SPECIAL
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee
Meeting held Wednesday, May 11, 2020 at 11:00 a.m.

DRC PRESENT:  David Weir, Chief Planning Administrator
                Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Planner Senior
                David Sedillo, Public Works
                Tony Trevino, Flood Administrator
                Hector Terrazas, Traffic
                Soo Gyu Lee, Traffic
                Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect
                Rocio Nasir, Utilities
                Geremy Barela, Engineering
                Tim Pitts, Building
                Sara Gonzales, Community Development

I.  CALL TO ORDER (11:02)

The meeting was called to order by David Weir.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 8, 2020

The minutes were motioned by Rocio Nasir, seconded by Cathy Mathews, and
approved unanimously.

III. OLD BUSINESS - None

IV.  NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion to determine the triggers for requiring right-hand turn lanes,
   alternate methods of traffic control, and the right-of-way required for turn
   lanes, if warranted, specific to Sonoma Ranch Blvd.

   Weir: Right hand turn lanes, alternate methods of traffic control and the right-of-
   way required for turn lanes if warranted, specific to Sonoma Ranch
   Boulevard. I believe that there’s potential to also talk about the requirement
   for the ISD clear sights being added to the plats. Sara, did you or Katherine
   want to kind of give background on this?

   H-Rogers: Sara, since it's been your project will you go ahead and lead that please.

   Gonzales: Sure. Based on the property what we've received is several e-mail
   concerns with, as we keep getting more developments through Sonoma
   Ranch as part of the development and through the VAD there is an existing
120 foot right-of-way that is designated there as part of the development. As John or Metro Verde has been submitting developments they are being asked and requested to add in decel lanes, and then the request is also to add in additional right-of-way in order to accommodate those decel lanes. The question that stuff has been proposed is since the right-of-way is already 120 feet do we need the extension of the additional 12 feet for the decel lane? Can it be used within the existing right-of-way that exists? How do we want to move forward with any of the proposed developments along Sonoma Ranch so that way we have it documented and kind of on file? So how do we want to deal with the decel lanes? Do we want decel lanes? What are the proposals for the future development of that area?

Weir: Thank you Sara. So just clarification, so are you wanting a decision by the DRC today, a motion on how to move forward or is this just for discussion purposes?

Gonzales: It can be for the discussion purposes or if there is a deciding factor because I'm not sure that we wouldn't have to have the public inputs in order for us to decide on it before we made a decision. Since DRC does allow the public to provide input. Here is the discussion for us to determine how we want to move forward with these and then I think if we can come up with a formal decision I would like it to be voted on at some point so we have a decision that can be documented. And if the applicant ever wants to appeal it they have the opportunity to.

Weir: Okay. Katherine did you want to add anything to what Sara introduced?

H-Rogers: No I think that's one of the primary discussion items today. It's something that keeps coming up. And I know there are some differing opinions about how to deal with it depending upon who the section or the department is. And we just wanted clarification so that we're unified front moving forward, so the applicants that we deal with in matters of these have a really clear idea of what they need to be doing and why. I think the biggest question for them is "okay why do I need to do this?"

There are a couple of other items that have come up recently. And we may want to have some discussion on those. It wasn't specifically listed so we couldn't vote on those but it is something that we may want to discuss specifically how we deal with a clear sight triangle issues we've been experiencing at intersections in numerous subdivisions. Right now there's been a request essentially like a no-build area on properties at those intersections, but that's a discussion item I think that maybe we can have after we're done talking about the decel lanes.

Weir: Okay. I see that Hector and Soo Gyu are in the meeting also. Did you want to provide your perspective on what's taking place with accel and decel lanes and right turn lanes?
Terrazas: Sure. For the decel lanes, when they went ahead and did the addition of the 323 acres the official Amendment which I think was Amendment 6, sir is that correct, when they added all that (inaudible) along Sonoma.

Gonzales: It would be Amendment No. 5. Yes.

Terrazas: Amendment No. 5. So when they did do that I did have them look at the roundabouts at Sonoma and Engler and Peachtree and Sonoma. And then with that when we were going through that I did have them add a note to look at decel lanes warrants if when development comes in. So with that it's a quick sentence in there that I've sent to Sara, and Sara sent it to both Chad and John about why we're requiring them to do it. Now if we're requiring them to do it, to do an analysis does it mean it necessarily has to have a decel lane, it just says that we need to have the justification to either have it or not. And if the justification to not built it it's not there then we're not going to be asking them for something because that's something that's not necessary. If it is there, if the need is there like on Metro Park Village III where Chad and John agreed and they sent us those letters that we agree it's needed, we're going to go ahead and do a variance or we're going to be building it with Sonoma Ranch mile one. And we all agreed that that was fine. Either way they agreed that the decel lane one was going to be put in.

The other issue that goes with that is do we want them to use 120 foot right-of-way that's dedicated to the City which in their cross sections, that whole cross section of 120 feet is taking up by a wide Parkway 10 foot Parkway and I think a 10 foot sidewalk on both sides. Is that right Sara?

Gonzales: Yes, that would be correct. They have parkways on both sides which are both the five foot sidewalks and then a 10 foot parkway for them to travel along on both sides of the roadway.

Terrazas: Right. So the question was and we kind of met on Metro Central Phase 1, just Community Development and Traffic about, they did say it warrants on the different development it does warrant it, will build with Sonoma Ranch Mile 1. And that's where we discussed, do we want them to have it within the right-of-way? Because if we do have it in the right-of-way, that cross section where we have what we wanted at the time with the PUD and what we want now with the Elevate is wide parkways to accommodate landscaping and a wide walking path. So if we, at that time we told John and Chad go ahead and use it for this, use the City right-of-way. But at that point also like it narrows down our usable space that we want to use for walking or whatever it is.

Now I know it's coming an issue about same thing on Metro Central Phase 2 about them having the warrant. My personal take is on if their development, whatever development it is, if it does need it they should accommodate it within their right-of-way because the City shouldn't have to
be accommodating something for them just for the sake of development. Because if the City really wants to have these wide parkways we can have them do both the decel lane and the wide parkway, the wide sidewalks. But it would take using the decel lane or doing a right-of-way dedication from developer to the City in order to maintain those wide sidewalk and wide street side amenities that we want.

Now I know in other cities that's what they do even if they have a 20 foot parkway and it's a mall that they're putting in or something that warranted a decel lane they will just have them shift the whole road over and it's going to affect the development, the area that they can develop, but if that's how we want to proceed with this that would be my recommendation.

Now as far as having them do a decel lane, warrant analysis I don't know if they've been kind of, Chad hasn't complained anymore since we told him that it's in the TIA. I don't know if he's been complaining to you Sara about actually doing the warrants. I know we met with them about what they've been submitting which is wrong anyway. It's not right. So we don't really know at this point if they're warranted or not. They just gave us those letters that said it's warranted so we took them for their word. So I don't know what to do if they're not getting us the right technical analysis either way.

Gonzales: Well and I think some of the concern we're running into is the comments are being provided by Traffic, we're then getting e-mails from Chad and them of saying how do we want these addressed? Is it going to be future, are they going to be the same for all cases? We have already made one decision where we said they could use the existing right-of-way, now we're saying they need to add the additional right-of-way and I think we just need to find a way to be consistent so we're doing it the entire strip. It shouldn't be outside or inside. We need to know which part of the right-of-way they should be providing those decel lanes, if they are warranted so that way our future development, we already know what's in place and they will as well that they won't have the reason to keep contacting us and trying to say this isn't what we agreed on. That's why we're looking for that decision.

Terrazas: Right. And another issue that, and I think it brought up to you and Debra on Sonoma Ranch Mile 1 they're actually using the wide parkway not for a decel lane because of course they said they're going to put it in but they don't show it. So I made a comment to Chad, but they're using City right-of-way to build in riprap associated with their development. Now I know my management and engineering group that we meet with, we've had issues about okay what fits in City right-of-way and we have to maintain it but it's actually for the benefit of the resident of the house. So that's something else that we got to see as far as liability. Do we want those retaining walls or riprap whatever it is because of the adjacent development inside of the right-of-way? Again my preference would be that if it's because of the
development, they could have fixed it in design or engineering and not need a retaining wall or maybe do something else. My personal opinion is that we should have them all contained within the private development. That way the City is not in the long haul having to deal with these issues when it needs maintenance and who's going to maintain it and what's going to have to take place.

Weir: I see that Tim has his hand up and wanted to comment.

Pitts: Yes I just wanted to comment on the idea of this, you know we do the warrant study and let's suppose that the turn lane whether it's a decel lane or a turn bay or whatever it is, is warranted, but I don't know that the warrant itself tells you whether we want it or not. That just tells you that if you want to keep the level of service at the level it's at then you would need that. So the question is whether we want the level of service to be at that level. And I think in Metro Verde we've said that the level of service is not going to be what we measure this thing on. So I guess that's the question I have is does the warrant study tell us anything? Do we want, right I mean I think we certainly want left turn lanes because that's a different issue if they're warranted but do we want right turn lanes. I mean do we want to keep the speeds up to 35 miles an hour when we're wanting people to be walking along that street? You know when you when you're going on Lohman next to Pier One and Ross Dress for Less and someone, yes people are turning right and you're forced to slow down, but people are slowed down in the other lane too because there's traffic backing up from the intersection ahead, and to me it just slows down everybody and it's not a problem because you just have to be more aware. So I guess that's what I'm asking. Maybe Hector or Soo can comment on, just because there's a warrant does that mean we need to build those things.

Terrazas: So for that, yes you're right the P&Z says that level of service is not going to be a determining factor. But this is not just a level of service for the sake of keeping speeds up but it's a level of service for safety for vehicles to eliminate those rear ends when you have people turning right. Like everyone knows when you're driving, the example you said, you have a lot of near misses because people are turning into Pier One or into Ross and you have a lot of people hitting the brakes. Now yes hopefully people are aware that that's an issue and it's a busy intersection. And of course there's always traffic on Lohman so it doesn't really let you get up to speed. But that's what we're trying to evade or avoid. And then another thing that it does state is if you look at the PUD of the original towards I think it's a pedestrian section, it does say that it's going to have major turn lanes at major intersections. Now I know that level of service is not an issue but I think this is a way to maintain it safe for both pedestrians and cars because at the same time if we do have those issues we don't want people having to be looking out for pedestrians walking and then having to look for that car.
behind them trying to turn or even if you’re turning and you know that there’s
people coming up behind you like at Ross, that way they can actually yield
to pedestrians and not have to feel forced to make a quick decision on okay
do I yield for this pedestrian that’s getting to the intersection or do I just go
ahead and try and beat them, cut across in front of them because there’s a
car coming behind me. So that’s what we’re looking at as far as the safety
issue.

Lee: Right. Okay. I believe Hector he well explained why we need a decel lane
but basically because our City code required to analyze whether we need a
decel lane or not because of the safety is the number one deal. Yes also
safeties related to the level of service, but as again to have to explain the
main reason we have to analyze this is the decel lane requirements
because of the safety for the vehicle and the safety for the pedestrian, also
the traffic on the lane, they’re not going to impede by the any cars waiting
for the pedestrian or any cars not able to get it into the parking lot or
whatever. But again it is all the level, not the level of service, it is a safety.
And then another, the main point is the access management, because the
access management is technically we go by the ITE how we analyze what
the safety at the access points because access point there’s a lot of you
know conflict points so you really try to minimize the access points. So one
of the best way we can minimize the conflict point at the access point is to
have the decel lane or the accel lane.

Weir: Thank you Soo. Was there anybody else that wanted to comment in
regards to this?

H-Rogers: Mr. Chair. I just have a question. It’s just my curiosity, why we haven’t
treated that section of Sonoma Ranch south of 70 in the same regard.
There really aren’t any turn lanes. I think the only turn lanes that I know of
are the neighborhood Walmart, I think the Safety Center, but other than that
there aren’t any turn lanes along that whole segment. And I was just
curious what’s the change in engineering or why we’re requiring it? And the
other question I have is even if there are some warrants for it, do we really
want to maintain all that additional right-of-way and those turn lanes? Just
some questions.

Lee: Let me, Hector this time I’m going to explain to you. Katherine there are
two main factors how to make the determination whether we need a decel
lane and or we don’t need a decel name. The one is a background traffic.
How many background traffic is there? And then second is how many trip
generated by the development? So it depends on the both and then there’s
a chart in the New Mexico, the State Access Management manual. But if
there’s enough trip generation then automatically the trigger, either accel or
the decel lane. And in terms of the right-of-way, our position is unless
there’s any technical, the invisibility, we would like them. We would like the
developer give us more space for the future as Hector explained. We want to leave the City right-of-way for any future use for the City. For example, so one of the main purpose we're going to use it is that let's say maybe 10 years later after we build the decel lane then we end up dealing with some modification of our existing fiber optic or any cell tower if we don't have any space. The only way the either City or the private development, they want to use our City right-of-way and then they have to use or pursue the easement dealing with the private owner which is not a good idea. And then also that's the one good example there is a much more the future use for the City.

Sedillo: Katherine. To answer another part of your question that Soo touched on, and you asked what's the difference between the development south and what we're seeing here. The development south also has two lanes of travel in each direction whereas the section that we have here only has one lane of travel. So that is one difference between those two sections. Soo did answer you know technically how those are impacted and why those come into play, but that's a major difference if you will in between those sections of roadway. Now there's also other things you did ask as far as you know do you want to take on this additional portion of the right-of-way. Obviously my first decision for that is no we don't want to take on more, but if it does come to a point where we weigh all the factors and we do have to maintain that portion of it, well then we look at that as the entire picture comes across, but you know there's certain things that we have to look at from a complete point of view and then make the decisions for the betterment of the community. So that's what we're looking at now. So hopefully that answers your questions a little bit as to why there's differences. And then would we want to take that additional right-of-way under our wings. As everybody knows everyone stretched thin with maintenance as we go through, and you know unfortunately sometimes we do have to take on those additional things. But that is a good point to make.

Terrazas: And Katherine just to let you know on Sonoma Ranch and just like David and Soo said, it depends on the background traffic. So of course on the older development that's already there the background traffic it's not going to be there. Now recently we had that coffee shop on the east side of Sonoma, I don't know if you guys know which one that's developing now or is it proposed? No sorry. There's a dental office that's going along Sonoma that in the future on the south side of the development they're proposing a coffee shop. So we did request them to do a TIA, a little mini TIA and in that we included them to make sure that there's a decel lane warrant analysis. And they said yes it meets it, not right now with the dentist office because of course you don't have that many turning traffic into there. And of course the background traffic you got to account for both. But once that coffee shop goes in there and that TIA report says it, it's going to generate a lot more turning traffic that's going to require the decel lane to be installed.
So we approve it with that condition because at this time they weren't going
to put in the coffee shop. So the need isn't there now but it is in the future.
So what we had them do was in the plat say they're going to have to have
a shared access point. And I think in that portion I don't think they needed
to give right-of-way because it was going to be, it's already in City right-of-
way. So they don't need to have anything, so it's going to be that kind of
case-by-case for the existing stuff. Now in the future stuff where we're kind
of planning it's all pretty much one developer planning it out, we were trying
to figure out into the future and saying you know what you're going to
develop this whole area, you have this whole area planned out, with your
trips, with the amount of traffic you're expecting at full build up these lanes
are warranted or they're not. So that's why we're trying to figure it out. But
we have been asking for decel lane warrants on Sonora Ranch the
commercial, those three lots just south of Northrise. We did ask them to do
a decel lane. It did show us that it met but they did go ahead and ask for a
variance. And I think David Maestas or City or who was ever was acting at
that time. Public Works director they did approve it. So it's not that we're
not asking for them but it's now that we have enough traffic along Sonoma
to have them warranted. So you're going to have that discrepancy and
that's something that developers always tell us, well there's nothing before,
I'm like well it's an old part of town that we never thought, like Soo said, into
the future, are we going to need it in the future when we have another
Lohman going up Sonoma when we have all these amenities along Sonoma
and the City grows. So that's why we're starting to see those decel lanes
being met because people are, there's just more development in the
northeast side and of course as development continues it's just going to
become a bigger issue and maybe even smaller developments at that time
will be needing to have them. Because if we have enough background
traffic, even five cars turning during the peak hour will trigger that need for
a decel lane.

Lee:

Yes, so let me clarify when we actually request for the decel lane when I
studied is that any development, even a small development if a
development is along any major arterial or collector or any corridor we know
we have some issue or the level of service D or below that we use to require
to have a decel lane warrant study. If some, you know even if the medium
size the development it's way off where it's located and far from any of the
congested area, we just now request to have the decel lane, the warrant
study. So it depends on the location. So if there is any known problem or
some issue with size of the development, if there's a medium or larger size
and then most likely we're going to request for the decel lane warrant study.
Now we're not required to have our decel lane warrant study.

Terrazas:

And along those lines usually we'll ask if we're kind of unsure on the type of
development, let's say it's kind of a road that's kind of iffy, like okay well it
depends if they put out regular, just a single home it's probably not going to
warrant it but if they put something more commercial like, not necessarily a drive thru but more like you're going to have kind of a lot of turnover in there, we asked them for a trip generation to kind of figure out and tell us okay how many peak hour trips we're going to be looking at and then we'll kind of make our judgment, do we want to ask them for the additional decel lane warrant analysis. We don't want to be just telling everyone go ahead and study to see if you need a decel lane warranted when we know that it's not going to be warranted. But in those cases just like Soo mentioned where most likely an arterial collector and they're putting something that's commercial related, more than likely we're going to be asking them for at the minimum a trip generation just to figure out if a decel lane warrant analysis, us requesting them to provide us that is enough. Do we have enough trips in there in the first place? Of course if they tell us "We're only going to have three trips in an hour." And that's it and we'd concur with that, then that's it, we wouldn't pursue a decel lane or an accel at that point.

H-Rogers: So just a couple of other comments. If in the future we're going to move towards requiring that people prove that it's warranted or not, do we need to increase the size of the required dedicated right-of-way? I personally think that the time of platting and when people give us that right-of-way essentially their obligation to provide more should go, they shouldn't have any more obligation to do so. So that's something we need to consider in the future is expanding that 120 feet which I think is plenty. But if that's kind of the determination of this Board then that's something that we need to look at.

And then the other question is at least for Metro Verde should we be treating the entrances to individual subdivisions that are just residential and single-family low density the same as either multifamily or commercial. I could see potentially the need for a turn lane for a busy commercial center but still struggle sometimes to understand. I mean I understand their warrants, I understand the engineering you can keep explaining, but would we treat them differently? Should we treat them differently, the single-family residential versus that commercial or multifamily. Just questions to ask.

Terrazas: So Katherine. We treat them differently if we had, if we know, that's why we ask them to give us the trip on these. Usually for residential if you have around 60 or 70 or 80 lots that's, and depending on the background traffic, that gives us 100 trips that our traffic standards call out now to ask them for a full blown TIA. Of course we're not going to be asking them for a full blown TIA for just looking for decel lane unless there's something else that we know is an issue just like Soo mentioned, that we have a failing intersection or we have a lot of congestion there.

Now as far as these, you're right, in the commercial development if it does go in do we treat them differently, yes we will. Right now I don't think they're requesting any access for commercial development directly off of Sonoma, and I don't think the plan is to have that because from what I've
seen from all their submittals, all their single-family home that's abutting Sonoma, for all those lots, all those properties, they're kind of focused on just single-family home at this time. Now for the future one I don't know if they're going to be adding any more access along Sonoma as far as just a right in or right out. I know we're kind of treating these as kind of, I know they're residential streets but they're (inaudible) off in arterial street so they're just going to be following all that traffic into there. I did have a resident talk to me about a month and a half ago, he lives over there at the end of Sierra that dilemma that's been there for a while just south of Peachtree, that school, and he was asking us to look into putting some traffic calming now that there's that park on the north side of Sierra because he sees people going far above the speed limit. And he even said that he used to do it because there was no development there. So we're trying to look at these kind of issues in the forefront now because for one it's easier if we have one development and Sara's right, we should, and you're right too, we should be telling developers since you're own this give them one direction and that way they don't have to go to you or to traffic or to someone else and get different answers. But we are trying to accommodate all the issues that we have now along Sonoma to not be an issue later in the future. So that's all I have.

Weir: Hector. If I can kind of summarize. So what I've heard today is that traffic will be at, their stance is that any development that will impact Sonoma Ranch Boulevard you're going to ask for that warrant study?

Terrazas: No, no. It just depends on what it is. So let's say they want a street off of, I don't know another street that's not one of the three major streets, because I'm not contemplating having any other streets between Peachtree and Engler, correct any other street access or single development? Is that correct Sara?

Gonzales: Sorry I had me on mute. Yes that's correct.

Terrazas: Okay. So yes, so it goes back to having all this development. Now we've just been asking them to look at the immediate development. So like Metro Park and that's essential, that development itself to see if it meets it. What we should be asking for is all that other development, all that commercial development that's planned behind it, we should ask them to include it. But we haven't at this point just because we don't know what kind of commercial it is, because the type of commercial is going to make a difference about what kind of trips or what they have.

So going back to what Katherine said about the plats, yes that's an issue when we say okay this is platted for commercial or this is platted, it's commercial zoning, but the dentist's office it's going to make a difference between a dentist's office and a Sam's Club or whatever it is. So that does become an issue where we don't have right-of-way and that's what goes
back to Soo saying, you know what in feasibility we can't put a turn bay there, they need to look at doing something else; so they need to install a traffic signal or some other way to get the traffic to not create an issue there. Maybe they need to have their main access point off of somewhere else. But we do you have that issue when it is required, a decel lane and they just go ahead and say well we don't have any room to do it or the plat's already been platted.

Weir: Hector getting back to a process standpoint. Basically whether it's a final site plan for a PUD or a final plat or construction drawing or commercial building permit, you would like to have the ability to ask for that warrant study with whatever type of application is being reviewed by the City. Is that what I hear?

Terrazas: Yes. I mean usually for the plats we'll ask them kind of like on, kind of example is like on Lohman where they have those just a shell buildings. Basically it's commercial but we don't know what kind of commercial and so we're kind of stuck, okay well if it's a drive thru it's going to make a difference versus just a dentist's office, it's going to make a difference. So we're kind of stuck with that. Now if we plat it and they say we want to do a Burger King or McDonald's or whatever it is, then that kind of land locks us into that. Now I don't know if we can just go ahead and this is where I disagree with Katherine that if they do change their use that requires additional right-of-way, I think we should kind of ask them to dedicate it.

Now another option that we could say is like okay you're creating the issue you don't have to dedicate it to us, you're just going to have to maintain it. Now that's always something we can do if we can get an agreement with them and they're going to have to maintain it, they're going to have to do all that. Now that's a lot of bookkeeping that we will have to take care of, so I don't know if that's a way that that's the direction the City wants to take on when it is the responsibility of the developer and we agree that it's needed and they don't want to have to dedicate it to the right-of-way to the City. And that's a way eliminate, meaning that we know we're always going to need and be short of as far as funding.

Lee: Yes David, let me just clarify. A lot of times we didn't know, well we didn't get enough information from the develop about what the proposal end use. Specifically in any retail purpose, you know there's so many different variations, so depending on the what they are looking for or what they're trying to develop, and a lot of times we couldn't get the answer. At the time, the only way we can do that during the plat phase so we just make a note, you know the developer they should give us enough information during the construction drawing or the development phase. So depends on how much information we receive or available during the plat we're able to make a determination when we need it.
Weir: So going back to Katherine questions, that sometimes creates a problem correct Katherine, and I'm thinking of like the University Avenue where we're trying to encourage that as a pedestrian way and when the more pedestrian friendly like when the Burger King came in I know there were probably warrants that met for a decel lane to be installed on that process, but that was kind of in conflict of the overall concept of what we wanted to do for that roadway. And I think that's kind of the discussion that's being prompted for Sonoma Ranch is that even though it may be more suburban in development style right now it has always been promoted as being a walkable mixed use type of area. So how do we accommodate both? And then how do we provide enough, I can see the developer as he's coming in thinking that he knew what all he needed to do and then it's kind of changing. So which I guess prompts the discussion today; is there a smooth and systematic way for us to approach this? And I guess I'll leave it at that.

H-Rogers: Yes I think one of the things and I've talked about this with Hector previously is it if the intent is to reduce the speeds, make it more pedestrian friendly, are there alternate methods than just asking for turn lanes. I mean they may be warranted in some locations, but are there other things that we can do that result in a much better environment for both the car and the pedestrian? Personally, I'd like to see that and maybe it's something that we can't solve now because we are stuck with the tools that we have. But moving forward I would like to see some alternatives than just requiring things such as this. Just my personal opinion as a planner and as somebody who you know lives in this community.

Lee: Right. I believe you know Katherine you and I discussed about the Burger King, and then also the hotel development along the University. We're not just to asking to have the decel lane. If any development located within the special you know the zoning area like the University or the Downtown area, we're okay but technically we have to ask first what at that development trigger the decel lane or not. If it is a trigger then we have to advise to the developer what the other option they can achieve instead of only having a decel lane. We are open to that. We are flexible, specifically within any areas, the University, or the Downtown area. We're not rigid. And then another, the important defector about the decel lane is that it goes by the speed too. Speed is another decision factor. If high speed means it's going to be more chance we need the decel lane. If it is a low speeds it's going to be less chance to get the trigger that the decel lane. That's the reason most of the times in the Downtown area I'm not expecting to have the decel lane. But the University is slightly different because the University Avenue categorized as a collector and then also 35 mile per hour, that's a kind of the bottom line for the diesel lane the requirement, so unfortunately the University, any development along the University we have to go by each individual development and the location. Even me as the Traffic Engineer
I'm not happy about to put in the decel lane along the University because in
the long-term we're going to have a complete street and the more
pedestrian friendly. But unfortunately because of our code requirement we
have to work with the developer, follow the right process which is the waiver.
So they can submit the waiver as long as they propose or working with the
City to come up with some creative solution or some (inaudible) solution to
meet the intention of the piecemealing. So you're pretty flexible.

H-Rogers: So I understand that's got a lot of flexibility but here's another question for
the group, is if the City wants to see a certain type of environment and they
know what the solutions are, why don't we tell them what we want? Right
now, I mean I don't want to disparage a lot of the developers, but the
developers want to just do the easiest, cheapest thing that they can.
They're not particularly creative. Almost it behooves us as a City to really
tell them "Hey this is what we want to see because this is what we're trying
to achieve." I know that there's a little angst about that because you know
the City doesn't want to design something that ultimately fails. But it seems
like we could come up with some good solutions to really see what we want
and not follow the codes because there are codes and there are methods
by which we can get around that.

Lee: Another point is along the University almost every existing vacant lot there
is not enough room to actually build a proper length of the piece of land. So
we have to allow them to find the (inaudible) here or ultimate solution.
Except for something further west and as you know the vacant lot belong to
either I believe it all belong to NMSU. And then other than that I believe
there's no way we can have enough the lanes to build up the adequate
decel lane anyway. There's only the little development we're going to deal
with later along the University. And then any vacant lot in the Downtown
area or if anybody wanted to do redevelopment there's no way they can
meet the minimum length of the decel lane anyway. So we have to find a
different way to do it. Or we're going to require have a maximum length
within the available, you know the condition.

Terrazas: And to go with that Katherine I don't want to speak for Soo but Soo did work
with Chick-fil-A on trying to work with them being right on University and
trying to get them to improve their access. And we ended up restricting that
you can't take a left out of whatever that street is, that Chick-fil-A is on
University. So that's one of the ways we can kind of help them, and of
course their site layout is going to make a big difference if they're not right
adjacent to the arterial and their main access point is off of a smaller, less
used street. That's always one of the ways we look at.

Now going back to saying yes can we work with the developer? Yes
we can, like we did on Metro Verde and Red Hawk right. So we had
roundabouts to put in and get people to slow down. But now the developer
wants to go back and get rid of those roundabouts. So it goes back, it's the
same development, same area, same developer. Why, I don’t know why we should treat Red Hawk and Sonoma Ranch differently because we know they’re going to be, they both should have some kind of traffic calming. And in the PUD it was supposed to be roundabouts because you do want to make it pedestrian friendly. And the roundabouts work great for pedestrians and they work great for traffic. Because we don’t have a signal, you can’t knock a signal down. Roundabouts, the only issue we have in this area is because people aren’t used to them, but once we get used to them we don’t have those crashes that you see at a regular typical intersection because you don’t have any T-bones, you have low impact kind of sideswipes. But besides that we want to go ahead and make it as pedestrian friendly as we want. Now if we don’t want those turn bays we could have more roundabouts at Mesa, at Sirocco and those because we do, and that’s why I was asking Sara, if we only have those three, I mean they could always propose that we put some mini roundabouts in there that accommodates traffic and that would help both for traffic flow and having those.

Weir: Let’s hold that thought. Tim’s had his hand up for a while so I want to make sure he has an opportunity to comment.

Pitts: And I just wanted to kind of throw in on Soo’s comment about dealing with let’s say University and I think it fits here with what Hector’s saying about Sonoma Ranch, that I think we really need to be proactive on this and we need to start thinking about what it is, and sort of what Katherine was saying what it is we want in these situations? What is it that we’re looking for so that we can be, you know if the issue on University, because it is a serious problem, what Soo’s talking about on University’s a very serious problem. We handle a lot of traffic through that corridor. And where are they going to go if it becomes clogged up with people going you know five miles an hour what’s going to happen. We don’t have alternatives and so we have to think seriously about that that kind of network issue. You know yes we want to make it so that people can walk there and be comfortable, but if I don’t know if we’re going to have people flying through Wyoming and other streets in that area because they’re trying to avoid University because we’ve slowed it down. So I don’t know, I just think we have to be real proactive about what we’re doing there. What do we want? What are we going to have as an alternative? Which goes back to the problem that we don’t really have network level transportation planning on this to deal with it. And I think what Hector is talking about on Sonoma Ranch is absolutely right. We need to kind of decide what we’re doing and we need Sierra Norte to be a partner in that and yet they kind of are fighting us, they want the best of both worlds. They want what’s in the PUD when it’s good for them and then they want what we’ve said in the past when it’s good for them. And very rarely do I hear them saying, you know whether it’s a raised crosswalk or it’s a, you know there’s always a fight over it. And to me it’s either they’re a partner in this or they’re not, we’ll just have to tell them what to do. If they don’t want
to be a partner. So I think that's part of the whole thing here and I think this is probably a good time for us and I know Rocio and I, we're trying to work with Hector and Soo on let's get some very standardized things that we can know what's going to be expected so we can let people know when they come in for a pre-app or when they call us up, yes they call the planner of the day, we can give them a good idea of what there is going to be expected of them. So I don't, a little rambling sort of comment but a lot of people talked in between when I was going to talk and I had a lot more things to say.

Lee: David. Can I answer to the team?

Weir: Sure

Lee: Okay I believe the team made a really good point and the team I believe you and I discussed about this issue before too. But from the traffic perspective there is two different (inaudible), one is the pedestrian friendly area which is really there's a two area at this point; one is a Downtown area and then the other one is the University. And then the all other area is not pedestrian friendly which is the typical, the arterial and collector, so we have technically two different type of roadway and then depends on the location and then we pretty much have a good idea of what is the best option. So we would like to just to build the typical decel or the accel lane on the typical arterial and the collector. In the residential friendly area like Downtown or the University, we would like to find out some alternative solution because in any way there's no way we can build the proper decel lane anyway. That is kind of how we are doing so far. And then in terms of the standardization how are we going to deal with, unfortunately traffic is the unit and then also depends on the location. Every single location is different situation and the different traffic volume so it's very difficult to make a standardized. So that's the one I wanted to tell him.

Weir: Thank you Soo. Have a couple other comments or things I think need to be brought to the decision. Does the SAD and the extension of additional infrastructure in that area, does that impact this conversation at all? And if it does, does the same level of review and requirements take place as projects are going forward? And then I think we need to go back to process again but I'll let Tony comment.

Trevino: Thanks David. For Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, as we know it's only a one lane in each direction now. So the future expansion of that might possibly be an addition of another lane in each direction so that deceleration lane will have to get pushed off onto private property if there's not enough room. So as far as infrastructure that is there, utilities will be provided so that should be the only kind of future improvement in that area.
Weir: Okay. I'm kind of continuing to follow off of Tim's comments and then trying to incorporate what Soo Gyu said also, I think as staff that deals with the developers and stuff, they need to at least go through, have a systematic process to tell them if you know if traffic is saying that each situation is so different. But we need to have you know kind of an if/then process to go through. Okay here's what's going to be looked at first and this is what we're going to request, and based on the determination of that then you may go down this route or this route. I think we all have had our levels of interaction with the current developer in this process but from the Community Development Department I think we need to look at how we'll treat everyone equally in both these situations. And what's the communication that we need to have? Is there a step-by-step or general guidelines to go through? Because in my career with the City I've heard various you know third, four people say, "Well just tell them what you want." And then you know I've had coworkers in the development process say, "Well I can't tell them what I want till I know exactly what they're going to do." And then the developer community will say "Well just tell me what you want and then I'll do it." And then they very rarely tell exactly what they want even though I'm guessing this case it's single-family lots. But there at least needs to be a framework or something that we can all walk through so we all know what's taking place. And I get the sense that was kind of what we wanted to have on the conversation today.

Lee: David. Do you think if we create the traffic management create some flow chart to the step-by-step, do you think it's going to help?

Weir: I think that would be useful, then when we could all have it and we could kind of say this is how we approach these items as they take place. I'm not so sure that we're going to be able to act on anything today. What I was going to recommend after we all have a good conversation is maybe come up with somebody coming up with recommendations of how they would like to see things go forward and bring this back in a couple of weeks.

Trevino: Yes and David that's a great point because I know the traffic standards as well as a lot of other design standards, they need to be updated. So we're all on the same page when you guys get people coming in for development in your office. I know when Maestas was down here in Public Works he did allocate some money for our portion of the rewriting the design standards. I know kind of we're waiting on redevelopment when their portion was going to come available so we can get that moving. Do you know where that's at?

Weir: Yes, I'm the holdup on that. I've got a preliminary draft ready. I want to polish that and get that up to Public Works and Utilities to look at.
Pitts: Tony.

Trevino: But yes I think right now just a punch list now kind of what Soo was mentioning to kind of help you guys at this point. And that'll be also a good starting point for us with the consultant of how to write that and get that put together so we can actually have time to see how that's working out for us and if that's going to be revised for other future developments.

Sedillo: So with that we have been working with Jeremy since we're since Traffic is transitioning from doing traffic or plan reviews from us to Community Development. We have been working with Jeremy and we were working. We do have kind of a cheat sheet that we've been sharing with Geremy about when do we ask for stuff, it's not to this level of detail especially for decel lanes and TIA's but we have something in the works where we have something that's kind of a skeleton for not just this but other issues that become, that's as far as Traffic concerns when the development is built out. So we do have a really good skeleton of what we need to do, now we can just elaborate and expand on that. And I can share it with Tim and I think Tim has a copy but I know Geremy has a copy of it because that's what we're trying to kind of, when the transition goes complete through to Community Development and Traffic will just be reviewing the upper level of the TIA kind of impacts and anything else then that might have a bigger impact than just a regular subdivision coming in.

Weir: Well good. Thank you. Katherine was kind enough to tell me that this is just a discussion item today. So that's good.

Gonzales: And David if I could. And that's the main thing is I brought it forward because I think we need to discuss it. But I do think we should be scheduling this here in a couple weeks to have a decision. So that way if the applicant does or doesn't want to appeal it if we make a decision because ultimately it's due they have to provide additional right-of-way is our main goal. That's one of the things we need to identify because if we have the 120 feet and they're coming in with these developments, we have to have that determination because we're getting, yes but no but yes but no and it's becoming very difficult for us and then we end up having to call and contact Hector, work through them and then work through them. So at least with some of these pieces I would like some type of decision being made at some point so we have guidance to provide to them saying this is what we want to see. And I think that's the main thing. I don't think that they're pushing back that they need a warrant study or that they need to even provide the decel lane, it's where should it be located is the main concern.

Weir: Okay, so maybe this is a good point to ask everyone. Do you feel that all the issues that you've dealt with are out there for discussion purposes and that you'd like to get a perspective the different departments are taking on
this? I'll start with you Sara. Have you heard items or are there other things
that you feel need to be brought up?

Gonzales: And the other one that was mentioned by Katherine was also the ISD. So
we have received several e-mails because it has become something that's
newer. Our developers are questioning why they need to put it on the plat.
And for us we just need some type of clarification. Can it be on the plat?
Can it be a separate page that's filed with the plat? Developers are now
being asked to add additional information to the plat that they weren't prior.
So we just need to know how that is going to be addressed so we can
address that comment when it comes up to us. Because we've had it from
Souder Miller, Metro Verde, as well as Marty Pillars questioned it as well.
So we need some kind of answer to provide to them as to why it's now being
requested as part of the plat through traffic comment review.

Weir: Okay. Sara. I'd like to put that on hold. I like to give everybody a chance
to talk about the XLT cell before we move on.

Gonzales: Okay.

Weir: David Sedillo. I saw that you took your mute off. So was there something
you wanted to add?

Sedillo: For the purposes that I have right now, if those additional spaces are
needed for buildout, yes it would be nice to have the additional right-of-way
for expansion in the future. How we address that Katherine coming through
with developments on your question of how can we let them know upfront,
yes we can do the checklist, we can let them know that if it meets certain
criteria they can follow these items. And then to couple in with Tony's that
will change when we review our processes. But the other big thing is
developers have to let us know what they're going to be doing as well. You
know when they come through and they say, "Well I'm just going to have
this development" and then they change it multiple times, they're getting
frustrated because then it kicks them into different criteria. Well you know
having this checklist will let them know that if they change that it will affect
them. And I think that's one of the things that they're not taking into account
or they're trying to hold on to and say, "Well when we first started I didn't
have to do this." Well yes you were correct when you first started it wasn't
the same thing either. So although we can do some things to help the
development community move forward with their things, they need to take
some onus and ownership on their end and not come back as with a blank
stare on their face and say "Well I don't know. What do I have to do?" Well
I said you know what do your homework and then when you're ready come,
don't waste our time either. It goes both ways. So and I know we all
recognize that but I think sometimes when we do let them know that, they
get offended and run to the third floor right a way. So one of the things that
we need to show is look all the information's there for them to find and to address these things. Yes we can help them along the process if they have some questions but we're not basically hand feed them and do their work for them.

Weir: I agree with you David. I think on our end as we've automated in our review and stuff it may be easier for us to bring up those past comments and provide them to show, no, no we had this discussion and you are changing this.

Sedillo: Yes. And at this point right now since we have the 120 foot right-of-way that was basically done up front, for now for this development I think we just need to stay with that. That's my opinion. And then we move forward. Now future development that may change, but again at this point right now we don't know when we're going to expand that, whether traffic volumes will actually need to expand that to another lane. So in my opinion right now we should remain within the 120 based on the direction already given for this development only, as we move forward that may change. But that's my opinion on the right-of-way issue.

Terrazas: So to let you guys know we have been making comments now at the plat level especially for the Sonoma ones that they need to give us decel warrants. That happened at Metro Park Village 3. We let them know at plat. During construction we followed it up. And so we've been letting them know even from the beginning because we, just like Katherine mentioned, "Well they say well they already did enough, they dedicate enough on the plat. Why do they need to dedicate more?" And it goes back to what kind of land usage there it is. Now single-family is a lot easier because more likely they're not going to change it unless they change their complete internal structure of their streets. But for commercial just like Soo said that's where we come with the harder question about what kind of commercial is it, is it going to be a fast food restaurant, is going to be something more of a sit down restaurant. So that's where we kind of go back and just like David Sedillo you mentioned they need to work with us as much as we will be working with them. I mean we're not trying to make it harder for them, we're just trying to make it so in the future when they have a nice development we want to be partners in this and they have something that they can say you don't have any issues in front of their access point and of course that the City doesn't have any issues on their side having to mitigate them later.

Weir: Okay. Tony I saw that you were wanting to come.

Trevino: Yes I just, I was going to respond to David's comment about the 120 foot right-of-way thing within there. I have not seen a plat if they have residents right up against the actual right-of-way. And if there's an issue later if we're considering possible to get additional right-of-way. I think now with the
amount with the multiuse paths going through there, the amount of landscaping we have through there and the possibility of us adding an additional lane, right now would be the time if there's additional space there on private property to acquire that right-of-way. But I'm not up to speed with the plat and where that is to make that comment kind of and push that direction.

Weir: Cathy Mathews and Rocio, were there anything that you want to talk in regards to impacts to the landscaping or Utilities with turn lanes?

Mathews: Yes. So I wanted to, it's been noted several times that of course with a whole subdivision with all of Metro Verde we've made a lot of investments in connectivity for pedestrians, for bicycle riders, for trying to get pedestrian access to the parks and the other kinds of spaces we're providing. And I'm heartened to hear that folks are concerned about that pedestrian use of this right-of-way is also key to how the subdivision is going and how it's supposed to be going. That pedestrian access and pedestrian use of these rights-of-way is how we want this subdivision to go. With pedestrians come the landscape for the shade, for the protection, for the sense of well being. And so we got it, in my mind those two have to go together, the landscape, streetscapes with the pedestrian access and how Sonoma Ranch is working with the multiuse path. As we've noticed in the last few weeks they're getting very heavily used and I think people are going to continue to expect to be able to very safely and very consistently and in a very uninterrupted manner use those multiuse pathways and use that kind of access that the City, or connectivity that the City has invested in and will continue to invest in it throughout the subdivision.

I guess I don't have a really clear picture in my head about how expanding the right-of-way or putting decel and acceleration lanes into private property will impact those multiuse paths and the landscape, but I am concerned that if we expand the right-of-way for at a decel and acceleration lane we will interrupt that connectivity and that smooth uninterrupted flows of pedestrian use of the multiuse pathway. Sorry for sort of a random amount of thoughts there but it seems to me there's a lot of issues to go forward. We're talking about maybe of a process of how to decide if we do decel lanes or not. But I think what that we have to keep in mind a major point of the entire subdivision is this connectivity and the pedestrian and bicycle usage.

Weir: Okay. Rocio did you have anything?

Nasir: Yes I do. Let's just be aware because we might have already utilities on the part that will be part of the street now and we have to, if we already have utilities we have to be aware of what the new cover will be and how we're going to be taking care of that. So I'm sure that I'll be looking at the plats
and checking on that to make sure that our utilities have the correct cover if
we already have existing utilities where we're asking for extra right-of-way.

On the extra right-of-way I concur with Katherine, we already have a
right-of-way that is required for street. Why are we asking for more when if
I'm not mistaken the ATP required for less? But I said I did not read the
final draft. I went to a whole bunch of meetings. I don't know. I'm just
putting that out there. I think we're going backwards and we're asking for
stuff that we're not ready for because we don't have the right standards yet.
But that's just my opinion. I am no longer in Community Development, I'm
in utilities and I'm trying to focus on that.

Weir: So Rocio basically the sooner that you know where the right-of-way limits
are going to be it makes it much easier for Utilities so you can put the
infrastructure in once and not have to go back and retrofit it at a later date.

Nasir: That's correct. Or like for example like we're talking about in Sonoma, we
did what it's called like leap development where we took the utilities back in
so a lot of that utilities already there. And it was set for a certain height or
a certain depth and so I need to know where the right-of-way will end up so
we know what the final depth or the final type top ground will be so we have
the covers that the Utilities require.

Weir: Thank you. Geremy, did you want to add any observations or comments
into the discussion?

Barela: No I think that covers it all. But too I guess for Rocio's sake for the utilities
that would just all be done through review to make sure that you've got your
proper coverage and stuff like that for any utilities that may run through any
of those decels. But no, I don't have anything else to add.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Katherine did you have anything else you wanted to add
before we went on to the clear sights?

H-Rogers: Not on this in particular but moving forward I think Sara's going to schedule
a DRC in the next coming weeks to actually make this a vote in terms of will
additional right-of-way be required. And then too is there going to be a
different philosophy moving forward for this particular stretch of roadway or
are we going to do standard practice. I think there has to be a couple of
agenda items to vote upon and most likely have those as separate items
moving forward

Weir: As a DRC member and DRC Chair I'd recommend that we have something
that we can provide to the members prior to that meeting before we
schedule it kind of to work from. It's difficult for me to have these
conversations and want to make a recommendation or a vote without
something to see, like similar to when we look at an issue with a construction
plan or a final plat. We always have that before us to reference. So that
would be my recommendation before we schedule that meeting.

H-Rogers: I agree David. And I think that we need staff to provide a recommendation
based on policy that's currently adopted, not necessarily what our standards
are today. Because we want to do this correctly moving forward not
basically where we've been if that makes sense. And I think we have a list
of all those policies either for or against however it may fall out I think that
those need to be provided to staff.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Before we leave is there anybody else that wants to
make any comments on the Sonoma Ranch and the accel/ decel
discussion?

Lee: David I want to just clarify about the (inaudible) we better have the additional
right-of-way. I understand that Cathy and (inaudible) and Katherine's
comment but if we require the additional right-of-way then we're able to keep
the same connectivity and then we can use for the future use for the
(inaudible) mentioned. So I believe it's more benefit to the City required
additional right-of-way instead of using the existing right-of-way.

Weir: Okay I don't think anyone, this was my perception, I think we all agreed with
that but I think we all want to make the best information available what we
most likely think will happen so we can give that to the developer. And I
think then we can all feel that we've done our due diligence and provided
the most information for the system. But I think those are all good
comments. Anything else? Or if not I'll ask us if Sara can reintroduce the
clear sight item to discuss again. Sara.

CLEAR SIGHT.

Gonzales: Okey dokey. So from the ISD, and that's why I'm not familiar with the
process or how that works. Recently over the past couple weeks in our plan
review we've received some comments from Traffic requesting the ISD to
be added to the plats. Our developers are asking us why it needs to be on
the plat. What is the requirement? Where does it say it's coming from?
And so for us to get a better understanding to support that we're trying to
find out what it is? Why does it need to be on the plat? Can it be on a
separate sheet? Does it have to be on the cover sheet? What is the
purpose of this going to be on the plat for those who are basically developing
these lots in the future? Look to Hector or Soo.

Lee: Okay let me clarify first before they have to jump in. We all the time required
to have a clear sight triangle including the ISD depending on the
development. But as I believe Rocio and David both know that we, the
Traffic Management, we deal with a lot of issue after the Community
Development approved rockwall along the right-of-way. And then we have to dealing with later for the safety concern, doesn't meet the ISD which is one of the clear sight triangles. So there's not any difference between the what we used to do it, it is not the brand new. So I'm going to just let Hector to go into detail. I just want to make sure everybody understand that. ISD is a part of the clear sight triangle. And this is not you know the new issue it is an old issue.

Terrazas: Right. So like Soo said, we do have those issues that happen. It's a good example is Sedona and Sonoma ranch. They built a rockwall on the northwest corner and at the time there was no issues. Then we started getting requests that people can't see because of the curvature of the road. So then we went ahead and hired a consultant to look at it and they said, "You know what we don't have ISD." We have stopping sight distance which is enough for a car in Sonoma. And this is before there was a forward stop. But a car on Sonoma to stop if they see a car coming out from Sedona from the west leg, from that middle subdivision.

The other issue that we ended up having was that people don't feel safe. So at that point we wanted to use what ISD. So using that we've been asking people to put it on the plat because we know that whenever a resident comes in and asks for a development or a rockwall, the only requirement that they need to show is a plat not the actual construction drawings of the subdivision, so that's why we've been asking them to put the clear sight in there so when whoever's reading, Geremy, me, whoever's reading a tech, a rockwall permit they can clearly see you know what there's height restrictions here. It's not a no build zone. It's just a height restriction as long as it doesn't impede your sight lines. So that's what we're trying to make sure we have enough. Now why do we use ISD like Soo said, our traffic standards do call out that bigger triangles than the ones that we have in the City triangle is a 50/50 and 30/30 depending on what we want to see. So what we've been doing is if there's curvature along the road for residential we've been asking for it. If it's an arterial or a collector we've been asking for it as well. That way it's in the plat because we've been having this issue where you can't see even though it's straight, the speeds that are posted at people are going 35 or 40 whatever the speed limit is of course that's going to affect how safe people feel trying to get out and making a left or right turn.

Now as far as putting in the plat, I went through our code and I saw that for multiple divisions and all the construction it does say that part of the submittals should include clear sight triangle in there as far as like including curb and gutter, clear sight triangle, and whatever they are going to be putting. So that's why we're asking to put it on the plat.

Weir: Thank you. So basically from an approval process this was something that probably used to come up more with construction drawings and it's a matter of needing to inform people that when they're making improvements to their
lot that there's additional information or additional items they need to be aware of because there might even be a case where from the Zoning Code a four foot wall in the front yard is okay but it but it creates those safety hazards within the street network.

H-Rogers: David if I can. One of the concerns, I fully concur that it's an issue. We've had problems with this. I think the biggest questions is, where is the best place to I guess alert the consumer about it. One of the concerns that came up from one of our local engineers is that oftentimes the surveyor who was preparing those plats does not have the expertise to determine what that is because they're not an engineer. That was one of the concerns. I understand that.

And then one of the other concerns is, is not unlike basically changes that happened to zoning or other design standards. Long time ago as you know there may have been, there are some plats that we have that have setbacks on them that were based on old zones that like don't even exist anymore. And we as planners say, "We don't want to see that anymore because codes change." And one of the other concerns that came up was, "Hey codes change. What if this is different in the future but you have this restriction and it's been put on a plat." So those are just, I'm just being devil's advocate. I understand that. But I also understand the need to inform the consumer and the people who are building these things about it.

Lee: Katherine. Go ahead Hector.

Trevino: No it was, it's Tony. David. Catherine is exactly right. I remember a couple years ago when a lot of stuff was being requested for surveyors to put on their plats and the surveyors did come back and rebuttal for a lot of those requirements. That is more of an engineering aspect and I can see the surveyors not wanting to put that in the plat and stamp that. So I agree with Katherine in those regards.

Weir: Thank you.

Terrazas: Along with that ...

Sedillo: Go ahead Hector and I'll follow you if that's okay with you David.

Weir: No, that's fine.

Terrazas: So another issue that we do have that we kind of get stuck if we go ahead and put the ISD in there, and we do know that there's issues, the plat doesn't tell us if you're going to be going up or down as far as vertically. So of course if you're coming up on a hill you can see the traffic that's oncoming. So that's going to be an issue that we can take care of it in the construction zone. But as far as in the plat we would need to go back and amend it.
Weir: Okay. David.

Sedillo: This is to Katherine to your point and I agree with Tony. It shouldn't be the surveyors that do this but instead of it being on the plat is there any way that once the plat is recorded that that parcel is tagged somehow in either it's SELLA or whatever other data source that we have to note that this may require additional reviews based on building of fences, walls due to this item. And simply that's just going through the plat and tagging each of those corner properties throughout the development. I don't know how easy that is or what it may take as far as you know staff to do. But at some point staff is still going to be dealing with this item once they receive the permits to move forward with it. Like was mentioned the consumer all they have to turn in is a plat but if there's something noted elsewhere to address these issues then maybe that's the best way to move forward with them, to identify them, and say hey at least we allow not only staff to be aware of that but I don't know if somehow the consumer can educate themselves on those requirements as well too. And be cognizant of knowing that whether it be a contractor that buys the lot to build it or whether it be a private resident, homeowner that picks it up themselves and then hires a contractor that each of those know what restrictions are going to be imposed based on their location and geometry of the adjacent roadways.

Weir: Geremy or Tim do you have any comments on what you see during the construction drawing review?

Pitts: So I'm just going to go back to the plat part and I agree it shouldn't be on the plat. We can maybe add a note on the plat saying that these lots may be subject to clear sight triangle or intersection sight distance. But yes I guess we can start maybe catching it more in the construction drawing phase however, because that is when we do have a rockwall permit come in we typically look to see if it's a corner lot and see if that affects them or not. But I think if we catch it in the construction drawings it may or I don't know maybe we need to get it out to the developer before it even gets to the construction drawing so they can design their lots, especially these corner ones a little bit different so that way if they do have to have a clear sight these homeowners aren't losing some of their property. Because I mean to have to build a wall come in clear sight triangle like that, it really takes up a majority of their backyard and that's a problem that we're having as well. So I think it should be something caught like in the design phase as well because it's hard to, when you get someone come in for a rockwall permit and to tell them that they have a clear sight triangle or 35 x 40 in some of these cases and it takes up a majority of their backyard, and sometimes it doesn't even fit, that 40 by 30 doesn't even fit. They're still not meeting that.
Terrazas: Right and then going back to ...

Weir: Still there Hector?

Terrazas: Yes sorry. I lost you guys for a second. Yes and going back to what Geremy said and what Soo said, I don't know where those 30, 40 numbers came from. *(inaudible)* intersection *(inaudible)* because ISD it's a lot less impactful to those corner lots than the typical 30/30, 40/40, or 50/50 that it is. Now if you have a curvature around those lots because of the street and yes it's going to affect more, but not just that corner lot but the adjacent lots. So let's say you have a really curved road, then it might affect that corner lot and the one right next to it as well.

Weir: Okay. Soo you did you have a comment?

Lee: Yes. Actually I want to try to explain that it is not only impact the corner lot you know it depends on the location. Sometimes it's going to impact the more than the one, the corner lot. So for example on Sonoma Ranch and Sedona Hill there are actually more than five lots impacted by this ISD. So anything from the intersection to the five lots it's all impacted not just one corner lot. So depends on the location and what the curvature of the roadway, it might impact on many lots instead of just one.

Weir: Okay. Thank you. Sara I have a question for you. Was the concern by the development community and design professionals that they had to provide it and it was inaccurate or was it, did they feel like this was sprung on and they weren't aware of what needed to take place? And I guess lastly is there a means that we could reach out to them and get their input on how they would address that because what I hear being said is that once those lots are sold to a builder or an individual or it's sold through the regular sale of home process there's a lack of knowledge that that these restrictions might be placed on there, so it's really how do we inform as many people as we can as early as we can.

Gonzales: So the way that it was brought up to us was in two different ways. The first one was it's something new why do we have to provide it and where does it show that we have to provide it? The second way that it was proposed to us was we are surveyors and that is not part of the requirements of the final plat so we should not be having that. And since they're already, this discussion came up over a year ago I believe with Soo and Katherine as to if we wanted it on the plat and that's where we started adding a note on the plot saying these lots would be impacted or clear sight triangles or clear sight regulations are followed within these plats so that way the public did know whenever they purchased these lots you went to the county you got the platted lot, you knew that you had to look for those restrictions. How we move forward has really become the question. So the concerns not that
they weren't notified for everybody but they don't feel as a surveyor that's the information they should be providing on that plat. They are providing that through the construction plans however the public does not get the construction plans whenever they go and purchase a lot. So I don't know how we inform the public any way. I don't know if there's a way in Excella to trigger it but they won't know that until they purchase that lot. And that maybe too late for them if they're building a certain type of home. So I don't know how we communicate that better with the public of saying you know if you find these certain lots be aware that these are your buildable areas, or when they're submitting final site plans and preliminary plats we need to ensure that their buildable area is big enough to fit a home so we don't run into these problems is what my recommendation would be.

Weir: So actually it may get back to the preliminary plat, final plat review your platting an unbuidable lot or one that's going to have undue constraints on it. So it's ...

Gonzales: That's how I feel it to be. Because if we're checking it at preliminary plat we're not letting them go forward with construction plans and final plat, we're ensuring that those lots are buildable lots.

Weir: Okay. Anybody else want to weigh in on just the background on how this has taken place? Does anybody have a suggestion on how to go forward or what they would like to see?

Sedillo: As far as I understand that Sara server is concerned about having the clear sight if they don't know and (inaudible) and planning the lots as well. And just like I mentioned earlier they don't know if the roads going to go up or down. If it's a hilly area then just like Soo said we're going to end up with a bigger triangle that's going to affect more than just one corner lot. That's so when we have those simple notes as far as corner lots may be affected, I don't think that's enough. So I don't know. I don't know how do we fix it because we have different issues. We have, one issue is how do we let the homeowners or the final owner know that they're going to have restrictions on their height of what they can build. And the other issue is on how do we not make it an issue for the public or for the City to deal with later in the future where we've got to end up putting up a stop sign or something that's not warranted but we could have figured out that, you know what this shouldn't have been an issue in the first place. They shouldn't have built that rockwall that high or whatever it is. But yes as far as going forward I don't know how go forward.

Gonzales: David. Can it be you know a separate sheet that's added. We already get it for the construction plans. So when they file the plat can it just be the final plat and then that sheet is just added at the end as maybe sheet three or sheet four because it's already drawn up. So couldn't we just file it along
with it as here's what you note as opposed it being on the plat so it does not affect the surveyor's license.

Weir: Excuse me here. Here's just my two cents on it. One, I think we as a City need to maybe write up that this is something that we're paying more attention to, that it's an issue and getting out to the engineers, surveyors, and developers that we know that we deal with on a regular sense and we can explain why it's become an issue. My other thought on that is like we have the ponding symbols on each of the lots. And then we have a note explaining it, maybe the lots that we know are impacted by this we put some type of symbol that this is anticipated to have this type of impact and then have the note on the plat provide more information. And then at least it's another notice when somebody looks at that plat that there's an asterisk or something else that needs to take place. I don't know if there's really a legal requirement to have a third sheet but that would again have to be something addressed through the Subdivision Code to actually require it. So I mean those are kind of my initial impressions and thoughts.

But again I think this is another thing that we were just going to discuss today so we can think about it some more and various ways to go forward with dealing with that issue. But I know that it's something that does need to be addressed because we encounter it more and more as we're going forward with these. But again it kind of gets back to the earlier discussion that we need to make the development community aware of this so that they don't design these subdivisions to have these type of issues with it. So it's something we just have to deal with it in my view. I think we've thoroughly discussed this enough or does anyone else have any other comments in regards to it?

Trevino: No. I think David what you mentioned about having the symbol on the plat and just throwing this out there, is it possible to have the clear sight triangle designated as an easement like we do for utilities and everything else, just that corner portion of the lot. And that will be not just to follow a note but it's just an easement on the actual site plat for that house or that lot and have that there. I don't know if that's possible or not.

Lee: But Tony the problem is we cannot make a determination of the line, which line was supposed to go depends on the final, the roadway, the profile it might change. And that's reason during the plat phase it's almost impossible to make the exact line it should be clear. That's the reason what we choose to do it during the plat phase is just make a note. It is a subject. But during the construction phase once we get the more final, you know the grade then we can ask to the engineer to make the exact line how much you know the line supposed to go into the private property. But without the final design there's no way we can make a determination.
Trevino: So I'm sorry because I thought in the design standards for the different classes of roadways intersecting with the speed, that distance was already verified.

Lee: No actually that's a clear sight triangle. And then also MTC required to meet the ISD. So ISD it's a different, than ISD is depends on the grade and then if the ...

Trevino: Right, I know what it is but is that stated in the design standards also?

Lee: I think so because of design standards reference to the AASHTO Green Book and the National Green Book has the ISD.

Trevino: Yes, because I know the ISD has actually I know never been utilized for previous development. I need to come back and (inaudible). And I think this is where the Design Standards need to get kind of back up to place and how we're going to accommodate this and how we're going to do this. Because now I can see where the issue that Community Development is dealing with when answering all these questions are for coming back and (inaudible) at the last minute.

Sedillo: So it does, so in our standards and the traffic standards it talks about yes the 30/30 for residential and 50/50 for arterial, it's in there. And then if you keep reading on it says these are minimum clear sight triangles, greater triangles may be necessary at the direction of traffic engineer. So that's when it goes back to what we've been looking at. If it's pretty much a straight square up intersection residential that 30 by 30 is more than enough. But then it's kind of like what Geremy said, now you end up with a lot 40 x 60 total and 30 x 30 of the area's not usable. So then if you go and use the Intersection Sight Distance you only need to go back 14.5 feet back and then wherever your next approach is, so it's a lot more friendly to the developer and the builder as well.

Trevino: Renew. Yes I understand that. But how (inaudible) implementing this additional requirement? Okay.

Sedillo: (inaudible) so (inaudible).

Trevino: Yes. Okay.

Weir: I think it's a really good discussion and to hear everybody's perspective how they come to it. I think we're probably at a place where we can leave it for now. I think we've shared the ideas and the concerns and what we're looking. For now maybe brainstorm a little bit what's our best means to deal with it. I think there are some really good ideas out there. Is there some way that we could flag it through our permit software? Is there some way
that we could identify it on a plat without saying the exact line? How we can
review the various design of these subdivisions they take place? How we
can get some input from the design professionals and developers and see
if they have an idea of how to get notice out there. So unless there's
something else are we had a good place to end discussion on this topic?

Trevino: I think David's (inaudible) so I think we're done.

Weir: Okay. Is there anything else that the Committee wants to discuss that
similar to subdivision design that's become an issue here recently?

Terrazas: Not from the traffic side.

Weir: Okay. Rocio, did you have anything else?

Nasir: No I don't.

Weir: Okay. Katherine and Sara, Tim, Geremy.

Gonzales: I don't have anything additional David.

Weir: Okay. If that's the case I would have, well before I ask for adjournment,
Sara said that she's going to set up another DRC in two weeks to talk about
the right-of-way and cross sections. And we'll continue to talk about the
clear sight areas and we can put that on the agenda also if we're ready. If
not. And Tim you came to the forefront, did you another comment?

Pitts: My comment was no I don't have anything to say.

Weir: Okay.

V. ADJOURNMENT (9:04)

Weir: Well then I'd entertain a motion to adjourn if there's nothing else.

Nasir: So move.

Weir: Do I have a second?

Gonzales: Second.

Weir: Okay. All in favor of adjourning you can just hang up I guess.

Gonzales: Thank you everyone.

Weir: Have a great and safe day everybody. Thank you. We're adjourned.
Chairperson