TO: Bernalillo County Zoning, Building & Planning Department

FR: Andrew Gingerich, GIS/Data Analyst

Date: February 8, 2016

RE: MPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan

The following include initial comments by Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MRMPO) staff after reviewing the updated Santolina Level A Transportation Plan (Jan 22, 2016), the Santolina Level B Transportation Plan (Jan 25, 2016), and the Santolina Level B Master Plan (Jan 2016). The comments are organized by general comments followed by specific comments for each document. Any reference to the Santolina Level A Master Plan refers to the final version (June 16, 2015). References to the 2040 MTP refer to the Futures 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Given limited time to review three large documents, it is possible that additional comments will be delivered by MRMPO staff in verbal or written form at the March 2 hearing.

GENERAL COMMENTS

MRMPO concerns are largely related to the size of the Level B Plan Area. At 4,243 acres, it is nearly one third of Santolina’s total 13,851 acres. The Planned Communities Criteria (PCC) indicates that Level B Plans are to be submitted for Village Master Plans, Community Center, Employment Center, or Urban Center Plans, and that these plans are typically 650 to 1200 acres in size (PCC, page 38). Having an appropriately sized Level B Plan is important because, in the case of Santolina, the Level B plans are equated with phasing (Level A Plan, page 35). If the Santolina Level B Plan is approved at the currently proposed size, MRMPO strongly recommends a more detailed phasing strategy to ensure predictable and contiguous development, as well as to evaluate important benchmarks (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘B’ MASTER PLAN, pages 80-84). A detailed phasing strategy for the Level B Master Plan would alleviate the majority of MRMPO concerns.

Closely related to phasing, MRMPO is concerned about different stages of development of roadways within Santolina during the course of its development. Specifically MRMPO has concerns regarding funding of roadway widening projects, and how multi-modal elements will be accommodated at each
stage of roadway development. (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘A’ MASTER PLAN UPDATED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN, page 17).

MRMPO is concerned about certain design elements of Santolina in the Level B Master Plan. MRMPO is very encouraged to see the high level of non-residential land uses proposed in the Level B Master Plan. As was demonstrated by the Level A Transportation plan, the development of these non-residential uses will be critical to performance of the surrounding regional roadway network. MRMPO is also encouraged to see a variety of housing densities proposed in the Level B plan and the close proximity of housing to services. This will help shorten automobile trips as well as make alternative transportation options, such as walking, biking, and future transit, more viable. However, MRMPO is concerned that the proposed zoning will be inadequate to ensure the development of certain aspects of the built environment envisioned in the Level A Plan (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘B’ MASTER PLAN, page 12, and pages 16-31). MRMPO appreciates that the Long Range Transportation System (LRTS) Guide is referred to for roadway designs. However MRMPO has some specific roadways design concerns (see comments for SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘B’ MASTER PLAN, pages 41-42).

Finally, MRMPO has concerns about the way in which the 2040 MTP Trend Scenario is referenced in the Level B documents in specific areas. MRCOG’s Socioeconomic Program Manager was consulted throughout the development of the alternative 2025 and 2040 socioeconomic datasets that were required for the analyses contained within the Level B Master Plan Transportation Master Plan. The methodology is consistent with those discussions. However, several references to the 2040 MTP Trend Scenario in the Level B documents need to be modified or clarified (See multiple comments).

SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘A’ MASTER PLAN UPDATED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (JAN 22, 2016)

Page 1: Atrisco Vista widening from Dennis Chavez to north of I-40 is not proposed to be publicly funded in the 2040 MTP. Would this widening project fall under 719.0 and 719.1 in the 2040 MTP project listing under proposed privately funded projects? Paseo del Volcan (PdV) construction south of I-40 is also not proposed for public funding. Please specifically identify which projects in this paragraph are proposed for public funding and which are proposed for private funding per the 2040 MTP.

Page 17: Under Strategies for Street Construction and Dedication, the statement is made that “the initial 2-lanes of permanent roadways, intersections, and other elements to serve the development will be constructed by the developer, per the Planned Communities Criteria and the Development Agreement.” It then states that additional widening, based on “actual demand and short term projections,” could be conducted through local government capital funding mechanisms. The transportation analysis demonstrates the need for additional on-site roadways to be widened to 4 or 6 lanes in order to adequately serve the proposed levels of development seeking approval. This means the results of the study are dependent on the widening occurring. The potential for reprioritization of public monies for roadway infrastructure needed to serve any approved levels of development is a concern, given the emphasis on “no net expense” language throughout the submitted documents. MRMPO expects limited additional public funding options in the future, especially for capacity expansion projects (2040 MTP, page EX-1). The current program 2040 MTP, with the exception of the widening of Dennis Chavez east of Atrisco Vista, does not anticipate any public funding for roadways within Santolina before 2040, with the exception of the PdV I-40 interchange at the north boundary of the Santolina, which is expected to have
combined private and public funding. Relatedly, MRMPO is also concerned with how additional elements in the roadbed will be covered in each phase of roadway construction, such as bike lanes, paths, sidewalks, and landscaping, which are depicted in the street sections on page 16. Will these elements be implemented only at the final phase of roadway construction? If so, this would greatly diminish bicycle and pedestrian systems during the interim period, which in the case of a project this size, could span decades.

Page 19: The first sentence on this page incorrectly cites the University of New Mexico’s Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER). It should cite the UNM’s Geospatial and Population Studies (UNM-GPS).

Page 19: The last statement references $5 billion of publicly financed roadway capacity projects. This is incorrect. The 2040 MTP identifies almost $6.3 billion for all types of transportation projects by 2040, including roadway capacity, rehabilitation, as well as multimodal projects. Of this $6.3 billion, publically financed roadway capacity projects account for only $1,036,980,106 and privately funded roadway projects account for only $1,555,881,922 for a combined total of $2,592,862,028 in roadway capacity projects by 2040.

Page 21: The first sentence of the Socioeconomic Forecast section should read ‘Population projections for each county in New Mexico were developed independently by UNM’s Geospatial and Population Studies department, and refined by MRCOG for the metropolitan area....’

Technical Appendix T-1, Page 16: The fifth paragraph incorrectly cites (BBER), the UNM Bureau of Business and Economic Research. It should read ‘and UNM’s Geospatial and Population Studies department, who independently produces county level population projections’

SANTOLINA LEVEL ‘B’ MASTER PLAN TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (JAN 25, 2016)

Technical Appendix, page 5: The 2nd paragraph in Section E. states “The original Level A Transportation Master Plan used the MRCOG 2035 MTP socioeconomic forecast, which was found to have overestimated population and employment in 2035. These overestimated forecasts were discovered after the completion of the original Level A Santolina Transportation Master Plan analyses.” MRCOG informed the Santolina project team during the initial planning meetings for the Level A plan that a new, lower, projection would be forthcoming. In addition, we request removal of the term overestimation, which is an oversimplification. MRMPO requests language similar to the following - “The original Level A Transportation Master Plan used the MRCOG 2035 MTP socioeconomic forecast. Since that time, the MRCOG board has approved a 2040 MTP socioeconomic forecast. The 2040 forecast is lower than the 2035 forecast due to the availability of new information regarding growth trends in the region. The 2040 forecast was not finalized for use at the completion of the original Level A Santolina Transportation Master Plan analyses.”

Technical Appendix, page 9: A table displaying the number of modelled/proposed lane-miles by functional classification should be included to compliment Figure 3, which depicts number of directional lanes at Full Buildout.
Technical Appendix, page 15: A map should be included showing the number of directional lanes for the Level B network (similar to Figure 3 for the Full Buildout network). This map should also be accompanied by a table displaying the number of modelled/proposed lane-miles by functional classification.

Technical Appendix, page 22: The MTB establishes the regional transportation project programming priorities for the AMPA, using estimates of anticipated travel demand based on approved socioeconomic data and reasonably anticipated funding levels. The current set of regional priorities identified in the 2040 MTP anticipates the funding of Paseo del Volcan (PdV) north of I-40 including the interchange at I-40 as being comprised of a combination of public and private funding sources. PdV north of the interchange is not anticipated before 2040, with the exception of potential right-of-way acquisition. The section of Paseo del Volcan south of I-40 is anticipated to be funded entirely with private sources.

Technical Appendix, page 39: The “off-site roadway effects” can be considered with inbound and outbound cordon—analyses and summary tables. See comment above in the Level A update comments.

Technical Appendix, page 45: Discussion of the interface between transit and bike/ped should include “last mile” language and the need for an effective transit system to have robust bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure connectivity to stations in order to effectively penetrate the origins/destinations of neighborhoods and employment areas.

SANTOLINA LEVEL 'B' MASTER PLAN (JAN 2016)

Page 2, Section 1.2.1: This section incorrectly cites the Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) as the source for the projections. It should cite the University of New Mexico’s Geospatial and Population Studies (UNM-GPS).

Page 3, Section 1.2.1: The statistics in this sentence have been corrected and a projection year added - “The projections suggest that by 2040, approximately 40% of the Albuquerque metropolitan area housing units will be located on the area west of the Rio Grande River (West Side). Yet, employment distribution for the West Side is projected to represent 27% of the jobs within the AMPA.”

Page 3, Section 1.2.1: The last statement in the first paragraph “The projections highlight the longstanding need for new employment centers on the West Side” is an opinion stated in the context of MRCOG’s projections. MRCOG supports the idea that we need successful employment centers on the West Side (whether they are new or not). Please modify this statement or remove it from the context of MRCOG’s projections. Similarly, the first sentence of the second paragraph “Due to land constraints, limited areas of the region can accommodate the forecasted population growth” is an assumption framed in the context of MRCOG’s projections. MRCOG’s forecast does indeed accommodate the vast majority of the forecasted growth without Santolina, as described in Santolina’s Transportation Master Plan. Please remove this sentence or clarify that this is the viewpoint of the project team and not a finding associated with the MRCOG forecast.

Page 4, Section 1.2.1: This is the only mention of the Jobs-housing ratio in the Level B Plan, and does not provide any additional information other than what is found in the Level A Development Agreement. Condition #2 of the Findings and Conditions passed with the Level A Plan states that “A plan for attaining
the ratio shall be provided in subsequent Level B Plans, such that the anticipated job development shall occur in relation to residential development."

Pages 8-14, Section 1.5.1 and all of Chapter 2: MRMPO is very encouraged to see the high level of non-residential land uses proposed in the Level B Master Plan. As is demonstrated by the Level A Transportation Plan, the development of these non-residential uses will be critical to performance of the surrounding regional roadway network as Santolina develops. MRMPO is also encouraged to see a variety of housing densities proposed in the Level B plan and the close proximity of housing to needed services. This will help shorten automobile trips as well as make alternative transportation options, such as walking, biking, and future transit, more viable. MRMPO is also very encouraged to see that each proposed elementary school is located along an open space trail, separate from automobile traffic. This will provide safe opportunities for students to walk and bike to school, helping to address public health issues articulated in the 2040 MTP (Section 3.8).

Page 11, Section 2.2.2: The boundaries of the Residential Village Centers, which have zoning implications described in Chapter 3, are not clearly defined in the Level B Plan.

Page 12, Section 2.2.3: MRMPO has concerns about the proposal for a Primary Education Campus and a Secondary Education Campus in the Urban Center District. The character of the Urban Center will be critical to the success of the multi-modal transportation system. In the Level A Plan, the Urban Center is described on page 44 as "a dynamic, high-density core where office, commercial, civic, educational, multi-family residential, retail and entertainment uses come together and serves as a destination for residents to live, work, shop and play. It is defined by a tight network of streets, wide sidewalks, tree-lined streets, unique architectural elements, street furnishings, pedestrian scale elements and urban green space." While educational land uses are among those listed above, the character described is that of an integrated urban environment. MRMPO is not concerned with the proposed educational land use itself, but rather how well it will be integrated into the urban center environment described in the Level A Plan. Underlying these concerns is that recent secondary and primary education developments have not been designed in a way that would fit with the described character of the Urban Center District. Rather, these developments have been built in a suburban style, with closed access, and are not well-integrated with the surrounding environment (see Attachment 1). MRMPO believes that, in order to fit into the vision of the Urban Center described in Level A, the proposed educational uses must be developed in and urban style with a pedestrian campus, and must be fitted to the Urban Center District as described (see Attachments 2 and 3). MRMPO is also concerned about the size of the proposed education campuses, which totals 177.9 acres (91.3 primary education campus, 86.6 secondary education campus). For reference, that is slightly larger than the portion UNM main campus bounded by Central Ave, Campus Blvd/Las Lomas Rd, University Blvd, and Girard Blvd (172.04 acres, see Attachment 4).

Pages 16-31, all of Chapter 3: The Level A Master Plan states on page 29 that the activity centers in Santolina are intended to "serve as vibrant, transit-oriented urban places that encourage walking to destinations throughout each center." This vision is complemented in several other places in the Level A Plan that show the intention to use innovative land use planning strategies in Santolina including form-based zoning (pages 42, 53), transit oriented development or TOD (pages 43, 44, 53) and mixed-use development (pages 31, 43, 44, 52). These strategies are important tools that are becoming more widely used across the nation to create built environments that support multi-modal transportation systems.
However, the zoning proposed in the Level B Plan is largely based on traditional single-use Euclidian zoning with some variation by district, and there is no mention of TOD or form-based zoning. Certain zoning categories in the proposed Level B Plan do allow for mixed-use, but only as a conditional use. MRMPO recommends, per their mention in the Level A Plan, that TOD and form-based zoning strategies be articulated in the Level B Plan. MRMPO also recommends an incorporation of a true mixed-use zone, and that mixed-use be considered a permissive use where it is currently designated a conditional use in the Level B Plan. These concerns apply in particular to the Urban Center and Village Center Districts. For reference, the Mesa del Sol Level B Plan submitted diagrams and tables to articulate building form dimensions (see Attachment 5). Also for reference, the draft (October 2015) zoning districts proposed for the city of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) provide a good example of how mixed-use zoning strategies can be implemented (see Attachment 6).

Page 34, Section 4.1: Paragraph 3 in the Overview presents a comparison between the Level A Transportation analysis using the 2035 Forecast and the Level B Transportation analysis using the 2040 Forecast (volumes go down on Central, 118th…). MRCOG asserts that any comparison between the 2035 and 2040 forecasts is invalid due to the differences in the control totals. Please keep all comparisons between the 2040 MTP forecast and the 2040 Santolina Scenario.

Page 34, Section 4.1: The statement regarding a 2040 reduction in river crossings (0.1% and 0.5%) is well within the limits of model variability (“noise”) and should not be presented as a benefit.

Page 36, Section 4.2.1: The Auto Transit Circulation, Full Buildout network takes advantage of major opportunities to connect to surrounding areas. The Level A Master Plan (page 74) states that a gridded roadway network would be identified at Level B and C Plans. MRMPO appreciates that the area of Santolina north of Dennis Chavez has achieved this, which includes the entire first Level B Plan Area. The internal grid fulfills the Long Range Transportation System (LRTS) Guide’s connectivity recommendations with the approximate quarter mile spacing of the collector and arterial network together. MRMPO asks that this gridded network continue to areas south of Dennis Chavez in future Level B Plans, and that Minor Arterial connections be made south of Santolina (see Attachment 7.A).

Page 37, Section 4.2.1: The phrase “once development occurs north of the interstate” is inappropriate. There is currently no approved master plan in the area north of I-40 near Shelly Road and an interchange there is not listed in the 2040 MTP. The federal long range transportation planning process conducted by MRMPO will determine which transportation improvement projects are prioritized in the future.

Page 39, Section 4.3: This section is presented as though the Level B traffic volumes are based on the 2040 MTP. Please add a clarifying statement to the opening paragraph that states that the Level B transportation analysis required modifications to the 2040 MTP forecast to create a “Santolina Scenario” because the 2040 MTP forecast does not reflect the level of anticipated development. This is an important detail that belongs in the Level B Master Plan.

Page 40, Section 4.3.2: This page should reference or include language related to the ultimate cross section anticipated in the Full Build/Level A Plan.

Page 40, Section 4.3.2: Conduit associated with new intersections must be built with input from agency staff and be consistent with regional Intelligent Transportation Systems plans.
Page 41, Section 4.4.1: The sentence “roadways within the Level B Plan Area consist of typical roadway functional classifications” is incorrect. FHWA classifies roads as interstates, other freeways & expressways, principal arterials, minor arterials, major collectors, minor collectors, and local roads. This section needs to be rewritten using language according to federal criteria (for more information see https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classifications/section03.cfm). Specifically, what is depicted and shown as “local” in the Level B plan more closely resembles “minor collectors” according to federal criteria.

Page 41, Section 4.4.1: 186 feet is an exceedingly large right-of-way. A roadway this wide is challenging for pedestrians to cross, and would difficult to integrate with activity centers. Please see comments below related to activity centers, BRT, and median size.

Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: Please relate the roadway cross-section design to the surrounding context by providing cross sections for roadways within activity centers. Wider sidewalks in the urban, town and village centers are highly encouraged. For example, please consider a multi-way boulevard where principal arterials boarder the urban center or the town center (see Attachment 7.B). This would allow free flow of regional traffic while also allowing access to the higher intensity adjacent land uses.

Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: Please explain the purpose of a 30’ wide median on the principal and minor arterials. Is this to accommodate left-hand and right-hand turn lanes at intersections? Or is this for the BRT routes to accommodate station platforms? Or is this this space intended for future expansion? This is a remarkably large median.

Pages 41-42, Section 4.4.1: The cross sections on the arterials and collectors show trail widths of 6’-10’. The AASHTO minimum trail width is 10’, typically trail widths range from 10’ to 14’. The recommended clear sidewalk width in urban areas is 10’. The bicycle lane width shown in the 4-lane minor arterial cross section and the 4-lane collector cross sections meets LRTS recommendations. For minor arterials and collectors, please consider having the outside lane be wider (12’) instead of the inside lane. This helps if transit is provided along the roadway as it will most likely run in the outside lane. Wider outside lanes also help with the level of comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians and improve multi-modal level of service scores.

Page 42, Section 4.4.1: It is difficult to understand the elements that will make up a 77’ or 99’ right-of-way for a 2-lane collector. The combined minimum bicycle lane and parallel parking width needs to be 13’. This also is an opportunity for back angle parking in urban areas.

Pages 45-47, Section 4.5.1: The two transit routes entering into Santolina have been identified—Central Ave and Dennis Chaves Blvd. Please also take into consideration Gibson Blvd which could provide a connection to the Bridge/Westgate Route 54. Given the low density on Dennis Chavez Blvd the Bridge/Westgate Route is probably more important than the Dennis Chavez Blvd route. The likelihood of BRT within Santolina is minimal, and would be a significantly lower priority than providing high-capacity and high-frequency service in more dense parts of the region with proven ridership. More important than identifying routes is developing a roadway network that does not preclude transit. The current proposed grid network with approximate quarter mile spacing of the arterial & collector network goes a long way to assist transit.
Pages 45-47, Section 4.5.1: The current transit centers are adjacent to minor arterials within the Town Center and Urban Center. Please continue to plan for minor arterial and collector roadways to be integrated within centers and concentrations of employment and retail so that these roads can be used by transit. At some point in a transit round-trip, transit users need to cross the road to get to a bus stop. If transit routes are aligned on minor roadways, then transit users do not have to cross regional principal arterials, which improves pedestrian safety and the regional network traffic flow.

Page 47, Section 4.6.2: The open space network has the opportunity to provide an off-street trail network that makes highly meaningful connections (to the urban center, village centers, office parks and schools) as well as integrating and connecting with residential development to make for a high quality of life. Depending how the open space trail network interfaces with residences and with roadway crossings, this trail system could provide a locally unique non-motorized network, particularly since it penetrates the urban center from three different directions. MRMPO encourages further planning and development of the open space network to make meaningful connections and foster public space, where people will want to live, travel and recreate. The on-street bikeway network in Exhibit 12 goes above and beyond the Long Range Bikeway System. If the gridded street network continues for the southern portion of Santolina in future Level B submittals, MRMPO expects the on-street bikeway network to be included.

Page 77, Section 7.6: Remove two references to the MRCOG 2040 projected population on this page. The connotation is that the need for new schools within the Santolina Master Plan area is determined by our projections, and that is not the case.

Pages 80-84, Section 8.2: MRMPO is generally concerned that the Level B Plan does not provide enough detail in the development phasing chapter. This makes it difficult to assess the overall concept of the Level B Plan. The PCC states that the Level B development agreement should contain a more detailed phasing plan than what was in the Level A (PCC, page 40). The proposed Level B Plan shows only two phases, a 2025 phase and a 2040 phase. It is critical to have appropriately sized phases because Level B Plans include an analysis of important performance benchmarks including the jobs/housing balance (Level A Plan, page 35) and “no net expense” policy (Level A Development Agreement, page 9). If the proposed Level B Master Plan is approved with its current boundaries, MRMPO requests a more detailed phasing strategy where such performance benchmarks can be evaluated (for reference, the Mesa del Sol Level B Plan included four phases for development, see Attachment 8).
ATTACHMENT 1—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

Below are examples of recent secondary and primary education developments on the west side. The character of these developments would not fit within the Urban Center as described in the Level A Master Plan (see Attachment 2).

CNM Westside campus

Atrisco Heritage High School
ATTACHMENT 2—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

Below is a depiction of the Urban Center from the Santolina Level A Master Plan. In the Level A Plan, the Urban Center is described on page 44 as "a dynamic, high-density core where office, commercial, civic, educational, multi-family residential, retail and entertainment uses come together and serves as a destination for residents to live, work, shop and play. It is defined by a tight network of streets, wide sidewalks, tree-lined streets, unique architectural elements, street furnishings, pedestrian scale elements and urban green space."

*Potential vision for Mixed Use Urban Center in "Main Street" style*
ATTACHMENT 3—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

MRMPO believes that, in order to fit into the vision of the Urban Center described in Level A, the proposed educational uses must be developed in an urban style with a pedestrian campus. This would be a departure from recent educational developments on the county’s west side. For reference, below are some local examples of schools that have been well-integrated into urban environments.

*Amy Biehl High School*

![Amy Biehl High School](image)

*Old Albuquerque High School (now residential)*

![Old Albuquerque High School](image)
ATTACHMENT 4—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

The image below outlines the portion of the UNM main campus bounded by Central Ave, Campus Blvd/Las Lomas Rd, University Blvd, and Girard Blvd, totaling 174.02 acres. That is slightly less than what is proposed for a combined primary and secondary education campus in the Santolina Level B Plan, which totals 177.9 acres (91.3 for the primary education campus, and 86.6 for the secondary education campus).
ATTACHMENT 5—for MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

MRMPO recommends, per their mention in the Level A Plan, that TOD and form-based zoning strategies be articulated in the Level B Plan. For reference, the Mesa del Sol Level B Plan submitted diagrams and tables to articulate building form dimensions. Excerpts from the Mesa del Sol Level B Plan Land Use Chapter are below (the full document can be seen at http://documents.cabq.gov/planning/adopted-longrange-plans/MesaDelSol-Plan-0912.pdf).
2.4.4 Housing Design Standards

The following are design standards for residential buildings at Mesa del Sol. In some cases, include the walls and piers, will be different for tall buildings, in order to allow for the unique character of residences within the Southwest and the Alcoves area.  Block specific standards for housing will be developed and applied by the Architectural Review Committee to be established by the developer.

- **Setback:**
  1. On the corner lot:
    - Minimum setback shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.
  2. On the rest of the property:
    - Minimum setback shall be determined by the Architectural Review Committee.
    - Minimum setback shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Height:**
  1. Maximum height shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Setback:**
  1. Minimum setback shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Parking:**
  1. Minimum parking spaces required for each building type are determined by the Architectural Review Committee.

- **Fences:**
  1. Minimum fence height shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Utilities:**
  1. Minimum utility clearance shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Setback:**
  1. Minimum setback shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Parking:**
  1. Minimum parking spaces required for each building type are determined by the Architectural Review Committee.

- **Fences:**
  1. Minimum fence height shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Utilities:**
  1. Minimum utility clearance shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Setback:**
  1. Minimum setback shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Parking:**
  1. Minimum parking spaces required for each building type are determined by the Architectural Review Committee.

- **Fences:**
  1. Minimum fence height shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.

- **Utilities:**
  1. Minimum utility clearance shall be determined depending on building type and distance from the street.
Rebate Bath

Buildings vary greatly in height and shape with varied setbacks and roof slopes. The setback regulations are intended to maintain a consistent look to the neighborhood's skyline.

1. Setback Regulations
   - Front set-backs are required to be consistent with the proposed design and must not exceed the maximum setback for each building.
   - Building heights must be consistent with the existing neighborhood context.
   - Roof slopes must be consistent with the proposed design to maintain a consistent look to the neighborhood's skyline.

2. Accessory Units
   - Accessory units may be attached to a main unit or standalone, allowed on a proposed accessory unit.
   - Space for an accessory unit may be provided on adjacent or adjacent property.
   - Accessory units must be attached to a main unit to ensure continuity and consistency.
   - Accessory units may be serviced by a separate utility entry to the accessory unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td>Value 6</td>
<td>Value 7</td>
<td>Value 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 9</td>
<td>Value 10</td>
<td>Value 11</td>
<td>Value 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 13</td>
<td>Value 14</td>
<td>Value 15</td>
<td>Value 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17</td>
<td>Value 18</td>
<td>Value 19</td>
<td>Value 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 21</td>
<td>Value 22</td>
<td>Value 23</td>
<td>Value 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 25</td>
<td>Value 26</td>
<td>Value 27</td>
<td>Value 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 29</td>
<td>Value 30</td>
<td>Value 31</td>
<td>Value 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 33</td>
<td>Value 34</td>
<td>Value 35</td>
<td>Value 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 37</td>
<td>Value 38</td>
<td>Value 39</td>
<td>Value 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 41</td>
<td>Value 42</td>
<td>Value 43</td>
<td>Value 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 45</td>
<td>Value 46</td>
<td>Value 47</td>
<td>Value 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 49</td>
<td>Value 50</td>
<td>Value 51</td>
<td>Value 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 53</td>
<td>Value 54</td>
<td>Value 55</td>
<td>Value 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 57</td>
<td>Value 58</td>
<td>Value 59</td>
<td>Value 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Note:**
- Column 1: Description of Column 1
- Column 2: Description of Column 2
- Column 3: Description of Column 3
- Column 4: Description of Column 4
ATTACHMENT 6—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

MRMPO also recommends an incorporation of a true mixed-use zone in the Level B Plan, and that mixed-use be considered a permissive use where it is currently proposed as a conditional use. For reference, the draft (October 2015) zoning districts proposed for the city of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) provide a good example of how mixed-use zoning strategies can be implemented. Table of contents and excerpts are below. The full draft can be viewed at http://abc-zone.com/sites/albuquerque.engagingplans.org/files/document/pdf/ABQ%20IDO%20Module%201%20-%20PUBLIC%20DRAFT_0.pdf.

---
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Chapter 14-16-2: Zoning Districts

2-3.1 Mixed Use Transition Zone (MX-T)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the MX-T district is to provide a buffer between residential neighborhoods and more intense commercial areas. Primary land uses include a range of attached and low-density multi-family residential, and small-scale office, institutional, and non-auto-oriented commercial uses, generally in one- or two-story buildings. Other uses are shown in Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table).

B. Dimensional and Other Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-3.15: MX-T District Dimensional Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth, minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width, minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious lot coverage, maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks, Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to alley or easement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height, principal dwelling unit, maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, accessory buildings, maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-3.16: Other Applicable Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses and Use-specific Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional Standards Tables and Exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping and Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Content from current Sec. 14-16-2-15 O-1 and Sec 14-16-2-13 RC districts.
*These tables will be filled in as later Modules are completed.
C. District Standards
2-3.5 MIXED USE FORM-BASED ZONE (MX-FB)\textsuperscript{44}

A. Purpose

The purpose of the MX-FB district is to permit a wide range of residential, commercial, uses institutional uses subject to form-based zoning controls to ensure that the buildings they occupy establish or reinforce a well-defined character. Subareas within this district will contain form-based controls tailored to the distinct character of each area where the district is applied. Permitted uses are shown in Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table).

B. Other Standards\textsuperscript{45}

Form-based controls include a mix form, dimensional, and architectural standards. Some of those topics are addressed for standard (non-form) districts in Module 2, so the form-based standards will also be developed and inserted in this section or in Chapter 14-16-4 as part of Module 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-3.24: Other Applicable Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses and Use-Specific Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-based Zoning Standards and Exceptions to Dimensional Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping and Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In form-based districts, some of the general controls in these sections may not apply (specialized form-based controls may apply instead). If so, some lines may be deleted from this table when Module 2 is drafted.

\textsuperscript{44} Content incorporates language from Sec. 14-16-2-2(B)37 and Sec. 14-16-3-22 SU-1 district.

\textsuperscript{45} This chart to be filled in during work on Module 2.
C. District Standards

42 The existing SU-1 Form-based zoning regulations are not carried over. They are overly complex, use a building form typology approach that is poorly suited to Albuquerque, and have not been used. The regulatory (not advisory) content of the Downtown 2025 form-based controls will be inserted in this section in Module 2, and other form-based controls from other SU-2 zones may also be included.
Chapter 14-16-2: Zoning Districts

1. Special Provisions for Specific Areas
   a. Downtown Core
      i. Mapped Area
         These form-based controls apply in the mapped area shown
      ii. Regulations
         [Downtown 2025 regulations (not advisory materials) to be inserted here in Module 2.]

   b. Other Area 1
      [Placeholder]

   c. Other Area 2
      [Placeholder]
ATTACHMENT 7—For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

7.A—MRMPO appreciates the proposed gridded network in Santolina north of Dennis Chavez Blvd. MRMPO asks that this gridded network continue to areas south of Dennis Chavez in future Level B Plans, and that Minor Arterial connections be made south of Santolina.

7.B—MRMPO recommends that multi way boulevards be considered for principal arterials entering activity centers. This would allow free flow of regional traffic while also allowing access to the higher intensity adjacent land uses.

Multiway Boulevard Example from Institute of Transportation Engineers, Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares (Page 77).
ATTACHMENT 8 — For MRMPO Staff Comments for the Santolina Level B Plan, updated Level A Transportation Master Plan, and Level B Transportation Master Plan (February 8, 2016)

MRMPO is generally concerned that the Level B Plan does not provide enough detail in the development phasing chapter. The proposed Level B Plan shows only 2 phases, a 2025 phase and a 2040 phase. MRMPO request a more detailed phasing strategy where such performance benchmarks can be evaluated. For reference, the Mesa del Sol Level B Plan included 4 phases for development, shown below.
February 5, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: Enrico Gradi, Community Development Manager

Cc: Kizito Wijenje AICP, Executive Director, APS Capital Master Plan
    Karen Alarid, Executive Director of Capital, Facilities Design and Construction
    Ruben Hendrickson, Chief Operations Officer
    Martin Eckert, Director APS Real Estate & Property
    Elvira Lopez AICP, Senior Planner/Manager, APS Capital Master Plan

From: April Winters, Planner, APS Capital Master Plan

Re: Santolina Level B Master Planned Community to be heard before the County Planning Commission on, March 2, 2016

SPR2016-0001

Santolina is a Level A Master Planned Community that is approximately 13,851 acres, and is bounded by Interstate 40 to the north, 118th Street and the escarpment open space to the east, the Pajarito Mesa on the south and the escarpment area adjacent to the Rio Puerco Valley on the west. The master planned area (Level A) will consist of 34,000 residential units built out over the next 40-50 years.

After approval of the Level A Master Planned Community in June 2015, the developer is currently requesting approval for Phase 1 Level B Master Planned Community. This phase will include 9,444 dwelling units and will encompass 4,243 acres. Santolina development (Level A Master Plan) will impact G.I Sanchez ES, Painted Sky ES, Jimmy Carter MS, Atrisco Heritage Academy HS and West Mesa HS. Currently, Painted Sky ES, Jimmy Carter MS and Atrisco Heritage HS enrollments exceed capacity; these schools are overcrowded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loc No</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>2015-16 40th Day</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Space Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>GI Sanchez K-8*</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Painted Sky ES</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Jimmy Carter MS</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>ATRISCO HERITAGE ACADEMY</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>West Mesa HS</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excess capacity at GI Sanchez is planned to relieve overcrowding at Truman and Harrison middle schools by 17/18 School Year, the year by which it will fully house a K-8
Albuquerque Public Schools recently built and opened George I. Sanchez K-8 school in 2015-16 to address growth and overcrowding of schools in the southwest quadrant of the District.

In addition, with the recent passage of the Bond/Mil Levy 2016 election, APS will continue plans to construct a new K-8 school to alleviate current overcrowding in the Northwest; and specifically, to relieve overcrowding at Painted Sky ES, Jimmy Carter MS, and SR Marmon ES.

To address overcrowding at schools noted in the table above, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

(i) Provide new capacity (long term solution)
   a. Construct new schools or additions
   b. Add portables
   c. Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
   d. Lease facilities
   e. Use other public facilities

(ii) Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)
    a. Schedule Changes
       i. Double sessions
       ii. Multi-track year-round
    b. Other
       i. Float teachers (flex schedule)

(iii) Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)
     a. Boundary Adjustments / Busing
     b. Grade reconfiguration

(iv) Combination of above strategies

All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.

(i) APS finds that the residential development of 34,000 housing units proposed by the Santolina Master Plan Level A would generate 15,846 K-12 students at build out. These students would need taxpayer approved school facilities at a cost of $587 million (does not account for cost of land) in today's dollars for construction of 13 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, and 2 high schools.

(ii) APS would need approximately 366 acres to develop the 18 schools needed to serve the Santolina Level A Master
Development Plan at full build out.

The following is an addendum to Albuquerque Public Schools comments for SPR2016-0001, a request for approval of Phase 1 Level B Santolina Master Planned Community.

(i) This Phase 1 Level B plan covers 28% of the entire Level A Santolina Master Planned community in terms of dwelling units.

(ii) APS will be contacting WAHL and seeking to find a consensual and collaborative process that will facilitate the smooth provision of school sites and to possibly obtain assistance from WAHL with the building of schools in the subject area.

(iii) According to APS standards, to meet the school needs of the proposed 9,444 housing units in Phase 1 Level B Santolina Master Plan, the District would need to provide four (4) elementary schools, one (1) middle school and one half (.5) of a high school. Alternatively, if the District chooses to deliver a K-8 instructional model, this would call for two (2) K-8 schools and one half (.5) of a High School. APS will provide educational program models that are cost effective and in alignment with the District Curriculum models of instruction.

The Table below demonstrates school needs based on the proposed Santolina Level A Master Plan 34,000 dwelling units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Capacity (students)</th>
<th>Projected enrollment (students)</th>
<th>Number of Schools Needed</th>
<th>Acres Needed per School Level</th>
<th>Total Acres Needed</th>
<th>Construction Cost per school</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost by School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>195.8</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$261,309,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$119,470,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$206,049,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>365.6</td>
<td>$190,000,000</td>
<td>$586,629,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table below demonstrates school needs based on the proposed Santolina Phase I Level B Master Plan 9,444 dwelling units:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Capacity (students)</th>
<th>Projected enrollment (students)</th>
<th>Number of Schools Needed</th>
<th>Acres Needed per School Level</th>
<th>Total Acres Needed</th>
<th>Construction Cost per school</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost by School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$72,526,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$33,184,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$57,233,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>$190,000,000</td>
<td>$162,944,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Larger tables below:**

**Level A Master Plan assuming 34,000 Housing Units and APS Development Standards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Capacity (students)</th>
<th>Projected enrollment (students)</th>
<th>Number of Schools Needed</th>
<th>Acres Needed per School Level</th>
<th>Total Acres Needed</th>
<th>Construction Cost per school</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost by School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>195.8</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$261,109,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$119,470,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$206,049,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>365.6</td>
<td>$190,000,000</td>
<td>$586,629,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level B Master Plan assuming 9,444 Housing Units and APS Development Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Capacity (students)</th>
<th>Projected enrollment (students)</th>
<th>Number of Schools Needed</th>
<th>Acres Needed per School Level</th>
<th>Total Acres Needed</th>
<th>Construction Cost per school</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost by School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$72,526,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$33,184,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$57,233,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>$190,000,000</td>
<td>$162,944,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Enrico Gradi, Bernalillo County Planning & Development Director
From: Debbie Bauman, Engineering Division, DMD

The Engineering Division of the Department of Municipal Development has reviewed the subject applications and submits the following comments:

**Permit # ZSPR 2016-0001 Santolina Planned Community Level B Master Plan**

**Transportation Section:**
For a half-mile west of 118th St. the future Gibson Blvd. will be a City-owned and maintained Community Principal Arterial that is planned to contain bicycle lanes and a paved multi-use trail, per the Long Range Roadway System Map and the Long Range Bikeway Systems Map. From Dennis Chavez Blvd. to Gibson Blvd. 118th St. is also a City-owned facility.

Secondly, Gibson Blvd. through the eastern escarpment (much like Dennis Chavez Blvd.) will likely have to be constructed at design grades that are flatter than existing topography, which may require the dedication of more right-of-way than a community principal arterial’s typical 156 feet. Dennis Chavez’s right-of-way through the eastern escarpment varies from 400 feet to 600 feet wide, due to it being cut into existing topography that is significantly steeper than minimum allowable design slopes.

Identification of impacts to City-owned and maintained transportation facilities should be coordinated in detail between the County Public Works Division, the NMDOT, and the City’s DMD/Planning Department during post-master plan reviews in order to effectively define Santolina’s offsetting traffic mitigation measures.
February 8, 2016

Mr. Enrico Gradi  
Bernalillo County Zoning, Building & Planning  
111 Union Square Street SE, Suite 100  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Subject: Comments for Hearing Date March 2, 2016  
Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, District Three

Dear Mr. Gradi:

Attached are the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) District 3 comments on the cases that were submitted by your department for our input.

Project Number: ZCSU2016-0005  
Case Description: Requesting a special use permit for a second dwelling on an A-2 property zone.  
Location Portion: 8 La Cresta Cir, Tijeras, NM 87059  
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Residential  
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): n/a  
Department Comments: NMDOT has no comments.

Project Number: ZCSU2016-0006  
Case Description: Requesting mobile home as second permanent dwelling  
Location Portion: 2650 Del Sur Drive SW  
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Residential  
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): NM 500  
Department Comments: NMDOT has no comments.

Project Number: ZCSU2016-0007  
Case Description: Special use permit to extend an existing storage facility  
Location Portion: 3234 Isleta SW, Albuquerque, NM 87105  
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Commercial  
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): n/a  
Department Comments: NMDOT has no comments.

Project Number: ZCZU2016-0004  
Case Description: Request for zone change from A-1 to SD-IMU  
Location Portion: 5632/5640 Isleta Blvd. SW  
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Commercial  
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): n/a  
Department Comments: NMDOT has no comments.

Project Number: ZSPR2016-0001  
Case Description: Santolina Level 'B' Master Plan
Location Portion: Southwest Mesa, generally bound by I-40 to the north, 118th Street and the escarpment open space to the east, NM 500 (Dennis Chavez Blvd) to the south, and the escarpment are adjacent to and just west of Shelly Drive on the west.

Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Planned Community

Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): n/a

Department Comments:

- The NMDOT has programmed funding in the STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program) to begin acquiring right-of-way for the proposed NM 347 (Paseo del Volcan) corridor. The final alignment has not been identified and the spacing between interchanges shall be determined by NMDOT and FHWA.

- The NMDOT has not identified any funding for the construction of the proposed roadway extensions or proposed interchanges or underpasses shown in the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). If any of these improvements do become funded, there is no guarantee that the design and/or construction would coincide with the time frame of the plan phasing. The developer shall commit cost sharing or matching a portion of the construction costs associated with any future roadway extensions and infrastructure outside, but in the vicinity of, the Santolina area. If Santolina’s phased development occurs prior to funding becoming available for the proposed MTP improvements, then those improvements must be installed at the cost of the developer.

- Based on the transportation analysis prepared in the Level ‘B’ report, increased congestion is projected as early as 2025 at several existing interchanges including but not limited to, Atrisco Vista Boulevard, 98th Street and Unser Boulevard. The developer shall identify mitigation alternatives for each of the impacted locations at each development phase for review by the NMDOT and FHWA prior to finalization of these measures.

- Revise, Note 5, from The Notice of Decision dated December 12, 2014 as follows: Written approval from the NMDOT will be obtained prior to the improvement or expansion of state roads identified in the Level ‘A’ and Level ‘B’ submittal. NMDOT and FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) review and approval will be required for any Level ‘C’ plan defining any required modifications and improvements to Interstate 40 and to other state facilities as a result of the development of Santolina and its roadway network. The approvals shall itemize financial obligations with participation and commitments spelled out. The coordination of the timeframes for the offsite roadway improvements and the Plan phasing will also need to be identified.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me at 505.798-6605 or Margaret.Haynes@state.nm.us

Sincerely,

Margaret Haynes, P.E.
Assistant Traffic Engineer, D3

CC:
Nancy Perea, P.E., Traffic Engineer, D3 (email)
Israel Suazo, NMDOT, Permit Agent (email)
Christi Tanner, Bernalillo County (email)