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td>Francisco Espinoza, 400 Camino de la Placita, Taos, NM 87571</td>
<td>575-751-2047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 Transit

The Town of Taos operates and maintains a public transit system called the Chili Line. The Chili Line runs from the Ranchos de Taos Post Office on the south, to the Taos Pueblo on the north, therefore NM 68 and US 64 are part of the transit route. The Chili Line has a number of northbound and southbound stops, primarily along the central business district. The Chili Line operates handicapped buses and a ADA accessible van.

The Chili Line also provides limited service to Santa Fe and to the Taos Ski Valley.

3.14 Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Limited pedestrian and bicycle facilities exist along NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita, however are not continuous and not all existing facilities are compliant with current ADA requirements. In some cases existing sidewalks are also in need of repair.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be an important aspect of the proposed improvements. Many of the destination areas are within the corridor study limits. There is significant bicyclist activity in the Town of Taos. Due to the existence of residential and commercial development along NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita, there is also a need for pedestrian facilities. Based on initial Public and Agency input, there is strong support for bicycle and pedestrian facilities along NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita.

3.15 School Access

The major school requiring access off the subject corridor is Taos High School. Taos High School is located east of NM 68 off Cervantes Road. Indirect access is also available from other east/west roads including Cruz Alta, Frontier, and Albright. North/south access is also available from Gusdorf Road.

Other schools in the Taos Municipal School District include: Arroyos del Norte Elementary, Ehos Garcia Elementary, Ranchos Elementary, Taos Cyber Magnet School, Taos Middle School, and Vista Grande High School.

3.16 Emergency Response

Emergency response in Taos is handled through joint Town of Taos and Taos County efforts.

3.16.1 Police

The Town of Taos Police Department has the primary jurisdiction within the Town of Taos limits, however, they can obtain assistance from the Taos County Sheriff’s Department and the Taos Pueblo Tribal Police, as required. The Police Department is based out of Town Hall, just off Camino de la Placita.

3.16.2 Fire Department

Based on input from the Town of Taos Fire Department, there are currently eleven Fire Districts that serve Taos County and the Town of Taos. In the vicinity of the NM 68 and US 64 corridor, a Fire Station is located off Camino de la Placita just north of Civic Plaza Drive. Another Fire Station is located to the south, off NM 68 on Camino Santiago.

Traffic congestion presents several challenges to emergency response due to a combination of factors, including high traffic volumes, narrow streets, and in some cases poor pavement markings.
CHAPTER 4 – EXISTING SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

This chapter discusses the environmental, cultural, and social conditions within the limits of the proposed project corridor. Information discussed herein will be used in subsequent analyses of potential impacts of roadway alternatives. The conditions described in this section are based on a review of existing data sources, field reconnaissance, and limited data collection.

4.1 Community Resources

4.1.1 Community Profile

The Taos area has a long history of human occupation. A mixture of Native American, Hispanic, and Anglo influences have affected the development of the community. The existing Pueblo of Taos dates from around 1400 and includes lands in the study area. The pueblo retains the multi-storyed adobe buildings that provide the distinctive pueblo architecture. Early Spanish explorers passed through the area. Coronado’s expedition crossed the Taos area in 1540 followed by Oñate in 1605. In 1710, Cristobal de Serna petitioned for a land grant, and the town was referred to as Don Fernando de Taos. In 1885, the name was shortened to Taos. The town was originally a Spanish fortified plaza surrounded by low adobe buildings. Taos grew beyond its defensive walls and developed into a key trading center on the Santa Fe Trail. Starting in the late 19th Century and continuing into the 20th Century, Taos developed an artist community and also became a popular New Mexico tourist destination. The Taos Downtown Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. A mixture of Spanish Colonial, Territorial, Mission Revival, and Pueblo Revival buildings occur within the historic district.

Several community facilities are located near the study area. A post office is located on the west side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte at Brooks Street. Several facilities are located on the east side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte including Kit Carson Park and Cemetery, Taos Art Museum and Pettich House, and Taos Community Auditorium. The Taos Convention Center and University of New Mexico (UNM) Taos are located on the east side of Camino de la Placita at Civic Plaza Drive. Our Lady of Guadalupe Church is located west of Camino de la Placita along Don Fernando.

Taos was incorporated in 1934 after a fire on the Taos Plaza. The original incorporated town covered 505 acres. The town has expanded 93 times and covered 3,560 acres in 2012 (Town of Taos, 2012). Taos is an important New Mexico tourist destination and is a key center for New Mexico culture and arts.

Several community facilities are located near the study area. A post office is located on the west side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte at Brooks Street. Several facilities are located on the east side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte including Kit Carson Park and Cemetery, Taos Art Museum and Pettich House, and Taos Community Auditorium. The Taos Convention Center and University of New Mexico (UNM) Taos are located on the east side of Camino de la Placita at Civic Plaza Drive. Our Lady of Guadalupe Church is located west of Camino de la Placita along Don Fernando.

4.1.2 Population Characteristics

The study area is located within Taos, Taos County. Based on the 2010 Census, Taos County had a population of 32,937 (see Table 4.1). Taos County is experiencing steady growth with a projected growth rate of 1.22 percent for the years 2010-2015.
Mexico’s poverty rates (14.4 percent family and 19.0 percent per capita). The Town of Taos has relatively high poverty rates (25.6 percent family and 26.6 percent per capita). Based on these statistics and the minority representation, Census Tract 9401 and the Town of should be considered communities of concern for environmental justice evaluation. The Pueblo of Taos, to the north of the study area, also should be considered a community of concern.

4.1.3 Social Services

Parks and Recreational Facilities

The Town of Taos, Parks Division, operates two parks located near the study area. Kit Carson Park is located on the east side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte. A playground, landscaped areas, and cemetery are located at the park. Taos Plaza is located between Paseo del Pueblo Norte and Camino de la Placita. The plaza contains sidewalks, landscaping, statues, and a cross.

Schools

Taos Municipal Schools operates the schools in Taos. The Taos Cyber Magnet School is located at 310 Camino de la Placita at Bent Street. The school offers traditional and online classes. Taos Garcia Elementary School is located at 305 Don Fernando, 0.1 mile west of Camino de la Placita.

Police, Fire, and Hospitals

Public safety services are provided by the Taos Police Department and Taos Fire Department. The Taos Police Department office is located on the west side of Camino de la Placita at 400 Camino de la Placita at the Town Hall Drive intersection. A Taos Fire Station is located across the street at 323 Camino de la Placita.

After health care providers are located in Taos. The local hospital is Holy Cross Hospital. Other regional hospitals are located in Española and Santa Fe. The Taos Medical Clinic is located along the southern part of the study area at 622 Paseo del Pueblo Sur.

4.1.4 Local Economy

Taos provides employment primarily in government, retail, and tourism-related businesses. Government employment is found with the Town of Taos, Taos County, Taos Municipal Schools, University of New Mexico Taos campus, Pueblo of Taos, Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Forest Service. Many stores, restaurants, and motels are located on Paseo del Pueblo Sur south of the study area. This area is an important retail area that serves Taos area residents as well as visitors. Central Taos near the study area supports restaurants, stores, and motels that cater to visitors. Visitors typically park their cars and walk through the Downtown Historic District. Several art galleries are located near the study area.

4.1.5 Existing Land Use

Land uses near the study area are a mixture of commercial, office, and residential uses. Most buildings are one-story-with a few two-story buildings. Many buildings are on small lots with frontages close to the street. The Town of Taos has worked to protect the traditional urban texture near the study area. The roadside character of NM 68 between Las Posta Road and Camino de la Placita has changed over the years from open agricultural lands to developed commercial and residential sites that has affected the conveyance of water across NM 68. In 1999, the Town of Taos prepared the Vision 2020 Master Plan (Town of Taos, 1999) that encouraged mixed-use development as stated in goal two of the plan.

Downtown Taos originally developed as a compact and complete neighborhood with a definite center and edge. This development pattern has not been maintained with recent development. Lands near the study area are zoned for a variety of uses including, the Central Business District near the plaza and Paseo del Pueblo/Kit Carson Road intersection, commercial along Paseo del Pueblo, and residential along the northern portion of Camino de la Placita. The revised land use element to the Vision 2020 Master Plan propose to promote four types of land uses in parts of Taos near the study area:

- **Urban Center** consisting of high-intensity commercial activity, retail, and office developments mixed with multi-family residential uses; and
- **Urban** consisting of a variety of higher density single family and multi-family residential developments with commercial and community services on intersections;
- **Suburban** consisting of medium-density, single family detached residences, which may include a guest house or casita apartment on a lot with a single-family residence; and
- **Civic Space** on property owned and developed for public uses such as public buildings, library, fire station, parks, plazas, playgrounds, and cemeteries (Town of Taos, 2012).

4.1.6 Air Quality

Air quality is good near the study area because surrounding lands have low-density development, air emissions sources are dispersed, and the open terrain allows for wind dispersal of pollutants. Traffic volumes are too low to result in exceedances of Clean Air Act standards. Taos is currently in attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQs) under the Clean Air Act. (New Mexico Environment Department [NMED] 2014a; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA], 2014).

4.1.7 Noise

**FHWA/NMDOT Noise Policies and Procedures**

The relative loudness of a sound or noise is described in units of decibels (dB), a measure of sound pressure on a logarithmic scale. For highway noise studies, traffic noise is averaged over a one-hour peak noise period and is expressed as an equivalent noise level (Leq). An A-weighting filter is used to correlate acoustic energy with the frequency sensitivity of human hearing. Thus, traffic noise conditions are discussed in terms of hourly average A-weighted noise levels in decibels, or Leq dB(A).

FHWA and NMDOT have adopted specific policies and procedures for evaluating traffic noise impacts and the need for noise abatement. According to FHWA and NMDOT procedures, noise abatement must be considered when predicted traffic noise levels exceed specified noise abatement criteria (noise level thresholds) defined for various land use activity categories. NMDOT noise policy defines “approach” as being within 1 mile of the abatement criteria.

Traffic is steady and is the main noise source at the study area. Residents and hotels are located near the study area. Single family residences are the most common noise sensitive (Category B) land use near the project area. The noise abatement criteria level is 67 dBA Leq dB(A). Under IDD-2011-02, the project would likely be classified as a Type II noise abatement program based on the alternatives under consideration. No additional through-lanes or physical alterations are proposed that would result in a Type I classification. This will be further reviewed once plans are developed.
4.1.8 Hazardous Materials

There are existing and historic service stations that may have hazardous materials issues. No active state clean-up sites occur near the study area (NMED, 2014b).

A 200-gallon diesel gas spill was reported in 1995 at the former Navajo Express Diesel next to McDonalds, located south of the Paseo del Pueblo Sur/Quemnul Street intersection. Contaminated soil was removed from this state cleanup site, and the site was closed in January 1995 (NMED, 2014c). No active unleaking petroleum storage tank (LPST) site is also located in this area at 217 Pueblo del Norte. The site has been remediated, but it is still listed as an active LPST site (NMED, 2014d).

A closed state cleanup site is listed at an Escan Com in the current Allsup's at 501 Pueblo del Norte on the northeastern corner of the Taos Pueblo Road intersection. A leaking gasoline plume with benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) contamination was reported. A remediation system was installed, and this state cleanup site was closed in November 2001 (NMED, 2014e).

A closed LPST site is located at 631 Pueblo del Norte St. The site was called Stop & Go #4. On April 22, 2010, NMED issued a No Further Action determination for this site (NMED, 2014f).

Additional sites will likely be identified with further research. Several areas may have historic land uses, such as service stations and dry cleaners, which do not appear on the environmental databases. Locations where such historic uses could occur include areas near the following intersections: Paseo del Pueblo/EA Carson Road, Paseo del Pueblo/Quemnul Street, and Camino de la Placita/Ranchitos Road. An Initial Site Assessment (ISA) will be conducted to determine the extent of hazardous materials contamination, if any, in the study area.


4.2 Natural Resources

4.2.1 Geology and Topography

The study area elevation ranges from approximately 6,900 to 7,000 feet above sea level. The landscape at the project area is mostly level, but slopes downward slightly to the southwest.

Taos is located in north-central New Mexico within the Southern Rocky Mountains physiographic province. The project area is located west of the Taos Mountain portion of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains (Ahern, 2006). Geologic formations at the project area consist of Quaternary alluvium and Quaternary piedmont (New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources, 2003).

4.2.2 Soils

Seven soil mapping units are found in the project area. Fernando clay loam (1-3% slopes) occupies 70% of the study area (see Table 4.2). The soils have moderate risk of water and wind erosion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Mapping Unit</th>
<th>Percent of Study Area</th>
<th>Water Erosion Risk</th>
<th>Wind Erosion Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caruso variant silty clay loam, 0-3% slopes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 1-3% slopes</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 3-5% slopes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 5-7% slopes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzano clay loam, 0-1% slopes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poganeab silty clay loam, nearly level</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedillo-Sevilla association, strongly sloping</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Soils and Erosion Risks

Wind erosion risk values range from 0.01 to 0.40 - the higher the value, the more susceptible the soils to sheet and rill erosion by water.

Water erosion risk values range from 1 to 8 – the higher the value, the less susceptible the soils to wind erosion. (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2014)

4.2.3 Vegetation

The study area is located in an urbanized zone with little native vegetation. Most land in the project area is covered with hard surfaces or has landscaped vegetation. Many planted trees occur on properties near the study area. An area of native vegetation, with a canopy of narrow-leaved cottonwood, occurs near Rio Fernando de Taos in the southern part of the study area.

4.2.4 Noxious Weeds

Since vegetation cover is limited in the project area, the presence of noxious weeds is also limited. A biological survey will be conducted to identify and locate noxious weeds within the project area.

4.2.5 Wetlands and Riparian Habitat

The presence of wetlands and riparian habitat is limited within the project area. Wetlands are likely along the Rio Fernando de Taos as well as along an unenamed drainage that flows under La Posta Road at the southern end and follows Ranchitos Road. As part of the biological survey, potential wetland areas will be identified.

4.2.6 Wildlife

Little wildlife is present because of the limited available habitat, presence of disturbed and developed lands, and steady traffic. Wildlife species are primarily those adapted to urbanized areas. Suitable habitat for small mammals and reptiles occurs in vegetation patches along NM 68 and US 64. The Rio Fernando de Taos provides a wildlife migration corridor across the southern part of the study area.

4.2.7 Migratory Birds

Trees and vegetation patches provide potential habitat for migratory birds. Potential nest sites occur in trees along NM 68 and US 64. Common birds include those adapted to urban areas such as house sparrow, rock dove, mourning dove, and house finch. A wide variety of migratory birds could occur in the trees along the Rio Fernando de Taos.
4.2.8 Rare, Threatened, Endangered, And Other Target Species

Because of the urban character of the study area, few protected species are likely to occur within the study area. Two protected bird species and a protected mammal potentially could occur along the Rio Fernando de Taos.

Yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus) – This federal proposed endangered species is found along riparian corridors in the southwestern United States. It prefers wooded riparian corridors with a well developed under and overstory where it hunts for insects, preferably caterpillars. The cuckoo arrives late in the nesting season and stays later than most other songbirds. This bird could utilize the Rio Fernando de Taos, but due to the level of development in the area, this is unlikely.

Southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax trailli extimus extimus) – This federal endangered species is found in riparian corridors in the southwestern United States. It prefers dense shoreline shrubbery, usually coyote willow or tamarisk, and prefers locations above a flooded surface. This species could utilize the Rio Fernando de Taos further downstream from the study area, but this area is not ideal habitat for the flycatcher. Surveys may be warranted to determine the quality of existing habitat.

New Mexico meadow jumping mouse (Zapus hudsonius luteus) – This federal proposed and state endangered species is found in riparian corridors with wet meadows adjacent to waterways. Within the study area, there are meadows adjacent to the Rio Fernando de Taos. Field surveys may be warranted to determine if these meadows are in fact wet meadows appropriate for this rodent. If so, a species specific survey, including trapping, may be required to determine the presence or absence of the jumping mouse.

4.2.9 Floodplains

Most of the project area is located outside of the 100-year floodplain. A 100-year floodplain is located along the Rio Fernando de Taos. The floodplain crosses Paseo del Pueblo Sur in the southern part of the study area (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2010).

4.2.10 Water Quality

Two surface water features occur along in the study area. The Rio Fernando de Taos is a regularly flowing stream in the southern part of the study area, and an unnamed drainage flows under La Posta Road. No other surface water features are within or adjacent to the project area. Groundwater occurs at relatively shallow depths. Depth to groundwater ranges from 2 to 125 feet with an average depth of 26 feet (New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, 2014).

4.3 Visual Resources

The views near the study area consist of an urban landscape. The pueblo style architecture is common throughout the study area (see Figure 4.1). Both Paseo del Pueblo and Camino de la Placita are narrow, curving roads that create attractive landscapes through this historic part of Taos. Trees are common throughout much of the study area, and the one- to two-story buildings fit well within the historic style (see Figure 4.2). The appropriate scale of the buildings and roadways along with attractive streetscape result in a pleasant visual environment for pedestrians (see Figure 4.3).
4.4 Farmland

Farmland Protection Policy Act was passed in order to prevent the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses by federal programs. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) classifies farmland that merits protection from conversion as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No land in the project area is currently used as farmland. The NRCS classifies five soil mapping units in the study area as Prime Farmland if irrigated, two units as Farmland of Statewide Importance, and one unit as not prime farmland (see Table 4.3, NRCS, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Mapping Unit</th>
<th>Farmland Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caruso variant silty clay loam, 0-3% slopes</td>
<td>Prime farmland if irrigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 1-3% slopes</td>
<td>Prime farmland if irrigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 3-5% slopes</td>
<td>Prime farmland if irrigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando clay loam, 5-7% slopes</td>
<td>Farmland of statewide importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzano clay loam, 0-1% slopes</td>
<td>Prime farmland if irrigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poganeab silty clay loam, nearly level</td>
<td>Farmland of statewide importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedillo-Sevilla association, strongly sloping</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Cultural Resources

A records search was completed for the study area. Cultural resource data was obtained from the New Mexico Cultural Resources Information System (NMCRIS) managed by the Archaeological Resource Management Section (ARMS) of the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division (HPD).

Table 4.4 is a summary of the sites found within a 0.5 km (0.3 mi) radius of the project area. There are 16 sites located near the project and eight of these sites are within the study area. Also, 26 surveys have been previously conducted within the 0.5 km (0.3 mi) radius (Table 4.5). Finally there are 12 properties that have been listed to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the State Register of Cultural Properties (SRCP) near the project area (Table 4.6). Of the 12 registered properties, 5 could be affected by the proposed project.

As the record search indicates, the study area is located within a culturally dense area. It is located within an older section of Taos, portions of which is within the Taos Downtown Historic District (SR 860, see Table 4). Taos has been occupied historically since the mid-1600s. This occupation was small ranches near the Taos Pueblo. Prehistorically this area was also occupied and utilized by Three-speaking people. Taos Pueblo itself was an important pueblo as it was a trading center between the Pueblo people and the Plains people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Artifact scatter</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo III (ad 1100 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Artifact scatter</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo III (ad 1100 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3924</td>
<td>Historic village of Taos (not w/in Taos Pueblo)</td>
<td>Hispanic: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3929</td>
<td>Kit Carson House National Historic Landmark</td>
<td>Anglo: Mexican / Santa Fe Trail (ad 1821 to 1846)</td>
<td>Eligible, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31035</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - dump</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84321</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - irrigation ditch/system</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo II to Pueblo III (ad 900 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84857</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - unspecified</td>
<td>Anglo: Spanish Contact/Colonial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84321</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - irrigation ditch/system</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo II to Pueblo III (ad 900 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84857</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - unspecified</td>
<td>Anglo: Spanish Contact/Colonial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84321</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - irrigation ditch/system</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo II to Pueblo III (ad 900 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84857</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - unspecified</td>
<td>Anglo: Spanish Contact/Colonial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84321</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - irrigation ditch/system</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo II to Pueblo III (ad 900 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84857</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - unspecified</td>
<td>Anglo: Spanish Contact/Colonial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84321</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - irrigation ditch/system</td>
<td>Ancestral Pueblo: Pueblo II to Pueblo III (ad 900 to 1300)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84857</td>
<td>Artifact scatter with features - unspecified</td>
<td>Anglo: Spanish Contact/Colonial to Recent Historic (ad 1539 to 1993)</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 — Previously Recorded Sites within 0.5 km (0.3 mi) of the Project Area

La Acequia de al Loma Abajo
Hispanic: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1850 to 1992)
Not entered

Artificial scatters
Anglo: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1846 to 1992)
Not entered

Artificial scatters
Anglo: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1846 to 1992)
Not entered

Hispanic: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1846 to 1992)
Eligible, D

Anglo: US Territorial to NM Statehood-WWII (ad 1880 to 1945)
Not entered

Our Lady of Guadalupe Churches
Hispanic: Post-Pueblo Revolt to Recent Historic (ad 1802 to 1961)
Not entered

Hispanic: Post-Pueblo Revolt to Recent Historic (ad 1802 to 1961)
Not entered

Hispanic: Post-Pueblo Revolt to Recent Historic (ad 1802 to 1961)
Not entered

Artificial scatters
Hispanic: Post-Pueblo Revolt to Recent Historic (ad 1802 to 1961)
Not entered

Hispanic: Post-Pueblo Revolt to Recent Historic (ad 1802 to 1961)
Not entered

Artificial scatters
Anglo: US Territorial to Recent Historic (ad 1846 to 1992)
Not entered

La Loma Plaza
Hispanic: US Territorial to NM Statehood-WWII (ad 1900 to 1945)
Not eligible
## Table 4.5 — Previous Archaeological Surveys within 0.5 km (0.3 mi) of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMCRIS No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
<th>Author, Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10644</td>
<td>Planned Senior Citizens Center for Kit Carson Memorial Foundation Inc.</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Boyer, J L, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15659</td>
<td>2.2 Mile Segment of SR 68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scanlon, Thomas S., 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20282</td>
<td>Taos Pueblo (9AL-79-561)</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dodge, William A., 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20285</td>
<td>Taos Pueblo (AL-79-561)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dodge, William A., 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23317</td>
<td>SR 3 at the Intersection of LA Placita Road</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Koczan, Steven A., 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25162</td>
<td>Ten Proposed Housing and Urban Development Homesites at Taos Pueblo</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Harrill, Bruce, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38002</td>
<td>Salazar Road Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38995</td>
<td>Buried Electrical Distribution Line for Kit Carson Electric</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>McCrary, O, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39859</td>
<td>Improvements to Portion of Spider Road for BIA-AAO</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>McKenna, P J, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42186</td>
<td>Ranchitos Road: Along State Road 240</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47958</td>
<td>Taos Public Library</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48098</td>
<td>US 64 in El Prado</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Evans, Laurie G., 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54836</td>
<td>Taos Youth and Family Center</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58041</td>
<td>Proposed Underground Telephone Cable ROW along Highway 68</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Michalik, Laura, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65299</td>
<td>Kachina Lodge Taos County, New Mexico</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wells, Daniel, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80214</td>
<td>Acequia de Los Sanchez</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ackery, Neal W., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84516</td>
<td>Proposed Drainage Improvements along the West Side of US 64 (Mile Post 253.6)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sullins, Adam, and Teresa Hurt, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99842</td>
<td>Proposed Central Station Development</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100826</td>
<td>US 64 ROW MP 251.96 to MP 253.38 and 285-m along Hall Creek Road</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brown, Marie E., Karen Serio and Kenneth L. Brown, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102675</td>
<td>Proposed Additions to the Taos Community Auditorium</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Raymond, Gerry, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107734</td>
<td>Proposed Improvements to US 64 MP 254.66 to 255.17</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campbell, K , H Lawrence and G Raymond, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109518</td>
<td>The Simon Bell Property: La Loma Plaza</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124893</td>
<td>Two Miles along Veterans Highway near Taos Pueblo</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cordua, Teresa and Andrew Zink, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125432</td>
<td>Rights of Way in Colfax, Rio Arriba, and Taos Counties</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Doak, David and Chance Copperstone, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126368</td>
<td>Taos Juvenile Treatment Facility</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Zink, Andrew and Teresa Cordua, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126994</td>
<td>Placitas Road</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Boyer, Jeffrey L., 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Alternatives Considered in the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives

The following sections provide a description of each of the alternatives identified and considered in the Initial Assessment of Alternatives.

5.3.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build alternative assumes that improvements to address the transportation needs identified in this report would not be undertaken. Traffic operations would continue with no major improvements to the corridor. Pedestrian and bicycle lane needs would not be addressed. Major Drainage and Pavement improvements would not to be provided for. Continued maintenance to address pavement, capacity, safety, access, and other roadway issues would be programmed and carried out as needed. The No-Build alternative will be evaluated and compared to the build alternatives in more detail in the later phases of the Alignment Study.

5.3.2 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Alternative 1 would provide for signal coordination through the corridor limits on NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita in an effort to improve traffic operations through corridor wide signal coordination. This alternative would include the addition of two new traffic signals on Camino de la Placita at the intersections of Civic Plaza Drive and Don Fernando Street to help maintain cross-street traffic flow. This alternative would also include a new traffic signal at the intersection of Albright/Teva, which was already planned for.

As a part of this alternative, opportunities to improve intersection geometry would be assessed. In addition, opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle lane improvements within the central business area would be assessed. Alternative 1 would be contained within the existing right-of-way, with the exception of any requirements for minor intersection improvements. Sidewalks and curb ramps would be assessed for needed improvements to comply with current ADA guidelines. In addition, pavement conditions would be assessed to determine the need for pavement rehabilitation. The roadway drainage would be assessed to determine the need for any minor improvements.

Figure 5.1 illustrates Alternative 1, along with the location of existing and proposed traffic signals (following page).

5.3.3 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-lane Improvements on NM 68

Alternative 2 is similar to Alternative 1, however it would also include roadway widening to provide for 4-lane improvements to NM 68 from La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita. Similar to Alternative 1, this alternative would involve corridor wide signal coordination plus 2 new traffic signals at Camino de la Placita at Civic Plaza Drive and Don Fernando Road. Similar to Alternative 1, this alternative would also include a new traffic signal at the intersection of Albright/Teva, which was already planned for.

Similar to Alternative 1, opportunities to improve intersection geometry would be assessed. In addition, opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle lane improvements within the central business area would be assessed. Alternative 2 would be contained within the existing right-of-way, with the exception of any requirements for minor intersection improvements. Sidewalks and curb ramps would be assessed for needed improvements to comply with current ADA guidelines. In addition, pavement conditions would be assessed to determine the need for pavement rehabilitation. The roadway drainage would be assessed to determine the need for any minor improvements.

5.2 Design Criteria

The design criteria used to develop the improvement alternatives are based on information in the following reference documents and sources:

- Current ADA Guidelines

Based on AASHTO criteria, and in order to provide for acceptable degrees of congestion, Urban Major Arterials should be designed for a LOS of C or D.

5.2.1 Design and Posted Speeds

A 40 mph Design Speed was used for NM 68. For US 64, a 25 mph Design Speed was used. For Camino de la Placita, a 25 mph Design Speed was used. NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita are currently posted at 35 mph, 25 mph, and 25 mph respectively through the project corridor.

As a part of the development and evaluation of alternatives, consideration was also given to the amount of existing right-of-way available, as well as other existing constraints within the project limits.

Major intersection alternatives were included in the evaluation of alternatives.
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sections. NM MainStreet’s proposal will be analyzed in more detail in Phase B of the study.

Figure 5.7 illustrates NM MainStreet’s proposed roadway cross-section. As an alternative, they propose to narrow lane driving lanes to 11’ and increase sidewalk widths in order to improve walkability. Figure 5.7A illustrates NM MainStreet’s proposed roadway cross-sections. NM MainStreet’s proposal will be analyzed in more detail in Phase B of the study.

5.3.3 Alternative 3 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-lane Improvements on NM 68 + One-Way Pair

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2, however it would also include converting a short segment of NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita to a “One-Way Pair” facility. In addition, this alternative would require the installation of 5 new traffic signals on Camino de la Placita to facilitate traffic operations; new signal locations would include Valverde/Lund, Town Hall Drive, Civic Plaza Drive, Bent Street, and Don Fernando Road. The additional traffic signals are required to address cross traffic flow from the side streets. Similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, this alternative would also include a new traffic signal at the intersection of Albright/Tewa, which was already planned for.

Similar to Alternative 2, opportunities to improve intersection geometry would be assessed. In addition, opportunities for pedestrian and bicyclist improvements within the central business area would be assessed. Alternative 3 would be contained within the existing right-of-way, with the exception of any requirements for minor intersection improvements. Sidewalks and curb ramps would be assessed for needed improvements to comply with current ADA guidelines. In addition, pavement conditions would be assessed to determine the need for pavement rehabilitation. The roadway drainage would be assessed to determine the need for any minor improvements.

On NM 68, between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, the roadway would be widened to provide for a 4-lane facility with paved shoulders, curb and gutter, and sidewalks. The paved shoulders and sidewalks would provide for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Left-turn lanes at key locations would be provided along this segment.

The One-Way Pair would provide for two lanes of travel in each direction and would provide for designated bicycle lanes and parking lanes where they can be accommodated.

Figures 5.5 and 5.6 illustrate Alternative 3 north of Camino de la Placita. Figures 5.2 and 5.3 illustrate Alternative 3 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, along with the location of existing and proposed traffic signals. Figure 5.7 illustrates the proposed roadway cross-section for the One-Way Pair segment through the segment north of Camino de la Placita. NM MainStreet provided input on the Alternative 3 roadway cross-section. As an alternative, they propose to narrow lane driving lanes to 11’ and increase sidewalk widths in order to improve walkability. Figure 5.7A illustrates NM MainStreet’s proposed roadway cross-sections. NM MainStreet’s proposal will be analyzed in more detail in Phase B of the study.

5.3.4 Traffic Roundabout Intersection Alternatives

Based on public input, it was requested that traffic roundabouts be assessed as an alternative to a standard intersection design. The use of traffic roundabouts on major roadway intersections along this corridor would have limitations due to a number of factors, including:

- Minimum diameter requirements
- Side street alignment
- Limited right-of-way available
- Impacts to businesses
- Impacts to historic structures
- Cost considerations

In order to evaluate this alternative, the intersection of NM 68/Albright/Tewa was selected as a “most likely” candidate, based on a number of factors, including:

- This location has the widest right-of-way available on NM 68
- Side street alignments are fairly normal
- No historic structures are located in the vicinity of the intersection

A minimum roundabout diameter of 80 feet was established for the traffic roundabout.

Figure 5.8 illustrates the traffic roundabout.

5.3.5 Intersection Realignments

As previously discussed, non-standard intersection alignments result in conflict points resulting in an increased potential for crashes. The non-standard design also results in poor intersection operations. Intersections that were identified as needing realignment include:

- Siler/Los Pandos
- Camino de la Placita/Quesnal
- US 64/Camino del Pueblo Norte

Figure 5.9 reflects a potential realignment of the Siler/Los Pandos intersection. The realignment would line up the two intersecting streets to improve both safety features as well as traffic operations.

Intersections realignments will be assessed in more detail in Phase 1B of the Alignment Study.
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CHAPTER 6, INITIAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES (PHASE 1A)

6.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the initial evaluation of each of the alternatives described in Chapter 5 of this document. As a part of the Alignment Study process, a preliminary evaluation of each alternative was done to:

- Assess consistency with the project purpose and need
- Conduct an Initial assessment of Engineering Factors, including engineering feasibility, construct-ability, traffic operations benefits, safety benefits, access improvements, drainage requirements, surfacing materials requirements, cost, and right-of-way requirements
- Conduct an Initial assessment of Environmental Factors, including a preliminary evaluation of Social, Cultural, and Environmental effects of each alternative.

Since the objective of the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives is primarily intended to identify major differences between the alternatives identified in Chapter 5, detailed evaluations were not performed during this phase; instead, a screening process was used that includes both qualitative and quantitative criteria and factors. Detailed assessments of the alternatives advanced from Phase 1A will be completed and documented in Phase 1B of the Alignment Study process.

6.2 Initial Evaluation Of Alternatives

6.2.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build alternative assumes that improvements to address the transportation needs identified in this report would not be undertaken. Traffic operations on NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita and its major intersections would continue to operate under existing conditions.

6.2.2 Roadway Build Alternatives

The following sections summarize the initial evaluation of the major factors associated with each of the roadway build alternatives evaluated in this phase:

6.2.2.1 Purpose and Need

"The purpose of the proposed improvements is to correct existing physical deficiencies, facilitate traffic flow and operations, improve traffic safety conditions, manage access to adjoining properties, and develop appropriate facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians."

6.2.2.1.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Signal Coordination in itself does not address the existing physical deficiencies, however, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, paving, and drainage improvements) can be added to this alternative to address this issue. In addition, geometric and pedestrian safety improvements could be added to this alternative to address needed intersection geometric improvements and pedestrian safety improvements.

This alternative would not address pedestrian and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

Traffic flows would be improved compared to the No-Build alternative; however, there would still be significant delays throughout the corridor (See Section 6.2.2.2 for more details).

6.2.2.1.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita addresses physical improvements needed on NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placitas; however, does not address physical improvements to the remainder of the corridor. However, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, paving, and drainage improvements) can be added to this alternative to address this issue beyond Camino de la Placita. In addition, geometric and pedestrian safety improvements could be added to this alternative to address needed intersection geometric improvements and pedestrian safety improvements beyond Camino de la Placita.

This alternative addresses needed pedestrian and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

Traffic flows would be slightly improved compared to Alternative 1, but not significantly (See Section 6.2.2.2 for more details).

6.2.2.1.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita + One Way Pair north of Camino de la Placita addresses physical improvements needed on NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placitas; however, does not address physical improvements to the remainder of the corridor. However, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, paving, and drainage improvements) can be added to this alternative to address this issue beyond Camino de la Placita. In addition, geometric and pedestrian safety improvements could be added to this alternative to address needed intersection geometric improvements and pedestrian safety improvements beyond Camino de la Placita.

This alternative addresses needed pedestrian and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

Traffic flows would be slightly improved compared to Alternatives 1 and 2, with the exception of the intersection of NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quesnal (See Section 6.2.2.2 for more details).

6.2.2.2 Traffic Operations

In order to assess existing and future traffic operations for the alternatives identified, LOS and Delay analysis was performed for each alternative, including the No-Build. Table 6.1 summarizes the analysis.

Alternatives 1 and 2 show an improvement over the No-Build alternative. Alternative 3 would result in the most improved overall LOS and decreased delays.

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 illustrate a comparison of the LOS for the alternatives for Years 2013, 2023, and 2033, as well as the No-Build alternative.

In addition, a Queuing analysis was completed the alternatives identified for years 2013, 2023, and 2033 to assess queuing values at the major intersections. The No-Build alternative was also assessed.

Figures 6.3 through 6.12 on the following pages provide a summary of the queuing values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exist</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Alt. 1 -Signal Coord.</th>
<th>Alt. 2 - Signal Coord. + Widen</th>
<th>Alt. 3 - Signal Coord. + Widen + One-way</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Alt. 1 -Signal Coord.</th>
<th>Alt. 2 - Signal Coord. + Widen</th>
<th>Alt. 3 - Signal Coord. + Widen + One-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NM 68 &amp; La Posta Rd/ Cervantes Dr</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NM 68 &amp; Tewa St/ Albright St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>240.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>314.7</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NM 68 &amp; Siler Rd/Los Pandos Rd</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>171.3</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>194.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NM 68 &amp; Cam. de La Placita/Quesnel</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>388.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>389.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NM 68 &amp; US 64/N Plaza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>284.2</td>
<td>196.8</td>
<td>211.4</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>US 64 &amp; Civic Plaza Dr</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>US 64 &amp; Cam. de La Placita/Rivali Ln</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>D*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>D*</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cam. de La Placita</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that the intersection is an all-way stop thus the LOS is valued differently than a signalized intersection.
6.2.2.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Compared to the No-Build alternative, Signal coordination would result in a slight improvement in the LOS at all major intersecting streets, thus slightly reducing delays, however not significantly.

The queuing analysis shows that this alternative would not improve the queuing along NM 68 and US 64, and in fact would make the queues longer in many cases.

6.2.2.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Compared to the No-Build alternative, Signal coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita would result in a slight improvement in LOS at all major intersecting streets, thus slightly reducing delays, however not significantly. Compared to Alternative 1, the LOS for all intersections is almost exactly the same, with the exception of the intersections of NM 68/Albright/Teva and NM 68/Siler/Los Pandos, which shows a dramatic improvement compared to Alternative 1.

The queuing analysis shows that an overall improvement in queuing over Alternative 1 in the segment south of Camino de la Placita, however, no significant difference north of Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Compared to the No-Build alternative, Signal coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, plus converting NM 68/US 64/Camino de la Placita to a One-Way Pair, would result in a significant improvement in LOS at all major intersecting streets with the exception of the intersection of NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quemual, thus reducing delays. Compared to Alternatives 1 and 2, the LOS for intersections south of Camino de la Placita would improve. North of Camino de la Placita and on Camino de la Placita itself, the LOS would not be significantly different. The LOS at the intersection of NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quemual would be significantly lower than Alternatives 1 and 2.

The queuing analysis shows an overall improvement over the No-Build and Alternatives 1 and 2.

6.2.2.4 – Intersection Re-alignments

Intersection re-alignments at key intersections, such as Siler/Los Pandos, NM 68/Camino de la Placita, and US 64/Camino del Pueblo del Pueblo Norte would improve traffic operations, including LOS at these intersections.

6.2.2.5 – Traffic Roundabouts

A preliminary assessment of incorporating traffic roundabouts was made. The intersection of NM 68/Albright/Teva was assessed as a most likely case, due to its existing geometric alignment and available right-of-way width.

While the traffic roundabout would improve traffic operations, significant widening would be required to accommodate the minimum size roundabout required for the design traffic volumes.

6.2.2.3 Safety

6.2.2.3.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Signal Coordination in itself does not address the existing safety issues, however, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, curb ramp modifications, intersection geometric improvements, and repaving) can be added to this alternative to address this issue, thus improving the overall safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists north of Camino de la Placita.

This alternative would not address pedestrian and bicyclist safety needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.3.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, in itself does not address the existing safety issues, however, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, curb ramp modifications, intersection geometric improvements, and repaving) north of Camino de la Placita can be added to this alternative to address this issue, thus improving the overall safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists north of Camino de la Placita.

This alternative would address pedestrian and bicyclist safety needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.3.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita + One Way Pair north of Camino de la Placita addresses safety improvements needed on NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placitas, however does not address physical improvements to the remainder of the corridor. However, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, curb ramp modifications, paving, and intersection geometric improvements) can be added to this alternative to address this issue beyond Camino de la Placita.

This alternative addresses needed pedestrian and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.3.4 – Intersection Re-alignments

Intersection realignments at key intersections, such as Siler/Los Pandos, NM 68/Camino de la Placita, and US 64/Camino del Pueblo del Pueblo Norte would improve traffic safety for motorists, as well as pedestrians and bicyclists.

6.2.2.4 Pedestrians and Bicyclists

6.2.2.4.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Signal Coordination in itself does not address the needed pedestrian and bicyclist needs, however, the addition of sidewalk improvements and repairs, curb ramp modifications, intersection geometric improvements, and paving improvements would address needed pedestrian and bicyclist improvements north of Camino de la Placita.

This alternative would not address pedestrian and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.4.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placitas by providing a paved shoulder and new sidewalks. However, it does not address physical improvements to the remainder of the corridor. However, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, curb ramp modifications, intersection geometric improvements, and paving) can be added to this alternative to address this issue beyond Camino de la Placitas.
6.2.2.4.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Signal Coordination plus 4-lane improvements to NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita + One Way Pair north of Camino de la Placita addresses pedestrian and bicyclist improvements needed on NM 68 between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita by providing a paved shoulder and new sidewalks. However, it does not address physical improvements to the remainder of the corridor. However, additional physical improvements (i.e. sidewalks, curb ramp modifications, intersection geometric improvements, and paving) can be added to this alternative to address this issue beyond Camino de la Placita.

6.2.2.4.4 - Sidewalk Improvements Through Central Business District

It should be noted that existing sidewalks north of Camino de la Placita, through the Central Business District, in many cases do not comply with current ADA standards. There are many cases of narrow sidewalks, or sidewalks that are in need of repairs. Major modifications to sidewalks through this area would likely result in a significant reconstruction effort and would require significant coordination efforts with applicable oversight agencies.

6.2.2.5 Drainage

6.2.2.5.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Alternative 1 in itself does not address drainage improvements, however, they could be incorporated at spot locations as required.

6.2.2.5.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Alternative 2 would address drainage system requirements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita. Drainage improvements north of Camino de la Placita could be incorporated at spot locations as required.

6.2.2.5.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would address drainage system requirements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, and north of Camino de la Placita, could be incorporated at spot locations as required.

6.2.2.6 Geo-technical and Pavement

6.2.2.6.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Alternative 1 in itself addresses paving improvements, however, paving could be incorporated at deficient locations as required.

6.2.2.6.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Alternative 2 would address paving requirements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita. Paving improvements north of Camino de la Placita could be incorporated at deficient locations as required.

6.2.2.6.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would address paving requirements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, and north of Camino de la Placita, could be incorporated at deficient locations as required.

6.2.2.7 Right-of-Way

6.2.2.7.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Alternative 1 would not require additional right-of-way, unless sidewalk modifications are required to meet current ADA requirements. This will be further assessed in Phase B of the study.

6.2.2.7.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Alternative 2 would not require additional right-of-way. It is anticipated that Temporary Construction Permits (TCP’s) and/or Work Permits may be required between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita to construct the roadway widening.

6.2.2.7.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would address paving requirements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, and north of Camino de la Placita, could be incorporated at deficient locations as required.

6.2.2.8 Utilities

6.2.2.8.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System

Alternative 1 would not require any major utility relocations. An assessment would need to be made to see if updating the signal system would impact existing utilities. The construction of additional traffic signals could have an impact on existing utilities.

6.2.2.8.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68

Alternative 2 would likely have impacts to existing utilities within the La Posta to Camino de la Placita segment. North of Camino de la Placita, an assessment would need to be made to see if updating the signal system would impact existing utilities. The construction of additional traffic signals could have an impact on existing utilities.

6.2.2.8.3 - Alternative 3 - Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair

The impacts of Alternative 3 would be very similar to Alternative 2.

6.2.2.8.4 – Intersection Re-alignments

Intersection realignments at key intersections, such as Siler/Los Pandos, NM 68/Camino de la Placita, and US 64/Camino del Pueblo del Pueblo Norte would likely result in some degree of impact to existing utilities, es-
### FIGURE 6.3

**Intersection PM Peak Hour Queuing Summaries**

**Slim 68/US 64 in Taos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Thru/Right</th>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>163/207</td>
<td>222/207</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77/112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>110/159</td>
<td>138/185</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>107/84</td>
<td>78/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 6.4

**Intersection PM Peak Hour Queuing Summaries**

**Slim 68/US 64 in Taos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Thru/Right</th>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>35/92/48/24</td>
<td>42/48/24</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>190/200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45/25</td>
<td>24/28/32</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>247/219/278/32</td>
<td>243/53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend Max Queue (ft)
- No Build/Coordinated
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

*Average of six runs
Note: Radial arrow indicates a queue that exceeds link distance.
#1 - NM 68 & La Posta Rd./Cervantes Dr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>143/283/239/140</td>
<td>223/307/200/157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>110/199/179/99</td>
<td>138/185/152/123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend Max Queue* (ft)
No Build/Coordinated/Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair
*Average of six runs
Note: Red text denotes a queue that exceeds link distance.

La Posta Rd. (489)
Cervantes Dr. (Link dist. 858 ft)

#5 - NM 68 & Tewa St./Albright St.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>20/32/19/51</td>
<td>42/48/34/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right/Left</td>
<td>Thru/Right</td>
<td>Thru/Left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend Max Queue* (ft)
No Build/Coordinated/Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair
*Average of six runs
Note: Red text denotes a queue that exceeds link distance.

Tewa St. (541)
Albright St. (Link Dist. 421 ft)

FIGURE 6.5

FIGURE 6.6
NM 68-US 64 Corridor Study
Intersection PM Peak Hour Queuing Summaries

No Build/Coordinated
Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

Legend Max Queue* (ft)
No Build/Coordinated/
Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair
*Average of six runs
Note: Red text denotes a queue that exceeds link distance.

No Build/Coordinated
Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

FIGURE 6.7
FIGURE 6.8
### NM 68-US 64 Corridor Study

#### Intersection PM Peak Hour Queuing Summaries

#### #8 - NM 68 & N Plaza/US 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Left/ Thru</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Thru/ Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>185/187</td>
<td>186/120</td>
<td>187/186</td>
<td>186/135</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue** (ft)

- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

**US 64 (Link dist. 565 ft)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Left/ Thru</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Thru/ Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>149/205</td>
<td>204/261</td>
<td>205/204</td>
<td>204/261</td>
<td>205/204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**US 64 (Link dist. 533 ft)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Left/ Thru</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Thru/ Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue** (ft)

- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

#### #10 - US 64 & Civic Plaza Dr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Left/ Thru</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Thru/ Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>205/304</td>
<td>204/214</td>
<td>204/214</td>
<td>204/214</td>
<td>204/214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue** (ft)

- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

**US 64 (Link dist. 234 ft)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Left/ Thru</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Thru/ Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
<td>N/A/ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue** (ft)

- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

#### FIGURE 6.9

[Diagram of NM 68-US 64 Corridor Study showing traffic flow and queuing summaries for intersections #8 and #10.]

#### FIGURE 6.10

[Diagram of NM 68-US 64 Corridor Study showing traffic flow and queuing summaries for intersections #8 and #10.]
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### #19 - US 64 & Cam. de La Placita

**Legend Max Queue**
- **(ft)**
- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>Right/Thru/Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>543/1877/576/1240</td>
<td>398/1240/304/242</td>
<td>Thru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>300/300/300/127</td>
<td>246/300/300/144</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**US 64 (Link dist. 288 ft)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>102/140</td>
<td>149/140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>149/149</td>
<td>149/149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue**
- **(ft)**
- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

**FIGURE 6.11**

### #27 - Ranchitos Rd & Cam. de La Placitas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend Max Queue**
- **(ft)**
- No Build/Coordinated/
- Coord. + 4 Lanes/One-way Pair

**FIGURE 6.12**
especially if there are any improvements that would require excavation, such as signal relocation or storm drain improvements.

6.2.2.9 Ease of Construction

6.2.2.9.1 Alternative 1 – Coordinated Signal System
Alternative 1 would not result in any major impacts to traffic for coordinating traffic signals. Simple temporary lane closures at existing and new signal locations would be required.

6.2.2.9.2 Alternative 2 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68
Similar to Alternative 1, no major impacts to traffic anticipated for signal coordination efforts. However, there would be significant traffic impacts between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita for roadway widening operations, including any storms sewer and utility relocation work. Temporary lane closures and short-term detouring is anticipated.

6.2.2.9.3 Alternative 3 – Coordinated Signal System + 4-Lane Improvements on NM 68 + One Way Pair
The impacts of Alternative 3 would be very similar to Alternative 2.

6.2.2.9.4 – Intersection Re-alignments
Intersection realignments at key intersections, such as Siler/Los Pandos, NM 68/Camino de la Placita, and US 64/Camino del Paseo del Pueblo Norte would be likely require significant traffic control efforts to complete improvements. Temporary and extended lane closures are anticipated.

6.2.2.9.5 Sidewalk Improvements through Central Business District
Sidewalk construction through the Central Business District would require temporary lane closures, as well as temporary sidewalk closures. There would be a need for extra coordination efforts with the business community.

6.2.2.10 Costs
The range of construction costs for this corridor would range from high to low as follows:

- Alternative 3
- Alternative 2
- Alternative 1

Roadway costs for Alternatives 2 and 3 would be higher than Alternative 1 due to the roadway widening required between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita, as well as the need for additional traffic signals.

Costs for all three alternatives would increase with the addition of any of the following items:

- Intersection Re-alignments
- Sidewalk reconstruction north of Camino de la Placita
- Drainage improvements north of Camino de la Placita
- Roadway paving
- Roadway widening

Table 6.2 summarizes preliminary cost estimates for each of the above alternatives. Table 6.2 also includes additive costs for additional improvements. See Appendix F for detailed cost breakdown.

6.3 Initial Assessment Of Environmental Impacts

6.3.1 Community and Land Use Impacts
Most proposed improvements would be compatible with land uses along NM 68 and US 64. Signal, intersection, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements would benefit the local community. The one-way pair option has a mixture of support and opposition. The one-way pair would require some changes in driving patterns for vehicles entering and exiting businesses and community facilities. This is not expected to affect business viability.

The project would need to be evaluated for environmental justice impacts. The proposed improvements are expected to benefit the Hispanic/Latino and Native American communities by providing safer traffic conditions, facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists, and a visually more attractive roadway corridor along NM 68 and US 64.

6.3.2 Social Services
Social services would not be affected by the proposed improvements. Police, fire, and health facilities would remain accessible. The one-way pair may require some rerouting of some small emergency vehicle traffic, but emergency response times may decrease because of reduced traffic congestion. Signal and intersection improvements would likely reduce emergency vehicle response times slightly. The one-way pair would also require some adjustments to school bus routes and parents traveling to Elko Garcia Elementary and the Taos Cyber Magnet schools. The construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities would provide safer conditions for students to walk or ride a bike to school and for tourists to walk through Downtown Taos.

6.3.3 Local Economy
NM 68 and US 64 play an important role in the local economy by providing access to local businesses and community facilities. Some comments from business owners have indicated concerns that traffic congestion leaves a negative impact on visitors to Taos. Many visitors are surprised that a small community like Taos experiences such traffic congestion. Other business owners believe that traffic congestion is to be expected and Taos visitors should be encouraged to park their cars and walk through the downtown. It is expected that sidewalk and intersection would benefit local businesses by providing some improvement to pedestrian and traffic flow. The one-way pair option would provide the greatest traffic improvement and improve traffic flow through Downtown Taos. Some business owners are concerned that the one-way pair will negatively affect the character of Downtown Taos. If the one-way pair option is implemented, some design mitigation measures may be needed to ensure that the cultural and historic character of Downtown Taos are retained.

6.3.4 Air Quality Impacts
Although air quality in Taos is good, maintaining traffic flow and reducing the number of idling vehicles can help improve air quality. Reducing traffic congestion and idling vehicles at intersections, such as NM 68/US 64, would result in minor improvements to air quality. Dust control measures would be needed during construction.

6.3.5 Noise Impacts
Keeping vehicle speeds at 25-35 mph in the corridor will ensure that noise levels do not increase substantially. Because NM 68 and US 64 are developed urban corridors with numerous driveways, streets and business frontages, noise walls are not a feasible option since any wall would have numerous openings. Keeping traffic speeds to 35 mph or less is the best option for limiting noise impacts.

6.3.6 Hazardous Materials Impacts

Further investigations will be needed to determine if there are any hazardous materials sites along NM 68 and US 64. Existing and historic services stations may have caused some impacts. An ISA will be conducted to determine the extent, if any, of soil and groundwater contamination in the study area.

6.3.7 Natural Resources Impacts

Roadway reconstruction would disturb the terrain and soils along the corridor. Measures would need to be implemented to minimize soil erosion and sediment transport during construction. At the completion of construction, soil erosion would be reduced because a greater proportion of the corridor would be covered with hard surfaces.

6.3.8 Impacts To Vegetation

Since there are no large areas of native vegetation in the project area, vegetation impacts would be minor. Disturbed areas would be reseeded with native vegetation at the completion of construction.

6.3.9 Noxious Weeds

No large-scale noxious weed infestations occur in the study area. If located, isolated areas of noxious weeds would be easily controlled.

6.3.10 Wetlands And Riparian Habitat

The project would potentially impact wetlands along the Rio Fernando de Taos as well as along an unnamed drainage that flows under La Posta Road at the southern end of the study area. Wetlands impacts would depend on any roadway widening or drainage improvements constructed near this waterway. If the biological survey determines that wetlands are present at these locations and would be impacted by construction activities, wetland delineations would be conducted, and a wetland mitigation plan would be prepared. A Section 404 permit under the Clean Water Act would be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

6.3.11 Wildlife

Wildlife impacts would be few because of the absence of wildlife habitat. The main habitat area is the riparian vegetation along the Rio Fernando de Taos. Migratory birds are the primary wildlife issue in the study area. Potential migratory bird nesting sites occur in trees along the Rio Fernando de Taos and ornamental trees growing in various areas near the corridor. Tree cutting and clearing should occur outside of the migratory bird nesting season (March–September) or preconstruction surveys for migratory birds would be needed.

6.3.12 Rare, Threatened, Endangered, And Other Target Species

A biological survey would be conducted to determine if the project has the potential to impact three species in riparian areas along the Rio Fernando de Taos. No protected species are expected to occur in other portions of the study area.

The yellow-billed cuckoo could utilize the Rio Fernando de Taos, but due to the level of development in the area, this is unlikely. However, surveys should be conducted for this species prior to construction.

Southwestern willow flycatcher could utilize the Rio Fernando de Taos further downstream from the study area, but this area is not ideal habitat for the flycatcher. Surveys may be warranted to determine the quality of existing habitat.

The New Mexico meadow jumping mouse potentially could occur in meadows adjacent to the Rio Fernando de Taos. Field surveys may be warranted to determine if these meadows are in fact wet-meadows appropriate for this rodent. If so, a species specific survey, including trapping, may be required to determine the presence or absence of the jumping mouse.

6.3.13 Floodplains

One 100-year floodplain area may be affected by proposed roadway improvement in the vicinity of the Rio Fernando de Taos. The project would not modify this floodplain or increase the flooding risk to any adjoining properties.

6.3.14 Water Quality

The construction contractor would obtain coverage under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). The construction contractor would prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project area. The SWPPP would describe Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be installed and maintained both during construction and after construction to prevent, to the extent practicable, pollutants in storm water from entering waters of the U.S. Permanent stabilization measures and permanent storm water management measures would be implemented to minimize pollutants from entering waters of the U.S.

A Section 404 permit through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Section 401 water quality certification through the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) would be needed if project activities affected any wetlands or jurisdictional waters associated with the Rio Fernando de Taos or the drainage under La Posta Road. A Section 404 Nationwide Permit 14 (which includes the water quality certification) could be used if impacts were less than ½ acre.

6.3.15 Visual Resources

Roadway, sidewalk, and intersection improvements would result in slight modifications to the visual environment. Intersections would be adjusted and sidewalks widened in some areas. Final plans would need to incorporate color and design features to ensure that the improvements fit within the Taos context.

6.3.16 Farmland

The study area contains soils classified as Prime Farmland if irrigated and Farmland of Statewide Importance. None of these soils are currently used as farmland, and there are no plans to convert any of these soils back to farmland. Proposed improvements would not take any currently cultivated farmland out of production.

6.3.17 Cultural Resources
Table 6.2  
NM/US 64, La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita  
Conceptual Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate Summary</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM 68/US 64</td>
<td>Camino de la Placita</td>
<td>NM 68/US 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade &amp; Drain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Storm Drain, Miscellaneous Drainage</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Grade &amp; Drain</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$126,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Widening - La Posta to Camino de la Placita</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$94,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill &amp; Inlay - La Posta to Camino de la Placita</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Surfacing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$714,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Signal or Signal Replacement &amp; Interconnect</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$1,305,000</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Signalization</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$1,305,000</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$262,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$285,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removals</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Traffic Control</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Signing &amp; Stripping</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Adjustments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$48,300</td>
<td>$20,700</td>
<td>$824,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Above</td>
<td>$3,093,300</td>
<td>$1,325,700</td>
<td>$4,709,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (15%)</td>
<td>$463,995</td>
<td>$198,855</td>
<td>$706,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Staking by the Contractor</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control/Quality Assurance Testing</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Construction Engineering</td>
<td>$653,495</td>
<td>$284,355</td>
<td>$1,171,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts Taxes (8.1875%)</td>
<td>$307,591</td>
<td>$131,825</td>
<td>$481,524.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total GRT Costs</td>
<td>$307,591</td>
<td>$131,825</td>
<td>$481,524.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Totals</td>
<td>$4,064,386</td>
<td>$1,741,880</td>
<td>$6,362,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Totals</td>
<td>$5,806,265</td>
<td>$8,676,805</td>
<td>$10,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>$5,807,000</td>
<td>$8,677,000</td>
<td>$10,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Re-Alignment @ Siler/Los Pandos + Right of Way Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements @ Camino de la Placitas/Quesnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements @ Camino del Pueblo Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Improvements North of Camino de la Placita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements North of Camino de la Placita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Improvements on NM 68 and US 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These costs to be determined in Phase 1B
There would be no impacts on previously identified historic buildings or archaeological sites. A cultural resource survey will be conducted to identify historic buildings and archaeological sites along NM 68 and US 64. Tables 4 and 6 list archaeological sites and historic buildings identified in previous studies in the vicinity of the study area. The presence of the Downtown Taos Historic District and several historic buildings merits special attention. The cultural resource survey would evaluate potential impacts to the district and historic buildings. Proposed improvement designs, such as lighting luminaries, may require SHPO review. Use of low vibration construction methods will be required near historic buildings.

6.3.18 Section 4(f)

A park and historic buildings near the study are potential Section 4(f) properties. Kit Carson Park is located on the east side of Paseo del Pueblo Norte. Several historic buildings are located along NM 68 and US 64 (see Tables 4 and 6). The cultural resource survey will provide more information on these buildings. Once proposed improvements are further developed, project impacts to the park and historic buildings will need to be reviewed to determine if they are Section 4(f) impacts.

As this report is only an Initial Evaluation of Alternatives (Phase 1A), the detailed assessment of Environmental impacts will be documented in Phase 1B, Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives if this project is advanced to the next phase of the Alignment Study.

6.4 Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations

6.4.1 Introduction

The objective of Phase 1A, Initial Evaluation of Alternatives, was to identify alternatives that would best achieve the need for physical, operational, and safety improvements need along NM 68, US 64, and Camino de la Placita.

The findings compiled in Phase 1A have verified the need to provide improvements to NM 68 and US 64 to address Physical Deficiencies, improve Traffic Operations, and to address a number of Safety issues.

The following provides a summary of the findings, alternatives analysis, effects of the project alternatives, along with recommendations for Phase 1B, Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives phase.

6.4.2 Summary of Findings

1. There is a need to address physical deficiencies on NM 68/US 64, including: drainage management, pavement, paved shoulders, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
2. There is a need to improve traffic operations along the entire project corridor, as well as at the existing major intersection.
3. There is a need to provide for signal coordination along the entire project corridor, as well as for providing for additional traffic signals at additional intersecting streets to improve traffic operations.
4. There is a need to address safety on this segment of NM 64/US 64. Safety improvements required include: addressing complicated intersection alignments, safety hazards created by inadequate drainage facilities, and lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
5. Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities are desirable and would be highly used.
6. The crash history on this segment reflects that crashes have occurred primarily at major roadway intersections, with the highest concentration at the highest volume intersections.
7. Intersection realignment is desirable at the intersections of Siler/Los Pandos, as well as the intersection of NM 68/Camino de la Placita/Quemad, US 64/Camino de Paseo del Pueblo Norte to improve both safety and traffic operations. Intersection realignment at the Siler/Los Pandos intersection would require right-of-way acquisition, as well as the relocation of an existing improvement.
8. There is a need to maintain access to existing businesses and residences.
9. There is a need to maintain side-street parking along US 64 through the central business district.
10. There is a need to provide additional off-street parking at strategic locations within the limits of the central business district. In addition, on-street signing would be desirable to provide guidance to existing and any new parking lot businesses.
11. The existing right-of-way within the project limits varies significantly. The segment between La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita provides the greatest opportunity for adding additional capacity and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The existing right-of-way through the segment north of Camino de la Placita, and through the central business district is very limited, therefore limiting roadway widening.
12. Traffic roundabouts could potentially improve traffic operations at major intersecting streets, however, would have significant right-of-way impacts.
13. Utility conflicts/impacts are anticipated with the construction of any type of storm sewer improvements.

6.4.3 Recommendations

Table 6.3, Initial Alternatives Screening Matrix, provides a summary of the findings for the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives for the Roadway Alternatives considered.

| Table 6.3 | NM 68/US 64, La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
| Initial Evaluation of Alternatives Screening Matrix |
| Factor | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| Purpose and Need |
| Travel Demand and Congestion | Improvement over existing conditions, however delays to be expected. Additional signals help traffic flow. Intersection realignment would improve operations if included in scope of work. | Improvement over Alternative 1, however delays to be expected. Additional signals help traffic flow. Intersection re-alignments would improve operations if included in scope of work. | Provides for best traffic operational conditions; some delays expected through Business District. Additional signals help traffic flow. Intersection re-alignments would improve operations if included in scope of work. One-way pair will improve traffic operations. |
Table 6.3
NM 68/US 64, La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
Initial Evaluation of Alternatives Screening Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Mobility</td>
<td>Additional signals would improve side-street access. Additional through</td>
<td>Additional signals would improve side-street access. Additional through</td>
<td>Additional signals would improve side-street access. Additional through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lanes and refuge lanes between La Posta and Camino de la Placita will</td>
<td>lanes and refuge lanes between La Posta and Camino de la Placita will</td>
<td>lanes and refuge lanes between La Posta and Camino de la Placita will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improve access and mobility.</td>
<td>improve access and mobility.</td>
<td>improve access and mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Deficiencies</td>
<td>Does not address physical deficiencies. Sidewalk improvements through</td>
<td>Addresses physical deficiencies between La Posta and Camino de la</td>
<td>Addresses physical deficiencies between La Posta and Camino de la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business District would address existing deficiencies.</td>
<td>Placita. Sidewalk improvements through Business District would address</td>
<td>Placita. Sidewalk improvements through Business District would address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing deficiencies.</td>
<td>existing deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineering Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td>Some improvement over existing conditions, however, LOS F for 2023 and</td>
<td>Some improvement over Alternative 2; LOS E for 2023 and LOS F for 2033</td>
<td>Some improvement over Alternative 2; LOS E for 2023 and 2033. Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2033 projections at major intersections.</td>
<td>projections at major intersections.</td>
<td>significant delays at Camino de la Placita, North Plaza, and Ranchitos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>No drainage improvements.</td>
<td>Storm Drain improvements; controlled flows between La Posta and Camino</td>
<td>Storm Drain improvements; controlled flows between La Posta and Camino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de la Placita.</td>
<td>de la Placita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Requirements</td>
<td>None anticipated. Right-of-Way acquisition and relocation at Siler/Los</td>
<td>None anticipated. Right-of-Way acquisition and relocation at Siler/Los</td>
<td>None anticipated. Right-of-Way acquisition and relocation at Siler/Los</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pando if intersection is addressed. Possible Right-of-Way and Camino</td>
<td>Pando if intersection is addressed. Possible Right-of-Way and Camino del</td>
<td>Pando if intersection is addressed. Possible Right-of-Way and Camino del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>&quot;$8.15 Million Costs would increase with intersection realignments and</td>
<td>&quot;$8.15 Million Costs would increase with intersection realignments and</td>
<td>&quot;$8.15 Million Costs would increase with intersection realignments and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sideway/ADA improvements through business area.&quot;</td>
<td>sideway/ADA improvements through business area.&quot;</td>
<td>sideway/ADA improvements through business area.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Impacts</td>
<td>None to minor impacts.</td>
<td>Potential impacts to underground utilities between La Posta and Camino</td>
<td>Potential impacts to underground utilities between La Posta and Camino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de la Placita.</td>
<td>de la Placita.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; no major impacts with limited excavation.</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; will need to conduct ISA if project is advanced</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; will need to conduct ISA if project is advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f) Properties</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Mixed Supported</td>
<td>Mixed Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3
NM 68/US 64, La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita
Initial Evaluation of Alternatives Screening Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; will need to conduct ISA if project is advanced</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; will need to conduct ISA if project is advanced</td>
<td>Some active LPST sites; will need to conduct ISA if project is advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
<td>No major concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>Several historic properties along corridor; no anticipated impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f) Properties</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
<td>Some historic properties along corridor may qualify; no anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Mixed Supported</td>
<td>Mixed Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Project Management Team (PMT) meeting was held on June 10, 2014 to review the findings of the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives. Based on the needs identified, the initial analysis of the alternatives identified in Chapter 5, and taking into account stakeholder input, the PMT made recommendations on which alternatives to advance into Phase 1B.

Based on the preliminary assessment of the Engineering and Environmental factors considered, and taking into account public and agency input, the following recommendations are made as a part of the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives:

Tha the No-Build Alternative all the Build Alternatives evaluated in Phase A are recommended to be advanced for further consideration in Phase 1B, the Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives phase:

Alternative 1 does not meet all the factors identified in the Purpose and Need for this project, however, it did receive stakeholder support, particularly that of the business community who are concerned with impacts to businesses with the One-Way pair Alternative. Alternative 1 would provide minor improvements to traffic operations when compared to the No-Build Alternative. The scope of Alternative 1 could be expanded to include intersection realignment(s), as well as ADA improvements north of Camino de la Placita. There was significant stakeholder support in going with Alternative 1 as an initial improvement to assess how these improvements might benefit traffic operations, rather than making more drastic improvements initially.

Alternative 2 meets a number of the evaluation factors associated with the Purpose and Need for this project, including: 1) provides for needed capacity, pedestrian, and bicyclist improvements between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita; and 2) improves traffic operations, and would perform better than the No-Build and Alternative 1. However, Alternative 3 would result in traffic operational problems at the approach to Camino de la Placita/Quesnal where the 4-lane section would have to be transitioned back to a 2-lane section. Significant queuing and associated delays would result due to the “bottlenecking” of traffic at this location. While, Alternative 2 provides for a number of beneficial improvements, it would not function as well without providing additional lane capacity north of Camino de la Placita. However, this alternative does provide a number of benefits.

Alternative 3 addresses more of the factors identified in the Purpose and Need for this project. Of all 3 alternatives assessed, Alternative 3 would provide for the biggest improvement with respect to traffic operations. Alternative 3 would also address capacity, pedestrian, and bicyclist needs between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita. The scope of Alternative 3 could be expanded to include intersection realignment(s), as well as ADA improvements north of Camino de la Placita. However, Alternative 3 received mixed support from the stakeholders, including the business community and the Pueblo of Taos. The majority of the stakeholders that responded to this alternative did not favor this approach initially, primarily due to the circulatory travel required.

In addition to the above recommendations, the following additional recommendations are made for further detailed evaluation in Phase 1B:

1. **Alternative Cross-section between La Posta Road to Camino de la Placita/Quesnal**
   - Based on public input, it is recommended that a 2-lane section with a raised median, bicycle lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalk be further assessed. The benefits associated with this cross-section include: access management, provides for designated pedestrian and bicycle facilities, provides for enhancement opportunities, and minimizes impacts to existing businesses.

2. **Intersection Re-alignments**
   - Conduct a more detailed evaluation of the following intersections:
     a. Siler/Los Pandos
     b. Camino de la Placita/Quesnal
     c. US 64/Camino del Paseo del Pueblo Norte (Allsup's intersection)
   - Horizontal geometric improvements at these locations would provide for improved traffic operations and improve safety for both motorists and pedestrians.

3. **Pedestrian and Bicyclist Improvements**
   - Assess in more detail opportunities for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Locations include the segment between La Posta Road and Camino de la Placita/Quesnal. In addition, the segment north of Quesnal, through the Plaza area is another key area that is in need of improvements to address: narrow sidewalks, damaged sidewalks, curb ramps, pedestrian crossings, and designated bicycle facilities.

4. **Traffic Roundabouts**
   - Based on public input, there is still a desire to further evaluate traffic roundabouts at a few key major intersections, including the intersection of US 64/Camino de la Placita/Rival Lane.

5. **Drainage**
   - There are locations along the corridor that are in need of drainage improvements to contain and control flows. In addition, ways of minimizing impacts to adjacent properties and irrigation systems should be further evaluated.

6. **Pavement Requirements**
   - Based on the Initial Evaluation of Alternatives, spot locations where the existing pavement is in need of reconstruction or rehabilitation were observed. These locations should be further assessed in consultation with the NMDOT's Pavement Design Section.

7. **Right-of-Way Requirements**
   - More detailed right-of-way requirements should be evaluated in Phase 1B for all of the alternatives being considered. In addition, right-of-way requirements for any proposed intersection realignments (including the need for potential "relocations") should be further assessed.

8. **Off-Street Parking and Wayfinding**
   - Based on stakeholder input, there is a need to locate additional off-street parking lots, especially through the downtown business area. In addition, additional signage is needed to direct traffic to designated parking lots and other points of interest. It is recommended that the Town of Taos, NMDO T, and NM Main Street work together on these efforts, and that these efforts be closely coordinated with the business community.