

MINUTES  
COMPLETE STREET ADVISORY GROUP MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

MEMBERS/ATTENDEES

Larry Hathaway	San Juan County & MPO Technical Committee Alternate
Virginia King	City of Farmington Public Works
Cynthia Lopez	City of Farmington Community Development & MPO Technical Committee
Steve Krest	City of Farmington Traffic Engineering
Nick Martin	Optum Health
Elizabeth McNally	Animas Environmental Services
Roshana Moojen	City of Aztec & MPO Technical Committee Alternate
Christa Romme	Aztec Chamber of Commerce & Four Corners Economic Development
Anngela Wakan	Safe Routes to School Coordinator

MPO STAFF

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

WELCOME

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

Mr. Delmagori reported that at the July 9 Advisory Group meeting, the members had completed and recommended approval of the values, goals, and vision statement. These were presented to the MPO Policy and Technical Committees at separate meetings on August 7. The Policy Committee recommended the addition of the word "networks" to the Vision Statement to read as follows:

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

The Complete Streets values, goals, and vision statement were all approved by the MPO Policy Committee.

Mr. Delmagori asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the July 9, 2013 meeting. Ms. Lopez moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Wakan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

LAND USE CONTEXT AREAS AND ROAD TYPES

Mr. Delmagori explained that the land use context areas and road types are overlays to existing land use categories and functional classification systems. He said that these revised categories could better relate to a complete street environment.

Mr. Delmagori noted that Staff had introduced several examples of land use context areas and road types used by the City of Roanoke, Virginia and the Pennsylvania DOT (PennDOT). The City of Roanoke uses eight land use context districts while PennDOT has seven.

Mr. Delmagori referenced that the City of Roanoke uses the traditional road classifications of arterials and collectors while PennDOT uses five different categories that go beyond the traditional classifications. The defined road types are used as a planning and design "overlay" for their road corridors, and do not actually replace the traditional functional classification system.

Mr. Delmagori presented worksheets as part of an exercise for the Advisory Group to develop land use context areas for this area. The worksheets listed some possible titles identify by the group at their July 9 meeting for the land use context areas within the MPO region. Mr. Delmagori said the Advisory Group would select the titles they preferred and also determine how many titles they thought should be chosen to define the land use contexts. The initial list of titles was provided, but the individual groups were also encouraged to develop their own titles if they chose. The list of possible titles to choose from was: Suburban Town Center, Central Business District, Urban Core, Historic District, Recreational/Open Space, Traditional Neighborhood, Village Neighborhood, Mixed Use, Agricultural Commercial, Agricultural Residential, Rural Recreational, and Neighborhood Commercial.

Mr. Delmagori said that choosing all of the titles could become burdensome as the Advisory Group starts trying to link the design guidelines and different elements of the street to the land use categories. He recommended narrowing down the list to five or seven to keep the number of titles manageable. Once each group identified the titles they preferred, Mr. Delmagori asked them to provide a definition that would explain what that particular title meant to them. Following this, the groups were asked to give an example from within the MPO region of that land use context area. This would provide a visual understanding of what that group envisioned fitting within the new land use context area title. Mr. Wakan noted that the land use context area title may not currently exist, such as "town center", but the groups could create that land use area or even develop a title of their own that was not listed, but yet might be desirable to be incorporated into the Complete Streets program.

On the worksheets, MPO Staff showed the potential titles moving from rural to urban, but Mr. Delmagori said this was only a recommendation based on the PennDOT classifications. He noted that the Advisory Group was not limited to or bound by this if they wanted something different.

MPO Staff also provided worksheets for the Advisory Group to use to consider titles for the road types. Mr. Delmagori said this process would be similar to developing the land use context areas. He noted that at the July 9 meeting, the Advisory Group had said they liked the road types used by PennDOT: Regional Arterial, Community Arterial, Community Collector, Neighborhood Collector, and Local. However, Mr. Delmagori stated that additional titles could be developed by the Advisory Group if they chose.

The 'Development of Road Types' worksheet asked each group to decide what title they preferred, to provide a definition of the selected road types, and then to provide an example of that road type from within the MPO region.

The small groups were as follows:

Group 1

Cindy Lopez  
Anngela Wakan  
Elizabeth McNally  
Steve Krest

Group 2

Roshana Moojen  
Christa Romme  
Larry Hathaway

Group 3

Nick Martin  
Virginia King  
June Markle

These groups worked together and spent most of the meeting developing their recommended land use context area titles, defining the titles they selected, and then providing an example from the MPO region of each context area.

**GROUP DISCUSSION - DEVELOPMENT OF LAND USE CONTEXT AREA TITLES**

At the conclusion of the individual group exercise, each group representative presented their thoughts and ideas on land use context area titles, definitions for their selected titles, and gave examples of those areas within the MPO region. The following is a summary of the land use context area ideas generated by each of the small groups, their definitions for the areas, and an example from the MPO region with their accompanying explanations.

**GROUP 1**

**Land Use Context Area Titles/Definitions/Examples**

1. Rural

The Rural category was split between Agricultural and Public Lands:

- a. Agricultural
  - i. Farms
  - ii. Pastures
  - iii. Large residential
- b. Public Lands
  - i. Multi-use
  - ii. Recreational and open space
  - iii. Mineral extraction in area

Example: Aztec Ruins Road & La Plata  
Glade area (BLM)

2. Industrial

- a. Semi-commercial, manufacturing, production uses
- b. Large lots required to include outdoor storage space for heavy vehicles, chemicals, or tanks

Example: Troy King and San Juan Boulevard

3. Neighborhoods

- a. Traditional and village residential
- b. Some small retail uses that serve the needs of the neighborhood such as schools, parks, bank, gas stations, and grocery stores

Example: Highland View neighborhood, Largo, and 20<sup>th</sup> Street neighborhoods

4. Regional Commercial
  - a. Commercial corridors
  - b. Big box stores
  - c. Strip malls
  - d. Focus on vehicular traffic
  - e. Large parcels with multiple commercial/retail uses

Example: San Juan Plaza, 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Bloomfield and Kirtland

5. Downtown
  - a. Mixed use
  - b. Historic district
  - c. More walkable/bikeable
  - d. Higher building density

Example: Downtown Farmington and Aztec

## GROUP 2

### Land Use Context Area Titles/Definitions/Examples

This group had two overlays within their land use context area titles: Historic and Recreational; and believed these could be found in combination with many of the land use areas considered.

1. Agricultural

The Agricultural title also included Agricultural Commercial and Agricultural Residential which differ based on street access requirements.

  - a. Large lot size
  - b. Low building density
  - c. Land used for agricultural purposes

Example: Ruins Road; Southside River Road

2. Residential
  - a. Primarily residential
  - b. Majority percentage in area is housing (some commercial in a village neighborhood if that is mixed into the overall area)
    - i. Traditional
    - ii. Apartment
    - iii. Village neighborhoods

Example: Kokopelli in Aztec

3. Neighborhood Commercial
  - a. Percentage of commercial use is higher than residential in this area
  - b. Main commercial corridors (i.e.: 20<sup>th</sup> Street) fed by residential connectors

Example: 20<sup>th</sup> Street

4. Central Business District
  - a. Main streets in all areas
  - b. Mall, big box stores
  - c. Basically no residential
  - d. Serves primarily one community

- e. Higher food traffic for retail shopping

Example: Main Street between 20<sup>th</sup> & Pinon

#### 5. Town Center

Group 2 split the Town Center title into Suburban and Urban Town Centers. The Suburban Town Center was defined as:

- a. Large scale foot print
- b. Served by large road networks
- c. Large parking needs (multiple communities coming together into a central municipal center)

The Urban Town Center was defined as:

- a. Possible more mixed use (commercial business in downstairs of building and residential, living space in upstairs)
- b. More pedestrian and public transit friendly
- c. Recreational options for downtown dining, window-shopping, etc.

Example: No MPO regional example

#### 6. Industrial

Group 2 believed this title was self-explanatory.

### **GROUP 3**

#### **Land Use Context Area Titles/Definitions/Examples**

##### 1. Rural

- a. Agricultural use
- b. Low density residential use
- c. Large land areas for recreation

Example: Between the cities of Aztec, Bloomfield, and Farmington, and into Kirtland

##### 2. Suburban Neighborhood

- a. Subdivisions with larger lots
- b. Schools
- c. Churches
- d. Parks

Example: Foothills area of Farmington, North Dustin and North Butler in Farmington, and North Oliver in Aztec

##### 3. Suburban Corridor

- a. Auto dealers
- b. Malls
- c. Shopping centers

Example: East Main Street in Farmington, US 64 west of Browning in Farmington

##### 4. Traditional Neighborhood

- a. Subdivisions with smaller lots
- b. Alleys common

- c. Direct access streets

Example: Subdivisions north and south of Apache Street in Farmington

5. Central Business District
  - a. Mixed use with business and some residential
  - b. Parallel parking
  - c. Buildings with 2-4 stories

Example: Downtown Aztec and Farmington

The Advisory Group agreed that Staff will take the ideas and the common themes from the Advisory Group's recommendations and discussion and develop a draft list of land use context area titles, definitions, and fill in any potential gaps. This draft list will be reviewed and discussed by the Advisory Group members at the October meeting.

### **GROUP DISCUSSION - DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD TYPES**

Most of the groups did not have time to fully consider or complete the exercise for the road types, so shown below is the limited information presented during the meeting. The development of road types will be more fully considered at the next Advisory Group meeting.

#### **GROUP 1**

##### **Road Type Titles/Definitions/Examples**

1. Regional Arterial
2. Community Arterial
3. Industrial/Commercial Collector
4. Neighborhood Collector
5. Residential/Rural

Group 1 liked most of the road type titles listed, but thought the Industrial/Commercial Collector should be added. This would apply for existing industrial facilities that were already embedded in the local community where there might be some special needs.

#### **GROUP 2**

##### **Road Type Titles/Definitions/Examples**

Group 2 liked the road type titles listed, but ran out of time to fully address them and tried to give examples to the titles listed.

1. Regional Arterial  
Example: NM 516 and US 64

2. Community Arterial  
Example: CR 350

3. Community Collector  
Example: 20<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> Streets in Farmington

4. Neighborhood Collector  
Example: Oliver in Aztec

5. Local  
Example: No example available

**GROUP 3**  
**Road Type Titles/Definitions/Examples**

Group 3 liked the current road classifications and those essentially already designated.

1. Principal Arterial  
a. Higher speeds, wider roadways, includes turn lanes, wider shoulders and has medians  
Example: Pinon Hills Boulevard

2. Minor Arterial  
a. Bike lanes, lower speeds, medians, sidewalks  
Example: 20<sup>th</sup> Street, North Butler, College Boulevard

3. Collector  
a. 2-3 lanes of travel, sidewalks, smaller shoulders, lower speeds, off-street parking, often passes through subdivisions  
Example: Dustin - north of 20<sup>th</sup> Street

4. Local  
a. Two lanes of travel, no medians or shoulders, no parking, sidewalks, lowest recommended vehicle speeds  
Example: Streets found in any subdivision

**MEETING WRAP-UP**

Mr. Delmagori reviewed and summarized the themes and titles developed by the groups for the land use context areas. He said the Advisory Group would now look for common themes and titles such as downtown, town center, and central business district. He also noted the over-arching titles such as agricultural and industrial which are becoming more clearly identified and defined as these titles are expanded and broadened. Mr. Delmagori added that this was a good start for the process. Now the Advisory Group could begin to bring together the ideas and titles and determine which land use context area titles work best for the MPO region. MPO Staff will draft some suggestions and have them ready for the Advisory Group to review and discuss at the next meeting.

Mr. Delmagori said work on developing titles for the road types would pick up again at the next Advisory Group meeting. Ms. Lopez agreed that more discussion was definitely needed on road type titles.

Ms. Romme said she liked the land use context title of Regional Commercial that was suggested by Group 1. Ms. Lopez said they thought this might be a good fit because much of the MPO region's urban area is more of an urban corridor and not necessarily a town center or a downtown. She added that this community has developed along a

commercial corridor and defining the individual land use context areas was difficult. Ms. Romme added that Aztec is very interested in defining and revitalizing a downtown area. Ms. Lopez agreed and said that Farmington would also like to redevelop its downtown area.

Mr. Delmagori said that since the meeting was running a little late, he would e-mail some information to the Advisory Group members on downtown revitalizations, innovative designs for intersections, and Complete Streets guidebooks. He will also e-mail the link to the Design Your Own Complete Street website. This website provides all the possible elements for a complete street and the user can use the tools to create their own. Mr. Delmagori thought this website could provide some excellent ideas and be a valuable resource when the Advisory Group begins to develop the Complete Streets design guidelines.

Mr. Delmagori reiterated that Staff would consolidate the information and ideas generated during the meeting and compile a side-by-side comparison of these land use context area titles along with some recommendations by MPO Staff. At the next meeting, the Advisory Group will review and refine the land use context area titles along with starting to develop the road type titles. Mr. Delmagori said he hoped that within the next three or four meetings, the Advisory Group would be ready to make their recommendations to the MPO Technical and Policy Committees on the land use context areas and road types for the MPO region. Once this process is finalized, the Advisory Group will begin to develop the Complete Streets guidelines that will provide a framework for the local entity planners to work from.

After some discussion, the Advisory Group decided to hold the next meeting on Wednesday, October 16, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.