

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>Comments on Level A (Revised) and B Transportation Plan and Technical Report</p> <p>1. Prepare a guideline that defines the parameters in which the Level A and Level B plans remain relevant and when exceeded shall require appropriate modifications to these plans and the subsequent review by the County. This guideline and the associated parameters shall apply to all appropriate sections of the plans.</p>	N/A	Bernalillo County Staff has indicated this comment will be removed. See PCC criteria and Level A Development Agreement. These protections are built into the process.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>2. Include adequate information to ensure that appropriate land/ROW for all major onsite corridors shall be provided to allow for the transition from interim to ultimate buildout conditions. This is especially relevant regarding the extension of PDV south of I40, as there is the possibility that this road will ultimately become a freeway.</p>	N/A	This is addressed in the Level B Land Use Plan. PdV south of I-40 has been planned to be consistent with the ROW north of I-40.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>3. Functional Classification Maps Provide consistent language or footnote differences: primary = principal arterial, secondary = minor arterial. Consider minor and major collectors.</p>	2016 Level B Master Plan and Updated Level A and 2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	Level B MP - Exhibits 3, 4, 5 and 6; Updated Level A Transportation MP, Figures 1, 2, 3 and 21 and Level B Transportation MP, Figures 1, 10, 11, 12 will be modified to maintain consistency with Functional classification. Updated Level A Transportation MP, Figures 13 and 43 and Level B Transportation MP, Figures 2, 13 and 21 will be revised to clarify the functional classification is based on MRCOG model link definitions.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>4. LRTS Guide/ Complete Streets Add text describing green infrastructure techniques used in roadways. Provide a section describing ITS techniques and adaptive signals as a best practice to consider in Santolina.</p>	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan, Section V, p. 41	Text describing green infrastructure techniques used in roadways and describing ITS techniques and adaptive signals as a best practice to consider in Santolina will be added to the 2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan, Section V, p. 41.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>5. 2040 V/C Off-site LOS Change (&gt;10%) Analysis:</p> <p>*Provide AM Peak off-site mitigation recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I40 and PDN/Atrisco Vista/118th St Ramps</li> <li>b. I40 WB between Unser Blvd and 98th St interchanges.</li> <li>c. 118th St SB between Central Ave and I-40 and approach to Gibson</li> <li>d. Unser Blvd NB between D. Chavez and Gun Club; Coors Blvd NB between Rio Bravo and Gun Club; and Isleta Blvd NB between Rio Bravo and Gun Club.</li> <li>e. Gun Club Rd WB approach to 118th St.</li> <li>f. 114th St NB approach to Central Ave</li> <li>g. Central Ave WB near 118th St; Central Ave EB approach to 98th St</li> </ul> <p>*Provide PM Peak off-site mitigation recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I-40 and PDN/Atrisco Vista Ramps</li> <li>b. I-40 EB between 118th St and Unser Blvd interchanges</li> <li>c. 118th St SB between Central Ave and I-40</li> <li>d. Dennis Chavez Blvd WB approaches to Unser Blvd and Broadway Blvd</li> <li>e. Central Ave WB and EB approaches to 118th St and 98th St</li> <li>f. Unser Blvd SB between D. Chavez and Gun Club; Coors Blvd SB between Rio Bravo and Gun Club; and Isleta Blvd SB between Rio Bravo and Gun Club.</li> </ul>	Supplemental report submitted to Bernalillo County.	A supplemental report will be submitted to Bernalillo County to discuss these locations and identify mitigation requirements.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>6. 2040 V/C On-site LOS Analysis:</p> <p>Provide AM/PM Peak on-site mitigation recommendations:</p> <p>* 118th St NB/SB between Dennis Chavez and Gun Club Rd</p>	Supplemental report submitted to Bernalillo County.	A supplemental report will be submitted to Bernalillo County to discuss these locations.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>7. 2025 V/C LOS Change (&gt;10%) Analysis:</p> <p>* Provide AM Peak off-site mitigation recommendations: I-40/Atrisco Vista WB on-ramp</p> <p>* Provide PM Peak off-site mitigation recommendations: I-40/Atrisco Vista WB off-ramp</p>	Supplemental report submitted to Bernalillo County.	A supplemental report will be submitted to Bernalillo County to discuss these locations.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>8. Transit MP: Page 62. Although no commuter/ BRT service currently exists on Dennis Chavez &amp; Mention there is an existing Route 222 transit service on Dennis Chavez that serves South Valley Railrunner Station and an existing Route 98 transit service on 98th St and Dennis Chavez that serves Rio Bravo/Coors commercial center.</p>	Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan Technical Report	The text on page 62 of the Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan will be revised to mention existing Routes 222 and 98.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>9. Pedestrian and Bikeways MP: Proposed trail network runs through the proposed street network. Describe how trails will cross roadways (grade separation, signalized arterial crossings, mid-block crossings, etc.). Disconnected trail network through urban center and other locations. Add more connectivity to trail network. Describe how trails will integrate with on-street bicycle and pedestrian network. Describe safety design features for on-street bike-ped network (buffered bike lanes, cycle tracks, bike intersections, etc.).</p>	Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan Technical Report and 2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	<p>Updated Level A Transportation MP Section F.3 (p. 67) and Level B Transportation MP Section V11.A (p. 58) will be revised. as follows: "Mid-block, unsignalized pedestrian/trail crossing treatments will be evaluated using the latest research procedures, such as TCRP 112/NCHRP 562 "Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings." This research identifies the safest approaches for safely crossing roadways at mid-block and unsignalized locations." "At the intersection of the trails and on-street network, the trails will enter at-grade with the sidewalk and provide access to the on-street bicycle network, or proposed crossing. At locations where high traffic volume and high pedestrian or bicycle traffic volume are present, if a traffic signal is not present, a pedestrian traffic signal (such as a HAWK) will be evaluated. In rare circumstances, a grade separated structure will be</p>
				Continued from previous line		<p>considered." Text from the Level B Tech report section V Typical Sections (p. 53), will be added to both the Updated Level A (p. 65) and Level B Transportation (p. 58) MP's bicycle sections (p. 65 Level A and p. 58) to highlight that the proposed typical sections for principal and minor arterials provide for a buffer between the vehicular and bike lanes. The base for the Level A exhibits has been corrected to show this open space connection. The overall open space network will be finalized with future Level B plans.</p>

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>10. Performance indicators, page 59. While vehicle hours travelled (VHT), congested lane miles and vehicle hours of delay (VHD) are reduced on the system network in 2040, vehicle miles travelled (VMT) increases by 2.6% in 2040. This measure has implications for regional air quality degradation and related health outcomes, meeting new federal ozone standards, and increased greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Describe possible reasons for increases to network VMT e.g. induced demand and provide realistic mitigation recommendations e.g. promoting transit use, mixed use development, compact/ walkable development, etc.</p>	Updated Level A Master Plan	The likely reason for the increase in VMT is the location of the jobs in Santolina results in slightly longer commute trips, as residents of the east side travel to the west side for employment. Although this does result in increased VMT, it more efficiently utilizes the existing transportation infrastructure that is underutilized in the current west-to-east morning commute, and the east-to-west evening commute. The Transportation Demand Management section of the Transportation section (Section 4.7, p. 49) of the Level B Master Plan describes the strategies for promoting transit use, mixed use development, walkable development, etc. Air Quality is also discussed in the Level B Master Plan, in Section 5.4, page 53, and a separate Air Quality analysis is being prepared for submittal.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>11. Transportation infrastructure no net costs. Page 19 identifies total 2040 MTP public and private costs. The 2040 MTP estimates \$155.5 million on-site Santolina transportation costs (\$55.5 million by 2025) not including PDN interchange (\$15A million) and PDN roadway through Santolina (\$11.6 million), and Gibson through escarpment {\$1.6 million) by 2040.</p> <p>Off-site improvements listed in the MTP include 118th St roadway (\$4.8 million) and 118th St/1-40 interchange (\$25 million) by 2040. Provide on-site and off-site Santolina roadway costs and potential funding mechanisms for Level B 2025 and 2040 build-out.</p>	Supplemental report submitted to Bernalillo County.	A supplemental report will be submitted to Bernalillo County to discuss these locations. This report will include cost estimates of the on-site and off-site infrastructure. The cost sharing arrangements will be included in the Development Agreement. The funding mechanisms will likely include PID's, TIDD's, developer imposed fees or other methods to be developed in concert with the County over the lifetime of the development of Santolina.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
				<p>12. Level A Minor corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Page 14. Long Range Transportation System (LRTS) Roadway Design Guidelines</li> <li>* Page 22. Footnote: For purposes of this analysis&amp;</li> <li>* Page 41. &amp;providing opportunities for commuting in the reverse of the typical west-to-east anticipated in the MPO forecast.</li> </ul>	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan, p. 14, p. 22, and p. 41	We are in agreement with these changes and they will be incorporated into the document.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>13. Level B Minor corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Page 45. Transit service within the County areas is provided on a contract basis with ABQ Ride.</li> <li>* Page 46. An existing Route 222 provides transit service on Dennis Chavez to South Valley Railrunner Station and an existing Route 98 on 98th St and Dennis Chavez serves Rio Bravo/Coors commercial center.</li> <li>* Page 55. As a transit market grows, the Santolina Master Plan.</li> </ul>	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan, p. 45, p. 46, and p. 55	We are in agreement with these changes and they will be incorporated into the document.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/8/2016	<p>14. Level B Major Corrections:</p> <p>Page 43 &amp; Exhibit 10: Replace "Local Street 3: with a cross-section of a "Major Local" which has 60ft: ROW and 36ft: face-of-curb to. Face-of-curb drivable width. Contact BCPWD for a copy of the cross-section typical of County Street Standards.</p>	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	14. The major local typical section will be included in the revised Technical Appendix. The proposed Local Street 3 will be maintained, but will have clarifying language added to indicate it is proposed for low volume streets with ADT < 1,500.
Planning	Outside Agencies Review - CABQ	Favorable	2/18/2016	<p>The Engineering Division of the Department of Municipal Development has reviewed the subject applications and submits the following comments:</p> <p>Permit # ZSPR 2016-0001 Santolina Planned Community Level B Master Plan Transportation Section for a half-mile West of 118th St the future Gibson Blvd will be a City-owned and maintained Community Principal Arterial that is planned to contain bicycle lanes and a paved multi-use trail, per the Long Range Roadway System Map and the Long Range Bikeway Systems Map. From Dennis Chavez Blvd. to Gibson Blvd. 118th St. is also a City-owned facility.</p> <p>Secondly, Gibson Blvd. through the eastern escarpment (much like Dennis Chavez Blvd.) will likely have to be constructed at design grades that are flatter than existing topography, which may require the dedication of more right-of-way than a community principal arterials typical 156 feet. Dennis Chavez's right-of-way through the eastern escarpment varies from 400 feet to 600 feet wide, due to it being cut into existing topography that is significantly steeper than minimum allowable design slopes.</p>	N/A	The proposed typical section includes bicycle lanes and a sidewalk/trail. Right-of-way or easements will be provided for the necessary width for construction of the proposed roadways.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
Planning	Outside Agencies Review - CABQ	Favorable	2/18/2016	Identification of impacts to City-owned and maintained transportation facilities should be coordinated in detail between the County Public Works Division; the NMDOT, and the City's DMD/Planning Department during post-master plan reviews in order to effectively define Santolina's offsetting traffic mitigation measures.	N/A	Agreed
Planning	Outside Agencies Review - MRCOG	Favorable	2/11/2016	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>MRMPO concerns are largely related to the size of the Level B Plan Area. At 4,243 acres, it is nearly one third of Santolina's total 13,851 acres. The Planned Communities Criteria (PCC) indicates that Level B Plans are to be submitted for Village Master Plans, Community Center, Employment Center, or Urban Center Plans, and that these plans are typically 650 to 1200 acres in size (PCC, page 38). Having an appropriately sized Level B Plan is important because, in the case of Santolina, the Level B plans are equated with phasing (Level A Plan, page 35). If the Santolina Level B Plan is approved at the currently proposed size, MRMPO strongly recommends a more detailed phasing strategy to ensure predictable and contiguous development, as well as to evaluate important benchmarks (see comments for SANTOLINA Level B MASTER PLAN, pages 80-84). A detailed phasing strategy for the Level B Master Plan would alleviate the majority of MRMPO concerns. Closely related to phasing, MRMPO is concerned about different stages of development of roadways within Santolina during the course of its development: Specifically MRMPO has concerns regarding funding of roadway widening projects, and how multi-modal elements will be accommodated at each stage of roadway development. (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL A MASTER PLAN UPDATED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN, page 17). MRMPO appreciates that the Long Range Transportation System (LRTS) Guide is referred to for roadway designs. However MRMPO has some specific roadways design concerns (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL B MASTER PLAN, pages 41-42).</p>	N/A	<p>As part of this Level B Plan, we are allocating approximately 1,000 acres, or 22% of the Plan area, to Open Space. Additionally, this level B Plan includes the entire Town Center that will serve all of Santolina at full buildout. We recognize that the Town Center will develop over the life of the project. In order to meet the benchmarks set out by the Level A Development Agreement, we are allocating approximately 45% of the Level B Plan area to support institutional, commercial, and businesses.</p> <p>MRCOG Transportation comments will be addressed in later sections.</p>
				<p>Finally, MRMPO has concerns about the way in which the 2040 MTP Trend Scenario is referenced in the Level B documents in specific areas. MRCOGs Socioeconomic Program Manager was consulted throughout the development of the alternative 2025 and 2040 socioeconomic datasets that were required for the analyses contained within the Level B Master Plan Transportation Master Plan. The methodology is consistent with those discussions. However, several references to the 2040 MTP Trend Scenario in the Level B documents need to be modified or clarified (See multiple comments).</p> <p>For more comments from MRMPO please see attachments.</p>	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	See MRCOG comment response matrix.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
Planning	Outside Agencies Review - State Hwy & Transportation	Favorable	2/9/2016	<p>Department Comments:</p> <p>" The NMDOT has programmed funding in the STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement program) to begin acquiring right -of-way for the proposed NM 347 (Paseo del Volcan) corridor. The final alignment has not been identified and the spacing between interchanges shall be determined by NMDOT and FHWA. " The NMDOT has not identified any funding for the construction of the proposed roadway extensions or proposed interchanges or underpasses shown in the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). If any of these improvements do become funded, there is no guarantee that the design and/or construction would coincide with the time frame of the plan phasing. The developer shall commit cost sharing or matching a portion of the construction costs associated with any future roadway extensions and infrastructure outside, but in the vicinity of, the Santolina area. If Santolina's phased development occurs prior to funding becoming available for the proposed MTP improvements, then those improvements must be installed at the cost of the developer. " Based on the transportation analysis prepared in the Level 'B' report, increased congestion is projected as early as 2025 at several existing interchanges including but not limited to, Atrisco Vista Boulevard, 98th Street and Unser Boulevard. The developer shall identify mitigation alternatives for each of the impacted locations at each development phase for review by the NMDOT and FHWA prior to finalization of these measures.</p>	N/A	<p>It is our understanding that right-of-way for the proposed PdV alignment has been identified and is in the process of being acquired. This includes right-of-way for the roadway from I-40 to US550, as well as the right-of-way for the proposed interchange location. A supplemental report identifying mitigation alternatives is being developed for County review, and all future development proposals requiring NMDOT review will include NMDOT review and approval.</p>

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
Planning	Outside Agencies Review - State Hwy & Transportation	Favorable	2/9/2016	Revise, Note 5, from The Notice of Decision dated December 12, 2014 as follows: Written approval from the NMDOT will be obtained prior to the improvement or expansion of state roads identified in the Level 'A' and Level 'B' submittal. NMDOT and FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) review and approval will be required for any Level 'C' plan defining any required modifications and improvements to Interstate 40 and to other state facilities as a result of the development of Santolina and its roadway network. The approvals shall itemize financial obligations with participation and commitments spelled out. The coordination of the time frames for the offsite roadway improvements and the Plan phasing will also need to be identified.	N/A	It is our understanding the FHWA does not review local land use development plans, and therefore will not approve future Level C Plans. However, we do agree that the approval of the NMDOT and/or FHWA will be required prior to any construction modifications on I-40 or associated ramps, State facilities, or projects with Federal funding. We also concur that all roadway improvements must be listed in and follow the procedures of the MRCOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which are ultimately approved by the NMDOT and FHWA. We anticipate that the approved Level A Master Plan and future Level B plans will impact future MTP efforts.
				Continued from previous line	N/A	We suggest the following revision to the proposed condition: Written approval from the NMDOT will be obtained prior to the improvement or expansion of state roads identified in the Level 'A' , Level 'B' and Level 'C' submittals. NMDOT and/or FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) review and approval, as appropriate to the nature of the request (i.e., FHWA review will be sought only for interstate facilities and during the design review process), will be required for any Level 'C' plan defining any required modifications and improvements to Interstate 40 and to other state facilities, that are proposed under a Level C plan in Santolina as a result of the development of Santolina and its roadway network.



Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	1) Traffic Modeling Comment, Page 9: - Is the existing frontage road south of I-40 adequate as a 2-lane (1 lane per direction) facility adequate to carry the future full buildout traffic volumes? Might a 4-lane (2-lane per direction) be considered?	N/A	NMDOT wishes the Frontage Road to remain a two-lane road and the modeling was done to satisfy that request. Turn lanes may be required at some point in the future at major intersecting roadways to achieve acceptable levels of service.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	2) General Comment, Pages 11 - 13: for the full buildout traffic volume maps (ADT page 11, AM Peak page 12 and PM Peak page 13) should consider providing a legend for the reader to identify the volumes shown are in hundreds or thousands.	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	Agreed, the maps will be revised to include a legend.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	3) Traffic Modeling Comment, Page 14: How many lanes for the full buildout I-40/PdV interchange WB exit ramp and EB entrance ramp are considered? Since this interchange is planned for future buildout after 2025 shouldn't it have a better LOS and v/c condition in 2040 other than severe? Maybe consider increasing the number of ramp lanes (if only considering 1 lane) and re-run the model to improve the condition.	N/A	The MRCOG model assumes a single lane for the ramps, and at the intersections with future PdV. The poor performance is due to the low capacity used on the off-ramp or on-ramp link in the model. This indicates the expectation that the intersection will be signalized. Improvements will be identified in the supplemental report at the intersection with PdV, however final configuration will be dependent on future NMDOT studies of the interchange.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	4) General Comment, Page 15: Same comment as #2 above.	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	Agreed, the maps will be revised to include a legend.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	5) General Comment, Page 16, second paragraph: Regarding the discussion of the roundabouts. Maybe consider providing potential candidate locations for future roundabouts. If only to earmark those intersections for possible roundabouts and planning real estate needs. Right-of-Way most of the time becomes an issue when constructing a roundabout footprint.	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	It is considered unlikely roundabouts will be located on major principal arterials (Atrisco Vista, Paseo del Volcan, Gibson, Dennis Chavez and the Loop Road). Minor/minor intersections, and minor/collector intersections could be considered possible candidates for roundabouts. A statement will be added that says "Roundabouts are not precluded in this Master Plan, and can be considered at appropriate locations, in consultation with Bernalillo County Transportation Staff. Right-of-way will be provided in the event previously granted ROW is not adequate."
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	6) General Comment, Pages 26 – 28: for the 2025 build traffic volume maps (ADT page 26, AM Peak page 27 and PM Peak page 28) same comment as #2 above, should consider providing a legend for the reader to identify the volumes shown are in hundreds or thousands.	2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan	Agreed, the maps will be revised to include a legend.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	7) Traffic Modeling Comment, Pages 27 – 28 and 34 – 35: – In the AM/PM peak hour volumes exhibit, in the year 2025, there are traffic volumes at the end of Shelly Road but in the year 2040, this traffic volume “disappears”. Could this be explained?	N/A	There was a coding error in the connector from the zone south on Shelley Road for 2040. The existing uses (Detention Center, Landfill and Motor Sports Park) were mistakenly connected to the Loop Road. However the base year model (2012) from MRCOG shows just 100 vph in the peak hour on Shelley, and also shows no employment growth for the existing uses in 2040. Adding these 100 trips to the 2040 volumes shown in Figures 25 and 26 would still result in v/c less than 0.90 in 2040. No change is proposed.
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	8) General Comment, Page 34 and 38: Did the traffic modeling analysis factor in traffic to/from the Metropolitan Detention Center and Sandia Motorsports?	N/A	2025 has it incorporated correctly, 2040 does not. See response above.

Department	Activity	Action	Note Date	Comments	Document to be modified	Response
PW Development Review	PW Transportation Review	Completed	2/26/2016	9) General Comment, Page 66: - Is there sufficient evidence to justify that the Santolina development will affect EB traffic on US-550 and Alameda Blvd? Can this scenario be explained as to how the model factored these volume reductions?	N/A	These reductions on US 550 and Alameda are due to the normalization of the socioeconomic forecast required to maintain regional control totals of households and employment, as directed by MRCOG. Households, and retail and service jobs, from the west side of Albuquerque/Bernalillo County and Rio Rancho were reassigned to Santolina (to maintain regional control totals). This reduces the traffic generation in those parts of the metro area. The result is fewer river crossings on US 550 and Alameda in the Santolina scenario as compared to the MRCOG Trend scenario.
PW Review	PW Review		3/10/2016	Prepare a Transportation Conformity Determination for air quality by June 2016.	N/A	Per discussions with Bernalillo County Staff, an Air Quality analysis will be submitted prior to the June Environment Hearing.

MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>SANTOLINA LEVEL A MASTER PLAN UPDATED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (JAN 22.2016)</p>		
<p>Page 1: Atrisco Vista widening from Dennis Chavez to north of 1-40 is not proposed to be publicly funded in the 2040 MTP. Would this widening project fall under 719.0 and 719.1 in the 2040 MTP project listing under proposed privately funded projects? Paseo del Volcan (PdV) construction south of 1-40 is also not proposed for public funding. Please specifically identify which projects in this paragraph are proposed for public funding and which are proposed for private funding per the 2040 MTP.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Level A and Level B Development Agreements identify the shared funding responsibilities for system and project infrastructure, and should be incorporated into future MTP's as the Development Agreements identify. The supplemental mitigation evaluation report submitted to Bernalillo County identifies the updated funding amounts for 719.0 and 719.1. Widening of Atrisco Vista is included in those project numbers, as are all roadways within Santolina.</p>
<p>Page 17A: Under Strategies for Street Construction and Dedication, the statement is made that "the initial 2-lanes of permanent roadways, intersections, and other elements to serve the development will be constructed by the developer, per the Planned Communities Criteria and the Development Agreement." It then states that additional widening, based on "actual demand and short term projections," could be conducted through local government capital funding mechanisms. The transportation analysis demonstrates the need for additional on-site roadways to be widened to 4 or 6 lanes in order to adequately serve the proposed levels of development seeking approval. This means the results of the study are dependent on the widening occurring. The potential for reprioritization of public monies for roadway infrastructure needed to serve any approved levels of development is a concern, given the emphasis on "no net expense" language throughout the submitted documents. MRMPO expects limited additional public funding options in the future, especially for capacity expansion projects (2040 MTP, page EX-1). The current program 2040 MTP, with the exception of the widening of Dennis Chavez east of Atrisco Vista, does not anticipate any public funding for roadways within Santolina before 2040, with the exception of the PdV I-40 interchange at the north boundary of the Santolina, which is expected to have combined private and public funding.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>A. Not quite. This language simply repeats the PCC language regarding roadway improvements. The Level A and Level B Development Agreements have and will identify under what conditions the developer will pay for project and system infrastructure, which are based on proportional use of the required improvements. The transportation analysis shows that widening is required to support development. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that a portion of the improvements will be funded by the developer. However, to be clear, the Level A Development Agreement defines "no net expense" as the following: "The "no net expense" policy is a mutual commitment to achieve the goal of a responsible balance of infrastructure costs, including construction, operation and maintenance, shared between the public and private sectors. The "no net expense" test is satisfied if the County's on-site public expenditures and off-site public expenditures reasonably allocated to the Project have been, or will be, offset by revenues and/or economic and fiscal benefits (direct, indirect and induced) from the Project." It is also assumed that as the MTP is updated every 5-years, that specific funding and construction projects will be updated to reflect decisions, and approvals relate to both public and private funding.</p>

MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>Page 17B: Relatedly, MRMPO is also concerned with how additional elements in the roadbed will be covered in each phase of roadway construction, such as bike lanes, paths, sidewalks, and landscaping, which are depicted in the street sections on page 16. Will these elements be implemented only at the final phase of roadway construction? If so, this would greatly diminish bicycle and pedestrian systems during the interim period, which in the case of a project this size, could span decades.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>B. Multi-modal and landscape improvements will be phased and it is expected that all roadways will include a reasonable portion of these elements at each stage of construction. Phased implementation of these improvements will be ensured through each individual Level C Plan applications and improvement agreements. For example, until transit service is anticipated, the construction of dedicated bus lanes is not warranted and cannot be constructed. However, an emphasis will be placed on ensuring that pedestrian and bicycle improvements are in place as soon as practical. The phasing of development within Santolina is included in the Level A Development Plan document under section 6.3 Phasing of Project and Infrastructure: "The Project shall be developed in multiple phases at such times, location and size as determined by market demand or the Owner. The Project Infrastructure improvements shall be installed in phases on an as needed basis and sized to serve the phase of Project then proposed for and/or being developed." The phasing of development through future Level C Plan applications will also be delineated further in the Level B Development Agreement.</p>
<p>Page 19: The first sentence on this page incorrectly cites the University of New Mexico's Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER). It should cite the UNM's Geospatial and Population Studies (UNM-GPS).</p>	<p>Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, this will be revised throughout the document.</p>
<p>Page 19: The last statement references \$5 billion of publicly financed roadway capacity projects. This is incorrect. The 2040 MTP identifies almost \$6.3 billion for all types of transportation projects by 2040, including roadway capacity, rehabilitation, as well as multimodal projects. Of this \$6.3 billion, publically financed roadway capacity projects account for only \$1,036,980,106 and privately funded roadway projects account for only \$1,555,881,922 for a combined total of \$2,592,862,028 in roadway capacity projects by 2040.</p>	<p>Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, this will be revised</p>
<p>Page 21: The first sentence of the Socioeconomic Forecast section should read 'Population projections for each county in New Mexico were developed independently by UNM's Geospatial and Population Studies department, and refined by MRCOG for the metropolitan area.'</p>	<p>Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, this will be revised</p>

MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>Technical Appendix T-1, Page 16: The fifth paragraph incorrectly cites (BBER), the UNM Bureau of Business and Economic Research. It should read 'and UNM's Geospatial and Population Studies department, who independently produces county level population projections'</p>	<p>Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, this will be revised</p>
<p><b>SANTOLINA LEVEL 'B' MASTER PLAN TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (JAN 25, 2016)</b></p>		
<p>Technical Appendix, page 5: The 2nd paragraph in Section E. states "The original Level A Transportation Master Plan used the MRCOG 2035 MTP socioeconomic forecast, which was found to have overestimated population and employment in 2035. These overestimated forecasts were discovered after the completion of the original Level A Santolina Transportation Master Plan analyses." MRCOG informed the Santolina project team during the initial planning meetings for the Level A plan that a new, lower, projection would be forthcoming. In addition, we request removal of the term overestimation, which is an oversimplification. MRMPPO requests language similar to the following - "The original Level A Transportation Master Plan used the MRCOG 2035 MTP socioeconomic forecast. Since that time, the MRCOG board has approved a 2040 MTP socioeconomic forecast. The 2040 forecast is lower than the 2035 forecast due to the availability of new information regarding growth trends in the region. The 2040 forecast was not finalized for use at the completion of the original Level A Santolina Transportation Master Plan analyses."</p>	<p>2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be revised as suggested</p>
<p>Technical Appendix, page 9: A table displaying the number of modelled/proposed lane-miles by functional classification should be included to compliment Figure 3, which depicts number of directional lanes at Full Buildout.</p>	<p>2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the table will be added.</p>
<p>Technical Appendix, page 15: A map should be included showing the number of directional lanes for the Level B network (similar to Figure 3 for the Full Buildout network). This map should also be accompanied by a table displaying the number of modelled/proposed lane-miles by functional classification.</p>	<p>2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the map and table will be added.</p>
<p>Technical Appendix, page 22: The MTB establishes the regional transportation project programming priorities for the AMPA, using estimates of anticipated travel demand based on approved socioeconomic data and reasonably anticipated funding levels. The current set of regional priorities identified in the 2040 MTP anticipates the funding of Paseo del Volcan (PdV) north of I-40 including the interchange at I-40 as being comprised of a combination of public and private funding sources. PdV north of the interchange is not anticipated before 2040, with the exception of potential right-of-way acquisition. The section of Paseo del Volcan south of I-40 is anticipated to be funded entirely with private sources.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>This is the correct summary of the current MTP. Discussions in Santa Fe and recent Legislative funding requests may result in changes to the current policy and funding availability with respect to PdV.</p>
<p>Technical Appendix, page 39: The "off-site roadway effects" can be considered with inbound and outbound cordon-analyses and summary tables. See comment above in the Level A update comments.</p>	<p>2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>Screenline volumes for the Santolina Scenario are included in Technical Appendix T-2 of the 2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan Technical Appendix, p. 15 (full Build), p. 27 (2025) and p. 51 (2040).</p>

MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>Technical Appendix, page 45: Discussion of the interface between transit and bike/ped should include "last mile" language and the need for an effective transit system to have robust bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure connectivity to stations in order to effectively penetrate the origins/destinations of neighborhoods and employment areas.</p>	<p>2016 Level B Transportation Master Plan</p>	<p>The current text addressing this will be expanded as suggested.</p>
<p><b>SANTOLINA LEVEL 'B' MASTER PLAN (JAN 2016)</b></p>		
<p>Page 2, Section 1.2.1: This section incorrectly cites the Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) as the source for the projections. It should city the University of New Mexico's Geospatial and Population Studies (UNM-GPS).</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, see previous response.</p>
<p>Page 3, Section 1.2.1: The statistics in this sentence have been corrected and a projection year added - "The projections suggest that by 2040, approximately 44% of the Albuquerque metropolitan area housing units will be located on the area west of the Rio Grande River (West Side). Yet, employment distribution for the West Side is projected to represent 27% of the jobs within the AMPA."</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, this will be corrected.</p>
<p>Page 3, Section 1.2.1: The last statement in the first paragraph "The projections highlight the longstanding need for new employment centers on the West Side" is an opinion stated in the context of MRCOG's projections. MRCOG supports the idea that we need successful employment centers on the West Side (whether they are new or not). Please modify this statement or remove it from the context of MRCOG's projections. Similarly, the first sentence of the second paragraph "Due to land constraints, limited areas of the region can accommodate the forecasted population growth" is an assumption framed in the context of MRCOG's projections. MRCOG's forecast does indeed accommodate the vast majority of the forecasted growth without Santolina, as described in Santolina's Transportation Master Plan. Please remove this sentence or clarify that this is the viewpoint of the project team and not a finding associated with the MRCOG forecast.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>
<p>Page 34, Section 4.1: Paragraph 3 in the Overview presents a comparison between the Level A Transportation analysis using the 2035 Forecast and the Level B Transportation analysis using the 2040 Forecast (volumes go down on Central, 118th ...). MRCOG asserts that any comparison between the 2035 and 2040 forecasts is invalid due to the differences in the control totals. Please keep all comparisons between the 2040 MTP forecast and the 2040 Santolina Scenario.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>
<p>Page 34, Section 4.1: The statement regarding a 2040 reduction in river crossings (0.1% and 0.5%) is well within the limits of model variability ("noise") and should not be presented as a benefit.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>

MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>Page 36, Section 4.2.1: The Auto Transit Circulation, Full Buildout network takes advantage of major opportunities to connect to surrounding areas. The Level A Master Plan (page 74) states that a gridded roadway network would be identified at Level B and C Plans. MRMPO appreciates that the area of Santolina north of Dennis Chavez has achieved this, which includes the entire first Level B Plan Area. The internal grid fulfills the Long Range Transportation System (LRTS) Guide's connectivity recommendations with the approximate quarter mile spacing of the collector and arterial network together. MRMPO asks that this gridded network continue to areas south of Dennis Chavez in future Level B Plans, and that Minor Arterial connections be made south of Santolina.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>When future Level B Master Plans come forward, the additional roadway networks will be developed. It is anticipated they will be similar to the gridded network considered in the 2016 Level B submittal.</p>
<p>Page 37, Section 4.2.1: The phrase "once development occurs north of the interstate" is inappropriate. There is currently no approved master plan in the area north of I-40 near Shelly Road and an interchange there is not listed in the 2040 MTP. The federal long range transportation planning process conducted by MRMPO will determine which transportation improvement projects are prioritized in the future.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Level A Master Plan Area extends past the 2040 horizon, so this statement was presented in the context of post-2040 roadway network requirements.</p>
<p>Page 39, Section 4.3: This section is presented as though the Level B traffic volumes are based on the 2040 MTP. Please add a clarifying statement to the opening paragraph that states that the Level B transportation analysis required modifications to the 2040 MTP forecast to create a "Santolina Scenario" because the 2040 MTP forecast does not reflect the level of anticipated development. This is an important detail that belongs in the Level B Master Plan.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>
<p>Page 40, Section 4.3.2: This page should reference or include language related to the ultimate cross section anticipated in the Full Build/Level A Plan.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be added.</p>
<p>Page 40, Section 4.3.2: Conduit associated with new intersections must be built with input from agency staff and be consistent with regional Intelligent Transportation Systems plans.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>
<p>Page 41, Section 4.4.1: The sentence "roadways within the Level B Plan Area consist of typical roadway functional classifications" is incorrect. FHWA classifies roads as interstates, other freeways &amp; expressways, principal arterials, minor arterials, major collectors, minor collectors, and local roads. This section needs to be rewritten using language according to federal criteria (for more information see <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classifications/section03.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classifications/section03.cfm</a>). Specifically, what is depicted and shown as "local" in the Level B plan more closely resembles "minor collectors" according to federal criteria.</p>	<p>Santolina 2016 Level B Master Plan</p>	<p>Agreed, the text will be clarified.</p>
<p>Page 41, Section 4.4.1: 186 feet is an exceedingly large right-of-way. A roadway this wide is challenging for pedestrians to cross, and would difficult to integrate with activity centers. Please see comments below related to activity centers, BRT, and median size.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The proposed ROW has additional width for sidewalks/path compared to the LRTP guideline, so this accounts for some of the additional width, as does the ROW provided for dual left turn lanes. The typical sections will be reviewed to more accurately considered curb and gutter and median curb widths.</p>



MRCOG Comments February 8, 2015	Document to be Modified	Response
<p>Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: Please relate the roadway cross-section design to the surrounding context by providing cross sections for roadways within activity centers. Wider sidewalks in the urban, town and village centers are highly encouraged. For example, please consider a multi-way boulevard where principal arterials border the urban center or the town center (see Attachment 7.B). This would allow free flow of regional traffic while also allowing access to the higher intensity adjacent land uses.</p>	N/A	<p>Agreed. We are developing a new cross section for major streets adjacent to the Urban Center. We are also developing a new cross section for the minor streets that pass through the Urban Center.</p>
<p>Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: Please explain the purpose of a 30' wide median on the principal and minor arterials. Is this to accommodate left-hand and right-hand turn lanes at intersections? Or is this for the BRT routes to accommodate station platforms? Or is this this space intended for future expansion? This is a remarkably large median.</p>	N/A	<p>The LRTP guideline has an 18' median. As many of the principal and minor arterial intersections are expected to require dual left turn lanes, an additional 12' was added to the LRTP guideline median.</p>
<p>Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: The cross sections on the arterials and collectors show trail widths of 6'-10'. The AASHTO minimum trail width is 10', typically trail widths range from 10' to 14'. The recommended clear sidewalk width in urban areas is 10'. The bicycle lane width shown in the 4-lane minor arterial cross section and the 4-lane collector cross sections meets LRTP recommendations. For minor arterials and collectors, please consider having the outside lane be wider (12') instead of the inside lane. This helps if transit is provided along the roadway as it will most likely run in the outside lane. Wider outside lanes also help with the level of comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians and improve multi-modal level of service scores.</p>	N/A	<p>The typical sections will be revised to only provide sidewalk to eliminate this confusion. The outside will be listed as 12', with the inside at 11', as requested. Urban area typical sections will be developed.</p>
<p>Page 42, Section 4.4.1: It is difficult to understand the elements that will make up a 77' or 99' right-of-way for a 2-lane collector. The combined minimum bicycle lane and parallel parking width needs to be 13'. This also is an opportunity for back angle parking in urban areas.</p>	N/A	<p>These typical sections were based on the LRTP major collector typical section, and include ROW widths for wider sidewalks, as well as the possibility of a two-way left turn lane in the median.</p>
<p>Pages 45-47, Section 4.5.1: The two transit routes entering into Santolina have been identified-Central Ave and Dennis Chavez Blvd. Please also take into consideration Gibson Blvd which could provide a connection to the Bridge/Westgate Route 54. Given the low density on Dennis Chavez Blvd the Bridge/Westgate Route is probably more important than the Dennis Chavez Blvd route. The likelihood of BRT within Santolina is minimal, and would be a significantly lower priority than providing high-capacity and high-frequency service in more dense parts of the region with proven ridership. More important than identifying routes is developing a roadway network that does not preclude transit. The current proposed grid network with approximate quarter mile spacing of the arterial &amp; collector network goes a long way to assist transit.</p>	2016 Santolina Level B Master Plan and Transportation Master Plan Technical Appendix	<p>The typical sections were developed with the provision for BRT in the future. A Gibson transit connection will be added to the Transit section graphic and discussion, p. 45-47.</p>
<p>Pages 45-47, Section 4.5.1: The current transit centers are adjacent to minor arterials within the Town Center and Urban Center. Please continue to plan for minor arterial and collector roadways to be integrated within centers and concentrations of employment and retail so that these roads can be used by transit. At some point in a transit round-trip, transit users need to cross the road to get to a bus stop. If transit routes are aligned on minor roadways, then transit users do not have to cross regional principal arterials, which improves pedestrian safety and the regional network traffic flow.</p>	N/A	<p>Agreed.</p>

Comments	Response
<p>4. The applicant shall make the following modifications to the Level A Plan (dated 12/1/14) as required by staff and agencies: The applicant will submit a proposed Level B Transportation Plan consistent with the Level A Transportation Master Plan, as revised, of the Santolina Level A Master Plan, prior to a Level B approval or future development activities such as building permits, that generate 500 or more cumulative peak hour trips when upon coordination with the developer BCPWD deems it necessary.</p>	
<p>a. The Santolina Access Management Plan (SAMP) with the Traversable Median column added to Access Spacing Standards Table on Page 3 is approved. The SAMP shall be added to the Santolina Level "A" Transportation Master Plan.</p>	<p>This has been completed.</p>
<p>b. Revise the Level A Transportation Network model as required by BCPWD. Revisions/reanalysis shall include, but not be limited to, the 118111 St./I-40 interchange, the new proposed arterial roadways, the new urban center layout, and any other changes to the Santolina roadway network. In accordance with PCC criteria, when substantial variations are identified to the Level A Master Plan, subsequent revision/reanalysis of the Level A Transportation Network model shall be required, when upon coordination with the developer, BCPWD deems it necessary.</p>	<p>The overall Level A Plan has been re-modeled per this condition.</p>
<p>c. All appropriate items in the Addendum to the Transportation Master Plan dated November 4, 2014 shall be placed in the appropriate Level A document.</p>	<p>These have been incorporated into the Updated Level A Transportation Master Plan.</p>
<p>5. Written approval from the proper state and/or federal authority will be obtained prior to the improvement or expansion of State roads identified in the Level A submittal. NMDOT and FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) review and approval will also be required for any required modifications and improvements to Interstate 40 as a result of the development of Santolina and its roadway network. Future coordination with NMDOT and FHWA will be done in subsequent procedures including the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Plan and the State-wide Transportation Improvement Plan. The coordination of timeframes for the offsite roadway improvements and the Plan phasing will also need to be identified.</p>	<p>Coordination with these agencies is and will be ongoing.</p>
<p>6. Funding for arterial streets and linkages, which are needed for Santolina and not programmed in the Bernalillo County Capital Improvements Program (CIP) or the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), shall be identified and submitted to the County for recommendation for inclusion in the CIP or the MTP.</p>	<p>The MTP already has placeholders for Santolina arterials and collectors, pre 2025 and post 2025. This is something the applicant has and will continue addressing as studies are reviewed and presented to the County and shared with MRCOG.</p>
<p>22. The applicant shall make the following modifications to the Level A Plan (dated 12/1/14) as required by staff and agencies:</p>	

c. Chapter 6, Transportation, Level A Master Plan on page 95: remove the sentence "The policy supersedes other policies that may be in place for roadways within Santolina" regarding the SAMP, and remove "(by others)" regarding the extension of Gibson Boulevard.

These changes have been made an incorporated into the approved Santolina Level A Master Plan.

Comments	Response
<b>PCC Level B Transportation Requirements</b>	
<p>1. A disclosure statement regarding strict conformance with the Level A Transportation System Plan will be required, or a substitute traffic analysis, with consequential findings, recommendations, and proposed amendments to the Level A Transportation System Plan and Level A Community Master Plan, must be conducted prior to formal submittal of the Level B plan.</p>	<p>The Transportation Chapter identifies the Level B proposed street network and its conformance with the Level A Master Plan.</p>
<p>2. A Level B transportation system analysis, including specific traffic studies for the particular plan submittal plus all other approved Level B plan elements in the community, existing and projected demand (phased as appropriate), and consequential noise and air quality impacts, must be conducted prior to formal submittal of the Level B plan.</p>	<p>A Level B Transportation System Analysis is provided as a Technical Appendix</p>
<p>3. The traffic circulation system must be identified, including:                      a. major roadways within the Level B area;                      b. major roadway connections between the Level B area and the remainder of the Level A area;                      c. concept location for local street intersections with major roadways; and                      d. major street access and access limitation concepts.</p>	<p>A traffic circulation system has been identified by the Level B Roadway Plan.</p>
<p>4. Typical roadway cross-sections for major roadways, including:                      a. right-of-way widths;                      b. number of lanes, including high occupancy vehicle lanes;                      c. medians and median treatment;                      d. streetscape character and special design features;                      e. bus bays and other transit facilities; and                      f. trails or bicycle lanes.</p>	<p>Typical roadway cross-sections for major roadways are provided in the Transportation Chapter.</p>
<p>5. The type and approximate location of pedestrian bicycle, and transit elements of the transportation system must be specified.</p>	<p>The location and types of elements within the transportation system for this Level B Plan area are identified in the Transportation Chapter.</p>
<p>6. A plan which identifies performance objectives for increasing transit ridership as appropriate, as well as strategies for achieving a mode split that maintains level of service D or better on all roads in the affected area, must be submitted.</p>	<p>Performance objectives for increasing traffic ridership are included in the Master Plan’s Transportation Chapter.</p>
<p>7. Any remaining transportation problem or issues identified in the Level A Transportation Systems Plan and appropriate to the detail of Level B review must be resolved.</p>	<p>Congested locations have been identified and can be improved to acceptable levels of service. Due to the jobs anticipated, the transportation system is improved with minor problem areas identified at certain on-ramps.</p>