DEV elopment Review Committee (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, August 19, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

DRC PRESENT:  
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Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Planner Senior  
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Rocio Nasir, Utilities  
Geremy Barela, Engineering-CD  
Meei Montoya, Utilities  
Andrew Wray, MVMPO  
Dominic Loya, MVMPO  
Soo Gyu Lee, Gary Skelton, Streets and Traffic  
Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect  
Hector Terrazas, Engineer  
David Sedillo, Public Works  
Tony Trevino, Engineering  
Tim Pitts, Building Development

STAFF PRESENT:  
Sara Gonzales, Community Development

OTHER PRESENT:  
John Moscato  
Chad Sells  
Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller  
Mike Johnson, Souder Miller  
Dan Lilley  
Martin Pillar

I.  CALL TO ORDER (9:01)

Weir:  
Good morning everybody. I'll go ahead and call the Development Review Committee meeting for August 19th to order. Today on the agenda we have approval of minutes, we have one old business, and then we have two discussion items as new business.

II.  APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 15, 2020

Weir:  
So the first thing I'd like to do is entertain a motion to approve the minutes from July 15th.

Nasir:  
So moved.

Weir:  
Okay. Thank you.

Dubbin:  
Second.
Weir: Thank you Mark. We have a motion and a second. Everyone on the City staff DRC that is in favor of approving the minutes please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: Anybody opposed? Okay, we'll consider the minutes from July 15th approved.

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Determination of the policy on and the process for requiring right-hand turn lanes.

Weir: The first item or the next item for action is old business. Determination of the policy on and the process for requiring right hand turn lanes. And I believe Hector Terrazas with the Public Works department is going to introduce this topic and lead the discussion. Hector.

Terrazas: Thank you David. So as far as determination for right turn lanes, Public Works data worked to create a flowchart to kind of help developers and even our staff to figure out what are the steps needed and when deceleration lane is needed. I think, correct me if I'm wrong, that we end up providing you that one.

Gonzales: I don't have the completed flowchart that was actually ... you sent us a preliminary one but it still needed review by Soo and them, so we did not receive a finalized one.

Terrazas: Okay. So I think the final changes were very minor, just some clarification on the naming convention. So going forward we'll be having that one as a guideline to see when we need turn bays or not for development.

Gonzales: Hector, is this something you can share with us right now and kind of go through and discuss for those who are actually online attending the DRC meeting?

Terrazas: Sure. Let me see. For some reason I thought you had gotten it, but let me find it.

Weir: Hector, once you get the flowchart up and walk through it, I'll ask if there's any members of the DRC that have any comments or questions for you. And then I see we have quite a few folks from the development community that may have some questions on that also, so I'll go through that.
Terrazas: Hey Sara can I e-mail it to you, that way you can share it since you're the host.

Gonzales: Sure. Does it not give you the sharing capabilities?

Terrazas: We were having a hard time with Zoom last time.

Gonzales: Okay. No, you can e-mail it to me and I will go ahead and share the screen. Not a problem.

Terrazas: Okay. It should be on the way. Did you get it yet?

Gonzales: Okay, can everybody see the screen? Okay, Hector, do you want to walk us through this process?

Terrazas: Sure. Well just looking at it there's still (inaudible) thing because it should say decel/accel lane analysis. So with this flowchart we'll start at the top. So for the decel lane analysis, that's what the flowchart is. It depends on the type of activity. We have three types of activities; we have a master plan/concept plan, a subdivision, and then development. So depending on where we're at, if it's like a single lot development or larger subdivision or master plan, we're going to have different paths we can take. And even with that they kind of overlap.

So I'll start the left side. So if it's a master plan or concept plan when do we need it? Is there is there a TA required? So all these three are going to have, okay is there a TIA required based on the master plan, or is there one already for that? So let's say for example, if we have a master plan and has a TIA, does the TIA address decel lanes? No. Then decel/acceleration analysis to be done at time of development. So if it does, then we just follow the guidelines in the TIA. I'll just stay on the left side. And then as far as previewing proposed existing right-of-way, we'll go in there and see, okay is there enough existing City right-of-way to accommodate that decel lane if it's warranted. If it's not, then accommodations need to be made for that.

So right there where it says going off of that magenta triangle in the middle. So does it accommodate it? Yes. Then we'll work with the developer or the builder to design and build the decel or acceleration lane and that's going on the right side. If it's no, is right-of-way dedication required prior to development. So let's say they're building a subdivision and they already have to dedicate 120 or half, or whatever it is, of the right-of-way to the City then we'll make that part of it. And then so it'll go into the Yes, dedication of additional right-of-way to accommodate that. So that'll fit it in. So that's pretty much the end of that. So then that's the stopping point. This is more for a master plan or concept plan.

For subdivision it'll be pretty much the same thing because it's kind of a bigger development. So we go development, subdivision, TIA required, if it's no. So most of the time if it's a subdivision, a large enough subdivision,
A TIA is required for 100 trips in the peak hour, either generated by the
development either incoming or outgoing traffic. So that's the vision and
the master client concept plan. It's going to follow that left side of the chart.
Now for a single lot development, that's where it's more likely a TIA finally
required. So in our traffic standards, it does say to look at driveways as a
as a standalone.

So then for single lot development, we'll look into the category of the
roadway where access will be located. So let's say it's an arterial or
nonresidential collector, then we would be requesting for a decel lane/
acceleration warrant study based on our traffic standards and that
references the DOT standards. Then we'll go from there and then we would
review the analysis and we would either accept it or not accept it. If it's not
warranted, then we would stop. If it's warranted, we go back to that review
the existing conditions, is there right-of-way there that need to be
accommodated, is there right-of-way that needs to be dedicated as part of
the development. And we go through the same process of that. Then it
goes back to that right-of-way portion and then designing and accepting,
which is going to be on a case-by-case, in case they're developing on an
arterial and there's already 120 foot of right-of-way and the City can
accommodate them there, then there's no need to dedicate additional right-
of-way.

So that was mostly on an arterial or a major collector where there's
traffic. So then on residential collectors, those collectors that we do see
some traffic but they're residential, we would look at the type and size of
land use. So for those we'll be asking for, if it's a commercial or residential
we'll be asking for trip generation report. Of course if it's like a house, they're
building a house we're not going to be asking them to give us a trip
generation report because we know it's not going to generate enough trips
to actually be anywhere near close to warranting that one. So if it's a
noncommercial small residential, then it goes all the way to the stop point.
That's where Traffic would make that decision. So it goes all the way down
to the stop point.

So then if it is a large residential or commercial development and like
I said provide trip generation report, we'll review it and see if it's needed.
Usually with the trip generation report we'll go ahead and look at the existing
background traffic and we'll use the MPO as kind of a ballpark figure to see
okay, do we have enough traffic vehicles that we are requesting? Do we
have enough background traffic on that small street or residential/collector
local street to warrant us having to ask developer or the engineer for a decel
lane or acceleration warrant study? So if it's yes then we'll go through the
same process, request it and then Traffic management will review it and
accept it. And if it's no, then it goes back to stop. So that's pretty much in
a nutshell. If you guys have any questions I can clarify.

Weir: Good. Thank you Hector. I saw that Tony Trevino and David Sedillo were
on the call. Was there anything that you wanted to add to this?
Trevino: At this time, we'll let the Development Committee kind of make comments. And I have some comments regarding this also. I know Sara has submitted some comments regarding this flowchart in regards to sections of the design standards being called out on this flowchart and what it was referencing, and I still think there is some missing information on there. We have been moving forward with some of these items with Mr. Moscato on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. I think he's seen how we've handled this and going forward, but I will go ahead and let the Development Committee ask their questions.

Weir: Okay. Let me just go through folks. If I could start with Geremy, since he reviews a lot of the subdivision and development permits for Community Development, was there any questions that you had?

Barella: I don't have any questions at this time, David.

Weir: Okay. Katherine, I know that you oftentimes deal with these issues also, was there anything that you wanted to comment on or ask questions about?

Barella: No. Typically, when we're doing this review, we look to Hector for more information on this stuff.

Weir: Okay. Katherine Harrison-Rogers, did you have any comments you wanted to make?

H-Rogers: No, David. I agree, as long as there's some additional information just to sort of fill in the blanks about where the requirements are coming from as specified by Sara and Tony, I think it makes it a little bit more clear. But I don't really have anything at this point in time.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Tim Pitts, is there anything you wanted to comment on or question?

Pitts: Yes. Thank you David. I wanted to ask Hector in terms of operationally on this the Community Development, Engineering and Technical Services section is going to be taking over some portion of these reviews. Is the intent that this is going to be clear enough so that our reviewers will be able to handle this without us having to ask Traffic? Is that how we're intending to work with this?

Terrazas: So, yes, we're going to try and make it as clear as we can because we are going to be transitioning, like Tim said, a portion of the minor stuff. If you go back to the chart, Sara, there is some numbering in their kind of footnotes. And they kind of, maybe I didn't include it in there, but (inaudible). So like number two, number three, those little footnotes, they refer to our
code. So our code is going to specify why we're asking for this and what point we're looking at. So let's say we're asking for trip generation on number one, right, so you got to figure out okay is there enough traffic to make it work as far as deceleration/acceleration lanes referencing the NMDOT standards, that's number two. And then number three, as far as the improvements that need to be made, our traffic code reads, when you do (inaudible) increases the traffic, the following action may be required. It just goes to the different ones that they can be in there. I tried to summarize as much as possible, some of its verbatim, some I cut out to make it simple, but I didn't add anything. This is straight from traffic standards.

Weir: Okay. Tim, was there anything else that you wanted to comment on?

Pitts: No. Thank you. That's what I was interested in.

Weir: Okay. Mark Dubbin, was there any comments or questions you had?

Dubbin: Not really, David. I kind of echo what Katherine and Sara said about calling out the section so that it's a little less ambiguous. And just I like Hector's idea of tying it to this particular trip generation, because that way we'll know the difference between a large development and a small development, just something so that it's a little better defined, but I think it's probably on the right track.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Rocio, did you have any comments or any observations, questions that you want to make?

Nasir: No David I don't know.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Hector or Tony, was there any other comments that you wanted to make? If not, I was going to go ahead and see if the other attendees from the development community if they had any questions and if you were ready to address any questions they had.

Trevino: I don't have any.

Weir: Okay. I see that Marty has already put his hand up. Marty, you want to ask your questions?

Pillar: One of the questions I had was at the end of the chart there is the traffic standards and they're calling out section 32-404 for the right turn lane. That document, whatever is shown on there, is not matching the standards that are on the City website under the municipal code. So I'm not sure where that traffic standard came from. Was one item.

The other one is Hector mentioned that the MPO counts would be used. If you're on a road that is smaller classification than a collector, the
MPO does not have counts. So what would we be using on those roads, major locals,_residuals, things like that?

Weir: Hector, do you want to start with the difference of information on the web page in the graphic which has been put together and then after that we can go address the traffic count question.

Terrazas: Yes, as far as the section 32-404 I'll make sure that it matches exactly what it says, I can update that one. As far as the other one, (inaudible) if you go back to the actual flowchart, it does say we're going to be asking for trip generation. So as far as the trip generation, let's say you're creating 100 trips, and look at MPO and the surrounding let's say we have a block over or two blocks over we do have information for the MPO. On that on our side once we know the trip generation traffic will make the call on making sure that, do we really want the engineer, the developer to provide us that data iff we're seeing two blocks over there's probably, maybe, I don't know, maybe 1,000 cars in a whole day, and then two blocks on the opposite side there's 500 cars a day. So then more than likely it's not going to warrant it. Now, if we do see just the type of development's going to be a large development, like five drive throughs in the same lot, then yes we're more than likely just with the trip generation report saying yes we're going to have 300 trips in an hour then we're going to be asking for the developer to provide counts for that specific location. Does that kind of answer your question Marty?

Pillar: Okay. You know the question I guess is, White Sage Arc, it's a major local and of course I've been working with Hector, looking at a site there. And that is, one of the questions that I'm looking at is during this discussion, how do we know where a decel lane is going to be required? And if we use those MPO accounts or if I have to go out there and provide counts for White Sage Arc. and I guess that's what you just said that we would need to do.

Weir: Being kind of a novice it sound like it was a case-by-case basis. And it would be based on some of the larger streets that the local street feeds into and then just kind of your professional knowledge. Is that similar to the way that you're handling it. Well I guess first for Hector, is that a fair characterization of what you just said and shared with us?

Terrazas: Yes. So in case of Marty's development, he does have two drive throughs in the same lot, in the same vicinity, so more than likely we will be asking to provide us counts on White Sage. Not just for that but just having a couple of drive throughs, more than likely it's going to go over the 100 trips, so we're going to be asking for a TIA and not just a decel lane (inaudible). So using those counts, you can use them for the decel lane and of course for the TIA.
Weir: Any follow up Marty that you might have on that?

Pilar: No, that is clear.

Weir: Okay.

Trevino: Hey, David.

Weir: Yes.

Trevino: Can I answer Marty's question regarding 32-404.4?

Weir: Yes. Please.

Trevino: It is their deceleration and acceleration lanes warranted for deceleration lane, it's there verbatim in the municipal code.

Pilar: I just printed it up this morning from there.

Trevino: Yes, I'm looking there right now. If you go, the only thing that's missing from that is or deceleration and acceleration lanes. Hector just starts it off as warrants for deceleration and acceleration lanes are along. So to make it exactly verbatim Hector just have to add decel and acceleration lanes right in front of warrants. Other than that it's in there.

Pilar: Okay, and then this Section 32-404.4 deceleration/acceleration lanes, that edition of the traffic standards that was approved through City Council and stuff?

Trevino: These are the design standards that have been there since 2005, I believe.

Weir: So it sounds like we just need to verify that, it's like you have Tony, that the municipal code, would you go through the clerk's office to review, it does match. And Hector had said earlier that he did summarize some of it to cut out some extraneous words, so they won't be word for word the like but the intent is to capture the essence or the key points of the standard.

Trevino: Correct. Yes sir.

Weir: Okay. Is there any one ...

Nasir: I just have a ... I think that it's not easy to find a way it was written in there, because I'm looking for it on my code and it's under Section 32-404 driveway design elements. And it's on point four which is all the way to the back right before going to 32-405.
Terrazas: Yes. And I was trying to make it so you don't have to go through the whole thing and kind of make it quick. But to answer kind of Marty's question, these were approved in 2012 by City Council. So we've been working with those for eight years now. Or I mean I think they have been there even before then. The latest approval of the traffic standards which include all this section is from 2012. But as far as clarification, I don't know would it be simpler to just put the whole thing in there and not kind of going to Rocio's point, not kind of make it to the point.

Nasir: I think that I don't know but put in 32-404.4, I think in my head that's confusing because I have been put in parentheses 4, but maybe I'm wrong on how it's written but it is there. Tony is right and you're right, it's there, it's the last point before going to section 32-405.

Trevino: I think when we had this issue, this item come up with Mr. Moscato on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, the biggest hiccup here is this is under the driveway standards, regarding driveway. I know Soo and Hector will always review it kind of based on the traffic safety elements that should be analyzed however, on the last variance request that we got from Mr. Moscato it was approved based on the situation that we're not referencing roadways, arterials, collectors, any kind of roadways, this is a driveway classification driveway design standard. In my opinion, we need to update the design standards as soon as possible to make this standard appropriate to use on roadways. But the way it's written I was not able to force this standard on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard just because it was referencing to the driveway. And that is where the confusion is coming from. It's just the title of the section for driveways, that is what's the confusion part and that is what has the City's hands tied to enforce this on right-of-ways, not just driveways.

Weir: Do you think if the DRC were to approve the flowchart and the notes and say this is the staff policy for reviewing and making those requests and requirements, that that would give you the support that you needed to create a driving transportation network until those design standards are updated and addressed? Because that's the way I envision and the reason that this was put on the agenda is the DRC could say, this flowchart and the notes is the City's policy for reviewing the requirements for accel/decel lanes for the entire street network, not just driveways, but also at the intersection of streets. And then we could provide that to whoever works on updating the design standards. Is that your understanding?

Trevino: Yes, sir. That will totally give the back end that Traffic Engineer needs to address the situation in a similar repetitious manner for all of these permits. It was hard for me to approve the variance because I did understand Soo's and Hector's concerns regarding Sonoma Ranch Boulevard and all the traffic coming into there and out of there. There's some geometry issues that had some problems also. But yes, that will kind of give clear direction
to everybody and mainly the clarification of the design standards because
the way they're written is so open for interpretation. We get a new traffic
engineer; their background is going to be different all the time of how they
interpret the design standards. And I don't think it's fair to the development
community because they've been doing the same thing for so long and it's
hard for them to put a price to their work when they're bidding out these
projects and don't know if they're going to have to go and get counts on a
residential roadway that they never had to before (inaudible) MPO. So I just
think it's unfair on both sides. And the more clear we can make and now till
we get the design standards rewritten; I'll be better for both sides.

Weir: Okay. And then I believe from a due process standpoint any decision of the
DRC can be appealed to City Council. So if we approve anything and
there's still some issues to be worked through, we can either go back to it
or if we make a decision and somebody doesn't agree with it there is an
appeal process to clarify via that. So I think we're on good grounds from
that standpoint. Ask the engineers and developers that are online if there
are any other questions or comments that you wanted to make, any
clarifications?

Pompeo: I did have a question for Hector as far as the driveway a right hand turns.


Pompeo: My question is this. Over time in realization that the state access manual is
now 19 years old, we have used other methodologies such as highway
capacity software to do analysis of turning movements at driveways. And I
want to make sure that it's recognized by Traffic that that methodology of
analyzing either roadway intersections or driveway intersections is
recognized as an applicable method when performing that analyzation.

Terrazas: So Paul, that's right. But the way we have the code now and you've done
it with myself and Soo previously, we'll ask for decel lane warrants analysis,
let's say it meets, the developer or the engineer always has an opportunity
to ask for a variance request. The reason we can't just say okay go ahead
and show us a level of service using like you said the software, it's because
it's in the code. So what we would ask is okay show us a decel lane
warrants, you show us that it does meet, you can always ask for a variance.
And when you do ask for variance, we ask you to show us technical support
and an engineer or the developer showing us that it doesn't cause a safety
issue. And going back to our traffic standards where it referenced or a TIA
as far as an intersection doesn't create a level of service below D, then
Traffic would support a variance of the decel lane warrant or the accel lane
warrant not being installed. Is means that what you're asking Paul?
Pompeo: Well, yes Hector. Thank you for that clarification. And what I was driving towards is, is that I would like to see that in writing. I think that where traffic engineers have a problem with trying to implement the State Access Management Manual, which was really written to take care of the State Highway Department's needs for accessing and controlling their facilities, gets over taxing and overburdened when we're talking about bringing those standards down to local roadways, much like the City of Las Cruces. I would really prefer that we instead of referencing the State SAM Manual and putting a period after it, that it's the State Sam Manual or other accepted methodologies, much like we do with drainage reports that we're not locked into one specific thing. We have the ability in the code to offer different methodologies. So I would I would like that somehow David I don't know how you do this or if it's even possible now, to get something like that in writing so that we're not constantly having to go back and get variances on what I consider simple items such as this.

Weir: What I would propose is, is there was some way to add it to the notes of the flowchart. But Tony had his hand up, I think he wanted to add some commentary to the question.

Trevino: Yes thanks Dave. No, Paul, I totally agree with you. I know that manual is old. We are making our interpretation on this change. I do not see why we cannot allow you all on the development side to review this flowchart, make your comments on it also and then kind of add the software you guys would like to use, and kind of we'll have it in there from the beginning so there's no questions. I don't the open ended or other approved software, because I can see us running into a situation later, well this isn't approved. So if we can get all those called out on there now and have this on there.

Pompeo: Okay. I think that would be good. Because I mean what comes to mind is the Highway Capacity Software and then maybe the Synchro software. And I'm sure there may be one or two others but I think that they're widely recognized within the industry and I think that to your point we could really hone in on those and be specific.

Trevino: And Hector he could I spoke to you all over that. Do you have an issue with that?

Terrazas: the only issue we would have is in case there's a safety issue in there, because of course we need to make sure that the safety, it's not, let's say it's a level service D but we know that it's still going to cause some safety issues. So as long as we review for safety as well, we're not creating a hazard with not installing it, that'd be fine. But that'd be more of a case-by-case. But if you want we can always, I mean, the DRC board can change, well I don't know, maybe David Weir needs to clarify this. Can we change our standards here with DRC and saying, you know what we're going to
bypass the need for decel lane warrant analysis and not requiring it if they
show us something, or do need to still have them provide that and then go
the variance way, which I know it's more work for Paul and all the
developers and engineers. But I don't know if that's something the DRC
board can go and do.

Weir: Hector and Tony please help me out. What I would propose is that the
flowchart and the notes be adopted as a policy of the DRC and that we
reach consensus with the engineering community and the development
community. And then it would still give you the leeway to recommend that
variances be proposed. But in most cases if we follow the policy you can
either approve it at a staff level or if there's some question you can bring it
back to the DRC and have a decision made that way. And basically we
handle these cases in that manner until the design standards get updated
and we have more leverage. What I would propose is along the lines of
what Paul had said is that you add a note to it that there are other methods
that would be acceptable to the Public Works or the Traffic Engineer for the
City, and that you would review them in that manner. And that if there were
any disagreements, you could bring it to the DRC to decide or they could
even propose a variance immediately. But I think in the short term that
would be the manner to address it. Tony, did you still have some
comments?

Trevino: No. My main goal here is just to decrease the amount of variance questions
we have to go through, it's as clear cut from the beginning because as
Hector says it's going to be in Community Development's hands soon, so
it's just going to be a simple kind of approval and only have to go to Traffic
for in depth questions for some difficult situations.

Weir: Marty, did you want to comment?

Pillar: I haven't done anything different.

Weir: Okay, I saw Chad's mics open also. Did you want to add anything Chad?

Sells: Are you going to send this out for public review and comment before you
act on it?

Weir: Well that was the next question that I had for Tony and Hector. At the
beginning of the discussion there was comment that there was some
additional edits they wanted to do. So if that's the case, I was going to
recommend that be postponed and then brought back to the DRC for
adoption after those changes have been proposed and then they've been
reviewed with folks.
Trevino: That is kind of the policy. However the requirements are for DRC to get these through. I am not aware of that. I have to kind of rely on you guys. However I kind of would like on the last meeting, there's another meeting we had where Tim and I believe you all mentioned that there's already an RFP out for design standards to be rewritten, kind of clarify that. At this point can you see where that's at? Because I am not up to speed with where that's at.

Weir: Yes. There is an RFP to review and update all the development codes and specifically the book to the municipal code, the chapters on the zoning ordinance, the subdivision requirements and the design standards. So that RFP's on the street right now. It's going to close I believe on September 1st, and then we'll hopefully have a successful contract negotiations and get a consultant working on that. That's a major project. So I wouldn't anticipate changes until a couple years from now. So I think it's wise for us as a DRC to adopt this as a policy of how it'd be treated until those amendments actually come forward.

Trevino: Okay. Yes because if there's going to be a big old public input process now then we'll have another one here in a couple months for the design standards again, I don't see why we're going to go through two different ones. Why would we want to do that? So I don't know the route that the DRC has to take, but as far as, I'll leave it up to you all for the ...

Weir: Well the question I had Tony is do you feel that the flowchart today is something that that you could work off and that you'd like the DRC to endorse today, with the comments that some of the practicing engineers and then you, yourself, said there were some clarifications that you wanted to make. I would recommend that we postpone it today and make those changes and share with folks and bring it back next week or the next two weeks, if that's a doable timeframe.

Trevino: Yes. The only thing that would kind of addressing Paul's comment is just maybe other applicable software to submit, but other than that, I think we are good with the way the flowchart is now.

Weir: Go ahead Hector.

Terrazas: So with that in mind I think we can just make the decision right now in DRC and go back to what Tony was saying, do we really want the variance request to go all the way through? So at the same time I think we should just, if Paul and Marty and Dan and whoever else is here has any comments, I think we can just kind of figure it out. That's the only major issue. And we can go from there and just adopt it today and not have to come back. But I'll leave it up to anyone else that has any input or maybe they do want to look at it closer.
Okay. Sara, do you have any comments that you wanted to add too from a processing standpoint or treatment by the DRC?

Yes. I mean my only comments would be from basically the DRC standpoint, the DRC is the interpreting body of the code. And I think at that point in time, if we have the discussion now everything is basically amended to where we include the comments that were provided as far as Paul Pompeo's request to add additional methodologies in order to be utilized for the decel lanes. I think the decision would come from the DRC body. And they should be able to make that decision today based on the flowchart that's provided as well as that amendment. And then of course, the development group can also appeal that decision afterwards if they choose to, to the City Council.

And so I think from our standpoint, we are the interpreting body of the DRC as far as the code regulations. So I would like to see if there is any other comments, especially from the development group as far as anything that would need to be amended or changed or ask the questions in order for DRC to continue and move forward with this item, so that way it is not postponed again to another meeting. Basically all the information has been provided, the code sections have been provided for each one as far as page two and three that was indicated from Hector. So we have the information we need to move forward in order to get the process going. I mean that would be my recommendation.

Okay.

I would be good with that Dave from my perspective. I'd be good with that as long as, as noted Hector, I mean Hector knows what the software is that we're running which is HCS or Synchro, there may be another one, but if he could just add that on to the section 404.4, meaning that it's the State Highway Manual or these other softwares, then I would be good with that.

Thank you.

Okay. Does anyone else want to comment? Or if there's not anything else I'll go ahead and close the discussion. And then would make available for a motion to approve the flowchart and policy for accel/decel lanes subject to clarifying additional software in addition to the State Highway Manual, or more appropriate language, I kind of butchered that. But I'd entertain a motion to that effect from the DRC members.

I do have just a comment. I would have liked to have seen that chart ahead of time you know to have seen more of the detail than just you know this small presentation.
Okay. Well, Rocio if you want to propose that we postpone it and bring it back next week and you have that week to review it I'm open to that type of motion. And then also Dan Lilley has his hand up to comment so hold that thought Rocio and then we'll let Dan comment.

Hey guys. What Paul was talking about, the approved the other acceptable software methods. There's one or two more but as long as they're based on the Highway Capacity Manual I think that, they're all based on the Highway Capacity Manual, or most of them, and as long as that's in there and there's a caveat and I'm not held to any particular software program. But I like Rocio's idea too, by the way.

Okay, I think we can craft the language that you can give a couple of examples or use the phrase "or similar software." That we can accommodate everyone. So I will go back to DRC members, do I have a motion to approve this or do you want to have a motion to postpone? I'll wait to hear from the other members.

I move to approve it with the condition that we add to that chart let's say in lieu of deceleration and acceleration, lane analysis other methodology to analyze for safety and level of service based on the Highway Capacity and Institute of Transportation Engineers be allowed as a replacement or in lieu of the deceleration lane. And that any software that follows that kind of (inaudible) with the Highway Capacity Software. The IT is allowed.

Okay. Do I have a second?

I second the motion.

Okay. We have a motion and second. I'm going to allow some discussion. David Sedillo I saw that you had your up. There's something you wanted to add before the DRC takes a vote.

Thank you Mr. Chair. I was just going to comment that I agree with Hector's initial motion, but it was seconded. So we'll let that motion proceed through.

Okay. What I'm going to do is I'm going to ask that one rep from each of the DRC departments vote for their department, and then we'll see how the vote goes. Public Works, I don't know David, Tony, or Hector who wants to cast the vote.

I think on the on the guy that picked on that.

Okay.

So yes.
Weir: Okay. Parks and Recreation, Cathy?

Mathews: Mr. Chair, Parks and Rec votes yes.


Dubbin: I'd support it, but I don't know if it's quite ready. It's an abstain.

Weir: Okay. I'll go ahead and vote for CD. I'll vote for approval. And then Rocio for Utilities.

Nasir: I abstain too.

Weir: Okay. So the motion passes, three in favor and two abstentions. So we'll make those changes and then I will ask that Hector get that out to all the attendees of today's meetings so you'll have an opportunity if you could potentially appeal that or you could request future modifications from the DRC at future meetings. So and under old business, the policy and process for requiring right hand turn lanes has been approved with modifications. And Hector I assume that you'll get that information together.

Terrazas: Yes, I'll go ahead and add it at the bottom or maybe a disclaimer at the bottom like it was approved.

Weir: Okay. Thank you.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion of application and process regarding Section 32-406 (b) "These values are considered minimums. Larger clear sight triangle areas may be needed as determined by the City's traffic engineer, based on horizontal and vertical curvature of roadways in question with appeal to the development review committee allowed."
   - What information factors are provided by the City Traffic Engineer to determine that the clear sight triangles are required to be larger.

Weir: We'll go ahead and move on to new business. The first item is a discussion of application and process regarding section 32-406 (b). These values are considered minimums. Larger clear sight triangles may be needed as determined by the City's Traffic Engineer based on horizontal and vertical curvature of roadways in question with appeal to the Development Review Committee allowed.

The point of discussion today is what information factors are provided by the City engineer to determine when clarify sight triangles are required to be larger. Just for the all the attendees at the meeting today, this is just
a discussion item. It's not for action. And so we'll have kind of a facilitated discussion on that. And I'd like to start with Hector again. If he can kind of give us some background on why we're having that as a discussion item today, and what type of input that you would like to have. And then I believe Sara, you've dealt with this on processing subdivision plats, so if there's anything that you could add, but I'll start with Hector.

Terrazas: So yes so since the last year we had some engineers ask additional questions about exactly what the topic is, what kind of additional information can the traffic engineer provide as far as the clear sight triangles. So we've been referencing AASHTO, the AASHTO clear sight triangles as just a geometric, the Green Book that we call. So that's (inaudible) should look at. As far as when we ask for additional larger triangles as the code states it, it's when we see that there's curvature at the plat level. We had two different cases at the plat level. We can't tell vertical, which is one of the issues that we discussed last time. So at the plat level if we see a curvature that's going to hinder sightlines, then we ask that those corner lots or any lots that are affected that Traffic thinks would be affected by that geometry and you can't see around the corner because there's going to be a building or something. And we've been asking the surveyor to go ahead and put a CS symbol on those lots. Traffic asks the engineer or surveyor to put those symbols and then put a little note disclaimer that height restrictions may apply. I don't remember it verbatim. Some surveys have been doing it already. So we haven't had an issue. Other engineers have asked us for additional information as far as what we're looking for or what triangles, so we just refer them to the actual book, The Green Book, and one of the tables 9-7. So I think at the construction level when we do get construction plans if we see additional issues such as we have a curvature and we have slopes or steep grades on the roadway that could also make those triangles longer. That table that I'm referencing in AASHTO does have does account for a grade steeper than 3% or flatter than 3%.

Weir: Sara, did you have anything you wanted to add to the discussion?

Gonzales: The only comment that I would make David, is I know there has been some comments and concerns as far as the clear sight and when it's required from our previous meeting back in May. During the clear sight meeting we discussed that the plats would only have the clear sight symbol, would not have the clear sight triangle. However, I just want to reiterate that we are still requesting them through the preliminary plat and through the construction drawings for verification, so that way we ensure the public knows that it is something that they have to look into. That's the only clarifying information I needed to provide from our side from a subdivision standpoint.
Weir: Sara, I have a question for you. Have you had building permits on some of the lots that have put the symbol on it? And has there been any issues with any fence or desire for structures in those larger clear sight areas?

Gonzales: We haven't yet, I do believe one may have come in recently, and I will defer to possibly Geremy and Hector to see if something had come in. However, most of our lots, these are still a new provision, so a lot of these lots are being, they're under construction. They're in the construction phase for the entire subdivision, not the lots individually so far.

Weir: Okay. Thank you.

Gonzales: So we haven't had that come up just yet.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Are there any members of the DRC that have any questions or comments or observations with regards to this discussion item?

Terrazas: David, I'd like to stress that there has been, I think there's one in process for now. But I have processed separately on some other developments where a resident already had owned, they bought a corner lot and they wanted to put a fence and it intruded in the existing City code which is residential it's 30 by 30. But what the ISD, it actually helped them because the ISD is sometimes depending on the geometry of the road, it's less restricted than the City triangle because when you have a 30 by 30 in a corner law, especially on a smaller lot, that's going to make a difference.

Weir: Okay. Excellent.

Gonzales: And I do want to ask Paul Pompeo was the one who had requested this be placed on the agenda. So I do want to know if this has clarified or has given him the information in which he was requesting to afford with the clear sight triangles and the requirements?

Weir: Okay. That was that was my next question. Does anybody else attending the meeting want to comment or ask questions about this discussion?

Pompeo: I would like to David since I'm the one that started this on this particular item.

Weir: Okay.

Pompeo: Okay, the reason I brought this up and with all due respect to Hector, Hector and I have gone round and round about this particular issue. And that is because the code states that larger clear sight triangles, and I'm not, let me back up one step. I'm not against putting the triangular shape note on the
plats to call attention to corners that may be subject to clear sight triangles
later on when the lots are being developed. I have no problem with that and
I think that’s a good plan. My issue specifically was the code states larger
triangles may be required as needed as determined by the City’s Traffic
Engineer. My issue is, is that the mere placing of a review note on a
subdivision review document stating to show the ISDs does not rise to the
level of an acceptable answer of, "determined by the Traffic Engineer." I'm
seeking clarification from DRC is, myself as an engineer in private
development what information should I be receiving back in the review
portion from Traffic Engineering that goes me clearly that the Traffic
Engineer has made a determination that a larger site triangle was needed?
Is it a report? Is it a calculation? To me in my mind it needs to be more
than just an assertion because if we're going to simply accept assertions as
engineering analysis, then I should be able just to assert back with a stamp
letter saying that I think it's okay. Obviously, you're not going to accept that
for obvious reasons. So I would just like some clarification or some
guidance from the DRC as to what the DR Committee deems to mean, what
the meaning of "determined by the traffic engineer" means. Thank you.

Weir: Paul, I have a question for you. Would you be comfortable with a DRC
interpretation outlining that similar to what we just did with the right turn
lanes? May be outlining what criteria is being used to consider those, and
I guess basically putting on paper what Hector had said when we started
the discussion.

Pompeo: Yes David. I would be happy or I would be satisfied with the DRC providing
guidance. I think both to myself and to Hector and (inaudible) as to what
the code means by "determined by the Traffic Engineer," and I think this
goes to the second item which is after this one, so I think we can just lump
it all together and just say, I need, I would like written clarification. Thank
you.

Weir: Okay. So Hector do you have any comments on that? Do you think it's
something that we could draft an interpretation for the DRC to adopt? And
then Geremy if you had any comments since you look at a lot of building
plans that oftentimes are corner lots, if there's any commentary that you'd
like to add to the discussion.

Terrazas: So yes I think having some more clarification on what that means to be
"determined by Traffic Engineer" because dealing with these clear sight
triangles, that's a lot of the feedback I get from the engineers and
developers out here is what is determining this. So I think having some
clarification for that would help out.

Weir: Does anybody else on the DRC that would like to weigh in or offer their
commentary on this topic?
Nasir: I do. I was happy to hear that we are actually using the standards for streets, not for highways because if I understand it correctly AASHTO is built a lot on higher speed streets, not on local streets.

Weir: Thank you. I'll ask that Hector, and I was going to ask if Geremy could help with the interpretation being put together, be sure and incorporate and recognize those factors.

Terrazas: Yes. So just to give an overview, the Green Book does take into account the speed of the street. So if 30, if it's 45, or it's 25, whatever the street is, it will take that into account as far as the triangle. What I do propose that we provide as clarification is that when we do request ISD that the information that the engineer can use is just refer back to those tables in the Green Book, in the AASHTO Green Book to make sure that those intersection sight distance are adequate for that location and for that geometry because it's going to be, it's literally on a case-by-case because we don't know exactly the curvature of the road because we don't get DWG's, we just see PDFs. So it's kind of hard to figure that out just from that. At the same time City staff will not be making the design on what needs to be done. So I just, my recommendation is that we just propose that the DRC just use AASHTO Green Book as an example for them to use the bigger triangles and they have tables on there for different speeds, different turning movements. So it's pretty much kind of a table that we have on the City side. And that's what we use.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else that wants to discuss this topic? What I propose is that we close the discussion and City staff will work on preparing an interpretation going forward.

Johnson: I wanted to one clarification. If the engineer does do the ISD site triangle and it shows that that corner is now free, in other words there is no need for a 30 by 30 clear sight triangle, does that remove that requirement from that corner lot? I think that I need some clarification on if the more advanced calculation shows there's not a clear sight triangle warranted on that corner whatsoever, which happens in some instances with curves, then the City's clear sight 30 by 30 is no longer on that lot. Would that be correct?

Weir: I'd like to look into that a little bit because I believe that requirement is in the zoning code. And so we may have to look at how we treat that and make modification.

Johnson: Can I just say that that has happened in some of the calculations we've done, it's not even coming into the corner so it's in essence saying the 30 by 30 clear sight triangle is not needed.
Terrazas: Right. And David, Mike and some of the other engineers here that they know, like I said before, the City triangles are really restricted, especially when you have straight 90 degree intersections, it's like I said 30 feet back one direction from the proper lane from that lot in both directions for residential or local to local road. It's kind of excessive so with that in mind, from my plan when, and we do look to the review the standards to get redone, we will probably make the case that we just use the AASHTO ISD because it's going to clear out both the issues about "Hey I can't see around the curve," it's going to give clear direction to all the developers. And at the same time it's going to get rid of that excessive restriction that we see now. But with that in mind right now David to give you some information, we do ask them, just like I said, if they want to build something they have to go through the variance process and they show us a technical analysis which is just them hiring an engineer and showing us, this meets ICM and all traffic will support it. And that's happened before. So yes I see where Mike's trying to get at, but kind of like on the other one, I don't know if DRC can supersede the code or kind of make it in lieu of kind of deal.

Weir: Sara just shared with me that she believes that's only in the design standards. Katherine, are you aware of clear sight being called out in the Zoning Code at all?

H-Rogers: David. It is called out in the subdivision code that clear sight has to be met I believe, it's just sort of in a checklist of items about things that need to be verified during revision, but I think that's the only mention of it. Sara do you know of any other areas where it might be mentioned?

Gonzales: And that's why I'm thinking in the Zoning Code the only time it references it is whenever you're building rock walls or you're building fences that says you have to be out of the clear sight, but it doesn't actually give you a definition of what the clear sight is. That's coming from the design standards that show you basically your local roads, your collector roadways, what are your sight distances that you have to be maintained from the property lines. Other than that I don't believe it's in there.

Weir: Yes. If that's the case I think the interpretation will handle it. Geremy you had your hand up, was there comment you had?

Barela: Yes. With this intersection sight distance I would like to see this as another means and method, not a variance. If we're allowing this and if this is a route that we want to go to allow to vary from the clear site triangle that is in our codebook, and if they're showing that this is ISD works, I would prefer this to go through as another means of method and not have to go through a variance request because as we all know that these variance requests linger and they sit on someone's desk a little bit longer. I would prefer not
to go through a variance request for this. If they can show that it meets with the ISD I would like to just have that put into the file and accepted that way.

Weir: I would propose that if the Public Works Department were comfortable with the DRC making that interpretation that that could be written into this interpretation and that could be seated as long as those requirements are met. You would have review being done by the City's Traffic Engineers and their stamp if they met these methodology they would go forward. But I don't want to impose anything on Public Works, so Hector or Tony or David, if you had thoughts on that I'd appreciate your input.

Pompeo: Hey, Dave, can I ask you a real quick question before Public Works chimes in?

Weir: Go ahead, Paul.

Pompeo: Okay, Hector, what is the date of, I don't have it in front of me and you probably do, what's the date of the current AASHTO manual right now?

Terrazas: Well, I think we just bought a new one and it's like 2018. But I may be confusing it with something else. No, I think it is 2018.

Pompeo: Okay.

Terrazas: That's the latest one.

Pompeo: So this is what I would propose Dave is that basically the design standard traffic standards that we have now are outdated pursuant to the New AASHTO manual. Can the DRC find that because the AASHTO manual's been updated and it is now newer than what the standards are, that it's the interpretation that we will use ISD in lieu of figure 2 in the traffic standards. And then we can move forward from there. So that way as Mike pointed out we can take the pluses and minuses, we can take the smaller triangles or the larger triangle depending upon what the current conditions call for and just use AASHTO and say that is the standard. Thank you.

Weir: Paul, in response. Today it's just discussion so we'll have to draft something and bring it back for (inaudible) ...

Pompeo: That's fine.

Weir: The DRC. Tim Pitts you had your hand up and wanted to comment.

Pitts: Thank you, Dave. I just want to comment on Geremy's response and I agree with him 100% that we need to get away from calling something that is an alternative means, a method of achieving the code and calling that a
variance. It's not a variance. That is an alternative means and methods that can be done by interpretation, it does not need to be done through a variance form. And in fact we shouldn't be doing that. A variance is when someone cannot meet code and they have to do something different. And it would be whoever it is, DRC or somebody saying, this section of code, this development or this subdivision does not have to meet. But I don't think we're saying that in case. What we're saying is, and I think this goes to Paul's point as well, if you're using a design manual, whether it's AASHTO or it's NACTO, or whatever it is that is an accepted means of accomplishing safety in the intersection, and that's acceptable to the traffic engineer. I don't think we need any sort of variance forms or anything like that. I think that can be done through interpretation.

Weir: Thank you, Tim. I think that's a good direction to go. But Hector is there anything you'd like to add?

Terrazas: As far as that like I said I'd be fine with just referencing the AASHTO for the sight triangles. But yes like Tim said, I don't know since it's code, it goes back to like the first, one can the DRC make a recommendation right now or I mean, I guess since it's larger triangles and we're telling them to do this I think the DRC can just say in lieu of these AASHTO sight (inaudible) on AASHTO standards will be used. I mean, I think that'd be enough to kind of satisfy both on the zoning. Because I think from what I recall, and I don't want to step on Katherine or Sara's toes, but I think like Sara said it just references clear sight, I think the only portion where clear sight is actually defined is in the traffic standards, so I think we would be fine at that level.

Weir: Okay. I think that's good. Tony and then Rocío.

Trevino: Thanks, David. My questions are earlier you said that DRC can make interpretations. How is it for us to kind of, what's your process for us to even make, add additional publishing as part of the design standards also because it's not listed in there anywhere. So this is just a question, can we do that, this is just an interpretation of it move forward. And how will the, I know the engineers on this meeting will be aware of that, how will the other engineers in the community be aware of this new interpretation or process?

Weir: Well, Tony the way I would anticipate it taking place is we're really just clarifying the processes that we use to review these items and it provides, really it's more giving you more leeway to use alternative means to address them. And so all the DRC meetings are noticed and all the minutes and any interpretation is available for anybody to look at. So what I propose that these items be written up and that we have the opportunity to distribute those to folks, but we could also do a PSA or ask our PIO office to help us clarify those things. So that's how I would anticipate it going forward.
Trevino: Okay, so with this, I just want to ask that Geremy is heavily involved in writing this thing because he's going to be the one that's going to be enforcing this in the review downstairs. Hector can be there for referencing and kind of other technical information, but that Community Development is heavily involved for the rewriting of this part of it.

Weir: I think that's a very good suggestion. I agree. Rocio, you had information you wanted to provide.

Nasir: I just want to mention that we do have in the meeting right now engineers from the outside and some of the subdivisions have been approved already for some time on corner lots, not to forget that the regular person can come over and pull a house permit on a corner and not have the table that we're asking the engineers to have to design the clear sight triangle. And so for us to have that available for the non-engineers, people that are going to come over and pull permits.

Weir: So in essence Community Development should have that information available for the builders and even property owners that are doing projects on their own so that they're aware that there is some additional alternative means when they do come into an issue with that. I think that's fair. I think it's something that the planners in addition to the technical service folks and Committee Development need to be aware of and provide that service to the public. Tim, you'd had your hand up earlier, was there anything else that you wanted to add again.

Pitts: I'll say what I was going to say which is sort of what you said. And that is I think that we need to do a little bit better job of documenting this. And we have a new position that we've just introduced. It won't affect the subdivision side, but then the building and the development and building construction side. We have a planning tech who is now responsible for managing the review process. And so you'll see some changes in the way that works. But I think what we're going to be doing is some very straightforward things of comments, of kind of vetting comments and making sure we've gotten everything out first time and so on. So I think that what you're talking about Dave of getting these things written down, of getting them into procedures that we follow that are a little more transparent to the engineering community, to the development community, and as Rocio brings up the regular business owner or homeowner that might want to do something, make things a little more transparent than they are right now.

Weir: Thank you Tim. Is there anybody else that's attending the meeting right now want to add anything to the discussion or make any comments at this time? If that's the case, I'll ask that Geremy work with Hector to start putting that interpretation together. I think we have some formatted or documents
that we can craft for this relatively easy and then we'll bring it at a subsequent DRC meeting for approval.

2. Discussion of application and process regarding Section 32-407 (1) "A traffic impact analysis will be required from the developer/subdivider where 100 or more new inbound and/or outbound trips are generated by the development during an adjacent street's peak hour or at the discretion of the City's development review committee and with input from the traffic engineer. Smaller developments may warrant a study if there are issues, as determined by the traffic engineer, over traffic safety or the development is located in an already congested (LOS D) area."

- What information is provided by the City Traffic Engineer to determine that the existing condition is at a service Level D.

Weir: If there's nothing else, we can go on to the second discussion item. It's discussion of application and process regarding Section 32-407 (1). A traffic impact analysis will be required from the developer/subdivider where 100 or more new inbound or outbound trips are generated by the development during an adjacent streets peak hour at the discretion of the City's Development Review Committee with input from the Traffic Engineer. Smaller developments may warrant a study if there are issues as is heard by a Traffic Engineer, over traffic safety, or the development is located in an already congested mean level service D area. And so for discussion today, what information is provided by the Traffic Engineer to determine that the existing condition is a level service D. So just from our earlier conversation, I think this was a question that was raised by Paul Pompeo. So Paul, do you want to add on to what you're looking for in this discussion?

Pompeo: Sure. Thank you Dave. This is just another request for information or direction from the DRC that I was requesting because we're into another part of the code where it says, "as determined by the traffic engineer." So what I'm asking for clarification on is, as a design engineer on the private sector side here, what information should I be expecting to receive from traffic engineering when making the assertion of the need for this TIA other than just a simple comment on a review sheet? So that's my question for the DRC today. Thank you.

Weir: Okay. Hector, can you provide some background? You're the star attendee today.

Terrazas: Usually when we do ask for a TA, it's because it's based on the trips, 100 trips. Level of services is usually the last one. The last one I think that I asked on as far as the level of service, a TIA based on level service without really knowing, but then again it was a restaurant, so was one over there close to the intersection of Lohman and Telshor. So just the kind of
information that we use is historical traffic studies. So we do know that
there's issues at Lohman and Telshor, it's our busiest intersection in the
City. We've done multiple signal timing; the City has to try and improve
congestion all along Lohman and Telshor and a whole quarter of Lohman
for that matter. So going back to what I said, we use historical traffic studies
that the City has done, or maybe the DOT has done. Maybe we know that
there's a signal need there and we need to make sure that it's not causing
more of a safety issue. If a signals needed already and we already at level
D as a four-way stop or whatever kind of stop it is, then that's
what we're looking for. So as far as using the traffic engineers service level
D, it's really rarely used unless we have some background traffic, either
counts or we've been trying to improve the signal timing there, fixing lines,
or we've been in contact with our police department and we know there's a
history of crashes there. So as far as providing it I don't know if you have a
specific case that you're looking at.

Pompeo: But to respond to that, Hector, it's just that sometimes it seems as if we're
getting comments on review sheets of asking for certain things that I am
having a hard time maybe understanding what the genesis of those
comments are based on. Dave also in looking at item number two, it says
that 100 trips generated by the development or at the discretion of the City's
Development Review Committee, and with input from the Traffic Engineer.
So that's another one of those issues where, do I bring that comment, if say
Hector and I are having a disagreement on a traffic item, in reading this
paragraph it would seem to allude that Hector and I are both coming to DRC
to have it out as to what is going to be required. Is that the way the DRC
views that? And if so is sending a request I guess through Sara, if this is a
subdivision issue. What if it's a building development issue that's just a
building, say a restaurant, the site design, is that the same methodology
that we use to get to the bottom of what is required? I know it's a
multifaceted question so I am looking for input from the DRC Committee.
Thank you.

Weir: Thank you, Paul. I can give you my two cents on that. That you know if it's
subdivision related your liaison would be the planner that's processing the
project. And then if it was part of a building permit, it would be at this time
I'm assuming Geremy would be your conduit to go for that. And if there is
a loggerhead that it would then come before the Development Review
Committee to mediate.

I have a couple of questions in regards to this. One is some of the
traffic reviews are going to be transferring to CD to initially process and so
there's that transition taking place. And so there's an opportunity, there'll
be some training that needs to be undergone. And so there'll be certain,
I'm assuming either a checklist or highlights of things to look at. And then
similar to the discussion we had with item one, is this something where it
would be beneficial to all to have an interpretation by the DRC drafted and
adopted, and that could be distributed to anyone that comes across this issue. So those are things that are swirling in my mind as a DRC members. But I'll open it up to the other committee members. Tim or Geremy, do you have any insights or any thoughts?

Pitts: Dave. Yes I agree with you that this is something we need to, again I think we need to have some better procedures available. And I think I won't task Geremy with it, he's got enough on his plate right now. But I think that when we retire the plan, review engineer, the chief development engineer, that that'll be a task for them is to make this, because they'll be taking on the task of reviewing at least initial reviews on all traffic issues. And they are going to need to be in a position of being clear on what it is they're reviewing, and what rises. So that'll make it easier I think for the development side because if we have to know it then we can tell you. But right now I think we are leaving it, Hector and his group at doing the reviews and so we are largely unclear what the triggers are for things. And so as we learn that we will do a better job of sharing that. That's all I got..

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Paul, does that help going forward? Are there more discussions or other inputs you'd like to receive?

Pompeo: Thank you, Dave. I appreciate the discussion today. And I just think anything moving forward that would provide some clarity and some direction to this so that when those of us on that private side are taking on projects and working on these developments, we have a pretty good understanding of what the requirements are going to be up front. And that's what I'm really seeking for in this discussion is just more clarity, more predictability as to what it is exactly that we're going to be expected to do when submitting either for commercial construction sites or for subdivisions. Thank you.

Weir: Thank you.

Terrazas: With that in mind Paul, just if you don't want to drive through there at five o'clock, just know that we're probably going to ask for a TIA. That's a quick way to know.

Pompeo: Okay.

Johnson: Hey Dave. On another TIA recently there was a question came from Hector to provide a level of service for pedestrian and bicycles. How does that determine? I mean here this is another item that's kind of, for a lack of a better term maybe seems arbitrary in some respects. But how would we address something like that I guess? How do we know when we're going to need a level of service for bicycles or pedestrians or any kind of analysis of that nature?
Terrazas: David. I can answer that. So as part of the latest updates to the Highway Capacity Manual and IT, it does reference that bike and pedestrians should be counted towards that. All the software that Paul and Marty and everyone uses, all the nationwide software, they do have a level of service for bicycles and pedestrians and of course vehicles. But also with that the City is moving to a multimodal way of thinking going back to Elevate, so that matches up to what the City is going to. And the new standards should include pedestrian amenities, and, of course bicycle amenities as well. So that's why we're asking, not just a few people, we've been asking everyone, all the major TIAs to include that at the beginning. Because of course if it's a single development and it's just a corner lot they're doing, there's really nothing much they can do to improve bike facility for there, or pedestrian facility if there's no sidewalk. There's already no sidewalk. But more than likely there's not, we still want them to review it, but more likely there's not going to be any improvements for that single lot if it's just a single lot. Now if it's a larger development in the case of the Apodaca one that went away for now, we did ask them to provide that to us. We received a TIA and it wasn't included. So we made that comment back to them to make sure that it accommodates pedestrians because it not only jives with what the City is going for as far as the new Elevate, but it also goes back to that blueprint, the original Apodaca blueprint to make it bike and pedestrian friendly.

Weir: So to reiterate your saying that between the City's Comp Plan, the Active Transportation Plan, and in the example you're providing, there was a neighborhood plan that all asked for that information. And then updates to the Highway Capacity Manual also has criteria to evaluate that. And so I guess you're saying you'll be requesting that information based on the policy and the changing of the standards that you use for that. Does that help Mike?

Johnson: Yes, it does to a point I guess. I guess it's again, if we start, if somebody was to research some of the standards cold like in the Municipal Code, you look at a lot of traffic standards and it's just referencing vehicles. So I would think they would need to have some sort of an update there also to reflect the multimodal aspects.

Terrazas: So with that looking at the traffic code, I mean, let me look at it so it can read it verbatim. It says, after all this, hundred trips and all this, it says the analysis will consist of the follow, then a) methodologies shall be based upon the Highway Capacity Manual and the latest edition of the IT trip generation. And of course it goes, or to more recent trip generation studies recognized by the Institute of Transportation here. So what we're following, what I referenced was that the Highway Capacity Manual as well as IT, trip general manual and whatever other studies that IT references, they all have been updated to include pedestrian, bicyclist, and actually multimodal or public transit, as far as public transit. It's more of an overarching kind of
deal that at this time we are going to be looking for but that might change depending on our new standards for the City.

Weir: Thank you Hector.

Pompeo: Down this rabbit hole. I'm just having an assertion to make here. You know, the problem I have with, I mean when you're talking about the IT generation rate you're talking about motor vehicles, you're talking about a roadway system or network. It's predictable as to what the generation rates are of motor vehicles, and which direction the splits are and where they go. I think we all recognize that. Most of the stuff I've looked at dealing with bicycles and pedestrians, there is no predictable methodology. Say for any new subdivision around here or any development, unless you have a full hundred percent build out, you don't know what the patterns or predictability are of pedestrians. So there are no generation rates that I'm aware of. And most of these studies dealing with pedestrians, I'll just use that and say the need of a HAWK signal or something like that comes after the fact. For instance, you know, the hawk signal on University Avenue, those were put in based on full development that's happened around there and it's predictable as to where the people are utilizing those. So I would just, and my opinion is I would be very cautious of bicycles and pedestrians being inserted into this traffic code because we're really grasping at straws to come up with predictability of those patterns. And then to use those reports as a hammer to make developers install infrastructure that number one may not be needed for 15 or 20 or even more years, and then are simply not needed because the pedestrians aren't using the facilities and there's no rational need for it at that time. So my two cents is I think we need to be very cautious about utilizing those in traffic reports. Thank you.

Weir: Thank you. Tony, you had your hand up.

Trevino: Yes sir Mr. Chair. I understand, and I really appreciate Hector and Soo trying to get proactive in the whole Elevate Las Cruces, this ATP and everything but it does put us in a predicament because the last level of service I did for pedestrian was on Tashiro and without having this *(inaudible)* whether A, B, C, or D we had a, going from nothing we had six foot sidewalks, six foot parkways, 35 mile per hour traffic, and we were still at a level D for pedestrians. And that's with all the amenities that the Elevate Las Cruces is asking for and so is the Active Transportation Plan for these buffered bike lanes and everything. We were still at a level D. So at this point without us having these thresholds of A, B, C, or D what's going to be acceptable. It's going to be hard for us to determine and improve these TIAs based on that situation. It would be nice to know kind of what they are now, asking for this but not a determining factor if it's approved or not. But just to start getting a basis for our future work on these roadways. Like I said on Tashiro we had nothing there and it went from an F to a D with all
these amenities. So it's just, this would be great information for us to know as we start to put together these design standards and what we're going to be asking for. Because Paul's right, there's really nothing there to kind of determine this information. But if these are the policies that the City has put forth on both Public Works and the development community for these pedestrian pathways and bike friendly, we got to have some kind of baseline where we're going to go with this. So I think that information is worth a lot to us. But as a determining factor, if it's approved or not, I don't see how we can do that.

Weir: So basically the information is good for us to have and see what's going on, but we have a lot of work to do on how we'll utilize it and what processes that we'll need to go through to require improvements to the pedestrian and bike network.

Terrazas: The City of Las Cruces is going to make us have that as part of our review policies, our design standards, as well as the Active Transportation Plan. So we have these policies in place but we don't have any baseline of how to even start from this. And for us to just to kind of, I kind of like this approach now where we're going to kind of transition the data and start getting the information instead of going to get the new design standards and just drop it on everybody and have a determining factor of approval or disapproval on the TIA based on this. But that's just my take on that and like I said I appreciate Soo and Hector already taking the proactive approach and gathering this information.

Weir: So it sounds like we'll have this discussion for a while now. I already I see that you had your hand up but and I didn't pick you or ask you to comment earlier.

Pillar: No problem. Thank you, Dave. Just have a question on the TIAs. If we're in an area that has been having quite a bit of development happening in it and previous TIAs have been done. If we come in and we do a development in that same area, is there a possibility of utilizing the existing TIAs so we don't have to redo one in that same area?

Terrazas: David, I can ask you that question. So we've discussed this, myself and Marty and some other developers since, let's say Mark's developing and then he develops a year ago, and then he hires his engineer, and then Tim's developing now and he hires this other engineer, then Mark had to pay for that study to be done. So I don't think from the City standpoint that we should be giving Tim a free pass at TIA. Now, if probably between Tim and Mark agree that yes, you know what I use that counts, as long as they're not old or I think they are using a year old, maybe year and a half. And there's not been any excessive other development either that goes through their or adjacent, then we'd be fine with using it, the counts, but the analysis,
and Marty correct me if I'm wrong, you're just thinking the counts, right, the actual counts.

Pillar: No, I'm you know looking at the entire TIA process. What if we look at just, for example Sonoma Ranch and Northrise, you know we've gone through and did traffic warrant analysis and that a traffic signal is warranted for that intersection. Now as we develop in that area again, TIA comes up and it says need to analyze the Northrise/Sonoma intersection again and you know what additional information would we be gathering about that intersection if we redid the analysis of that intersection?

Terrazas: So on that one, that's a really specific case and you might know this but if you don't want to do that, then that's fine. But we've been letting people know is if you need to do your (inaudible) for that signal, then that signal doesn't need to be analyzed. We know we need a signal there. That's what we've been telling everyone. So that's how we're treating that one. But as far as in any other development, I'd be fine as long as you and the other engineer are fine using each other's data and you give permission. I'm fine with it as long as it's not out of date no more than a year old. And we haven't had 10 Walmart's pop up right next to it, because then that's going to skew the traffic. But yes, I mean, you guys come up to an agreement, I would be fine with you guys doing that.

Trevino: David.

Weir: Yes, go ahead, Tony. Sorry.

Trevino: I want to kind of just, and I hear what Hector saying but, and Rocio can attest to this, for drainage reports we utilize other (inaudible) reports all the time for drainage. It's City property, it's public information. I would not have a problem utilizing an adjacent TIA as long as it hasn't changed based on the conditions haven't changed and everything. I don't have an objection to that. Hector and I and Soo can discuss that. We do it all the time for drainage reports. I don't think there needs to be in agreement between one engineer or the other because it is City information, they did it for a City development on the City right-of-way. So I don't see an issue with that. But Hector, myself and Soo will discuss that here. And I understand where Marty's coming from because we do it all the time for drainage reports. Thank you.

Weir: Okay. Thank you Tony. Is there anything else you wanted to add Marty?

Pillar: No, that's what I wanted to discuss about. Thank you.

Weir: Okay. Does anybody else in the meeting, want to contribute to the conversation or have any questions on the topic?
Dubbin: I just have a general observation, church.

Weir: Sure.

Dubbin: Future DRC meetings it'd be great if you guys are going to have an action item on like the little presentation received at the beginning of this meeting that could be attached to the agenda so we have time to review it and talk educated about what's going on because it was kind of blindsiding, I didn't really have a chance to review it.

Weir: No, that's a very reasonable request. We'll work and get that stuff out to you sooner. If the discussion is over, is there anything else that the DRC would like to describe as a as a body?

V. ADJOURNMENT (10:43)

Weir: If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Dubbin: I'll move to adjourn.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

Nasir: Second.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: Anybody that wants to continue discussing? Okay. I'll consider the DRC today adjourned at 10:43. Thank you, everybody for attending and contributing. I think we had some really good discussions and we've got a lot of things that we all need to work on as a team together. So thank you very much. And we will be doing this again I'm sure. Thanks a lot. Everybody stay safe.

Chairperson