

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>General</b>						
1	1	A	MRMPO	Recommends that the Coors Corridor Plan specifically address a mix of land uses and call for higher densities in appropriate locations along the corridor (BRT stations, activity centers and transit nodes) to enable the success of proposed high capacity transit. Recommends that allowable zoning and land uses in key areas along Coors Boulevard (BRT Stations, activity centers and transit nodes) be densified to support the proposed premium transit service (BRT). This would help implement Council Bill O-11-69 which modifies the provisions of §14-16-2-16 C-1 and §14-16-2-17 C-2 to allow and encourage residential dwelling units in appropriate locations in C-1 Neighborhood. Commercial and C-2 Community Commercial Zones that are located adjacent to Transit Corridors or within Activity Centers, as designated by the Comprehensive Plan.	The 1984 and 2014 Plans include Design Overlay Zones; their scope does not extend to establishing zones (land uses, density, etc.). However, five community or major activity centers are already designated within the Corridor in the Comprehensive Plan where a mix of land uses and higher density development are appropriate, and Coors itself is designated a Major Transit Corridor. 8 of the 11 BRT station locations recommended in the Plan coincide with these activity centers. The Plan supports transit-supportive development through, for example, its allowances for building height and as a possible criterion to help justify a deviation to the DOZ regulations (see D.3.12 ii) b. on p. 93, B.4.3. iii) b. on p. 22).	
<b>Plan Area Boundary</b>						
2	3	A.3.1	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	This might allow someone to plat themselves out of the plan.	Addressed by B.5.2 on p. 22. The City would request a boundary change. A property-owner cannot plat himself out.	
<b>Jurisdictions and Regulatory Sub-Areas</b>						
3	13	Map A-9	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Include the Flyway public art project at the northeast corner of Bosque Meadows and Coors, the Bosquecito property and other Open Space properties west of the Piedras Marcada Pueblo site.		Amend map to show these 3 lots as "Open Space & Rio Grande State Park"
<b>Plan Goals</b>						
4	iv, 15	TOC, A.6.0	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	The 1984 Coors Corridor Plan (CCP) - enactment #72-1984, designates Coors Blvd. as a limited access Parkway. We want to maintain this designation for Coors Blvd. in order to retain the vision of the 1984 plan, which recognized the need for design guidelines for development and the need for environmental and view preservation policies and guidelines. Please include enactment #72-1984, on page IV to the 2014 draft plan and include the Limited Access Parkway designation in the 2014 Plan goals.	"Limited access parkway" is not an official designation for roadways in the Long Range Roadway System map adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Board as part of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) nor in the more recent interim LRRS (R-13-77, Oct. 18, 2013). The LRRS is the governing document for the status of roadways in Albuquerque and other parts of the metropolitan area. Coors is a principal arterial with limited access per the LRRS. Like the 1984 CCP, the 2014 draft CCP sets out the purpose/goals for both transportation and development in the corridor to achieve a balance between traffic function, the built environment and the natural setting.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
5	15	A.6.3 i)	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Emphasize the intent of the Plan to strengthen the preservation of the natural features along Coors by replacing 2014 goal with the following sentence in Purpose, Boundaries and Issues (1984 CCP pg. 1):“The plan provides policy and design guidelines for development within the corridor area which will integrate natural resources with development activities in order to achieve a balance between the built and natural environments.”	The 2014 Plan sets out several goals under three headings, in contrast to the 1984 plan that expresses a purpose in two sentences. Staff believes that, in combination, the goals in the 2014 Plan under the two headings of Environmental and Recreational Resources and Urban Design express the same balance desired by the commenter. See also the Executive Summary (A.1 on p. 1) that begins with the general aim of the 2014 Plan.	
<b>Plan scope, Transportation</b>						
6	15	A.7.1 iii)	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Since these projects are outside the six year time frame of the TIP, these projects would go to the MTP instead, and a city department will need to propose these for inclusion to the MTP.	NMDOT will coordinate with the development of the 2040 MTP. Note that some of the recommendations may be in the current 2035 MTP, e.g. an interchange at Coors/Montaño.	
<b>Review &amp; Approval</b>						
7	19	B.3.1 ii) d	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	What are the criteria? It might be clearer to specify which exceptions/deviations cannot go to the ZHE.		For clarity, add: " <u>Special exceptions to regulations in the DOZ, including to the View Preservation regulations, are not allowed. Deviations to the DOZ shall be controlled by the process described in B.4.3 and shown in Table B-1.</u> "
8	19	3.1 ii b	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	We support an EPC review first, followed by a DRB review for site development plans for building permit on shopping center sites and any sites of 5 acres or more. Please revise the sentence to read: “A site development plan for building permit for the first phase shall be approved and reviewed by <u>the EPC and then</u> the DRB with public notification.” It should apply to both commercial and residential developments. Some developments may also require more EPC review even after the first phase.		When approving site development plans for subdivision, the EPC has discretion to decide whether or not to delegate its authority to the DRB or to the Building Permit process in regards to future applications for development on individual lots within the site. The intent of the Plan is to ensure that, at minimum, the application for the first phase of development is reviewed at a public hearing to establish the intended design of the site and to provide the opportunity for public input. Because the DRB holds two types of hearings--publically noticed and regular hearings--the Plan should specify that the first DRB hearing be publically noticed. Therefore, replace the 3rd sentence with the following: " <u>If EPC delegates approval of subsequent Site Development Plans for Building Permit, the first application at minimum will be heard by the DRB with public notification.</u> "
9	19	B.3	COA Zoning	Add a table for Review and Approval similar to Deviations		Create table

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
10	19	B.3.1 ii) d.	COA Zoning	Add "Deviations to the DOZ shall be controlled by the process shown in Table B-1"		For clarity, add: " <u>Special exceptions to regulations in the DOZ, including to the View Preservation regulations, are not allowed. Deviations to the DOZ shall be controlled by the process described in B.4.3 and shown in Table B-1.</u> "
<b>Review &amp; Approval, Exceptions &amp; Deviations</b>						
11	18, 20	B.3.1 i), ii) c., B.4.1	NMDOT	The NMDOT has no objection to the adoption of the Coors Corridor Plan with 2014 Updates with the understanding that any development along and/or near the corridors will require review to determine any effects to the adjacent state roadway system.	NA	NA
<b>Exceptions &amp; Deviations</b>						
12	20	B.4.3 and Table B-1	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	We are very concerned and disappointed that both the view regulations and design guidelines in the draft contain weak language and numerous exceptions. The tools we have utilized since 1984 to ensure quality developments in the corridor have been altered in the new plan to the point of being useless.	The cited section aims to provide more guidance and predictability for applicants, neighborhoods, staff and decision-makers.	
13	21	B.4.3	Fishman, J for owners of undeveloped property in Andalucia	Supports inclusion of a deviation process in the Plan.	NA	NA
14	21	B.4.3 and Table B-1	COA Zoning	Define dimensional and non-dimensional		Draft definitions
15	22	B.4.3 ii) b	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	The examples of potential exceptions are far too lenient, i.e. physical characteristics, number of jobs, support for transit, public amenity, historic/archeological preservation. Are they really necessary? Future job growth should not be used as a potential justification for a deviation. This document should also encourage the donation or sale of land, which is difficult to develop, for public use such as Park and Ride sites or Open Space. There are currently no designated City owned Park and Ride sites between Paseo and I-40.	Meeting at least one of the criteria cited is just one of four requirements the applicant must meet to justify a deviation. The actual granting of a deviation would not be automatic, but subject to a decision by the EPC or Planning Director. Provision of a park & ride is already listed as one of the criteria the applicant can use to justify a deviation. The implementation, ownership and operation of the facility would be a matter for the relevant parties to negotiate, and would not necessarily include the City.	
16	22	B.4.3.iii) b, 4th bullet point	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	We suggest that proximity should be defined by 660 feet, the same standard used for Major Transit Corridors in O-11-064 [re. residential dwellings in C-1 and C-2 commercial zones]. As always, the improvements should be subject to our approval.		Agree. For clarity and for consistency with existing criterion in the Zoning Code, replace "in close proximity to" with "within 660 ft. of"
17	22	B.4.3.iii) b, 4th bullet point	Rio Metro	Consider broadening the language to explicitly permit mixed use and higher density residential projects near transit stations, which would complement policy 2.3. i) on p. 88. Transit ridership and cost efficiencies increase when these types of development are clustered around stations. [summarized]	Mixed use and higher densities are permitted by the underlying zoning of properties, and are outside the scope of the Plan's DOZ, which is to set design standards for development.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Public Projects</b>						
18	20	B.3.2 iii)	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Will developers contribute to streetscape and pedestrian-oriented improvements as well?	This section is about public sector projects along Coors Blvd. Developers will be expected to provide sidewalks, street trees, etc. in conjunction with new development and redevelopment, per standard City procedure.	
19	20	B.3.2 iv)	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Does this exclude the possibility of easements on private property for a “viewsite”?	A viewsite may be provided on private property as a public amenity (see p. 110, E.3.4, p. 22 B.4.3.iii) b, 5th bullet point).	
<b>Park &amp; Ride</b>						
20	22, 36	B.4.3 iii) b 4th bullet point, C.4.1.2 & 4.2	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	
<b>Glossary</b>						
21	23	B.6.0	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	“High impact recreation” should be removed from Open Space definition.		Make change
22	23	B.6.0	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Please explain what MTP is, similar to the TIP definition		Draft definition
23	23	B.6.0	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Please consult with Tony Sylvester (Rio Metro) to ensure the accuracy of the RMRTD definition		Have Rio Metro review definition
<b>Transportation</b>						
24	25	C.1	Kanester, J.	The biggest transportation problem is West-East commuters. Consider: widening or double-deck bridges, signal adjustments at turns, and a commute lane; finishing other proposed roads on the West Side, including from Hwy 550 to I-40; travel demand management by business community regarding work and business hours. [summarized]	The Plan addresses Coors Corridor only but was informed by transportation projects, conditions and forecasts for the metropolitan area. The recommendations in the Plan do not undermine these other planning efforts and projects, and aims to coordinate with them.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Multi-Modal Strategy</b>						
25	26	C.2	Gallegos, A. B.	General concern about congestion on Coors and impact on residents as the Westside continues to develop with R1 or R2 developments, for example the apartments being constructed in the Bosque School area which will add many additional vehicles to the area. Stopping growth is unrealistic, but transportation issues must be addressed effectively. This is a very serious matter for maintaining a livable and enjoyable lifestyle for our Westside community. [summarized]	This Rank 3 Plan addresses the forecast congestion in this particular corridor with a multi-modal strategy, which emerged as the preferred alternative from a transportation study led by COA DMD in conjunction with other agencies such as NMDOT and MRCOG. The transportation policies and targeted projects optimize the person-carrying capacity of Coors Blvd./Bypass in the long term with better transit, bike and pedestrian facilities and connections. Many of the design regulations for development adjacent to Coors also support the multi-modal strategy. The Plan has no zoning (it does not change land use categories on private property), but other ranked City plans (e.g. Comprehensive Plan, West Side Strategic Plan) address the job/service/housing imbalance on the Westside that exacerbates congestion from backed-up river crossings. These plans apply in zoning-related decisions made by the EPC and City Council.	
26	26	C.2	MRMPO	Supports plan's efforts to improve all modes of transportation	NA	NA
27	26	C.2	Retberg, A.	Add travel demand management (TDM) to Plan, e.g. staggered office hours, van/car-pooling.	Most of the traffic on Coors is crossing the river to employment and university east of the river. Promotion of TDM is more appropriate at the destination end and city-wide. There are existing examples of TDM, such as UNM and the City subsidizing bus passes for students and staff. The 790 Blue Line on Coors is heavily used to access UNM, and is "standing room only" during much of the academic year.	
28	26	C.2.1	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Coors is a Major Transit Corridor. See Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) p. II-83 for order of modes.	Coors is both a Major Transit Corridor and an Arterial per the Comp Plan, which allows some flexibility for modal hierarchy on arterials. The Coors Plan establishes a multi-modal strategy and tailors policies for each mode to the conditions and traffic forecast in this specific Corridor, which seems consistent with the intent of the Comp Plan.	
29	26, 36	C.2.0, C.4.0	Lopez, V.	I am a resident of Bosque Meadows and am very pleased with the proposal. It will ease the increasing problem of traffic on the West Side, promote the use of public transportation and make Albuquerque just a bit more "green".	NA	NA
30	28	Figure C-2	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Could you please make Figure C-2 bigger than the photos on the page?		Will make figure a little larger
31	32	Figure C-6	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Transit vehicles should be both directions in mixed-flow lanes. If the drawings can't be changed, please add a note.		Revise diagram or add note

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
32	29-32	Figures C-3 through C-6	COA DMD, Engineering Division	Figures C-3 through C-6 call-out details of roadway cross-sections, but curb and gutter is the only item not called-out. Much of existing Coors Blvd. contains just shoulder. If the objective is for all sections to contain curb and gutter it should be explicitly called out so as to avoid any ambiguity.		Address in C.9.1 Right-of-Way instead, along with the addition of bike facilities.
33	29-32	Figures C-3 through C-6	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Is figure C-3 the current section for the segment described in the title? Or future? We suggest adding an introduction explaining what the following cross sections are, similar to page 54.	Addressed in C.2.1 on p. 26.	
<b>Typical Sections</b>						
34	29	Figure C-3	COA Planning, Project Staff	Insert after "156 ft. ROW": "(at major intersections 175 ft with Single Left-turn Lane, 200 ft with Dual Left-turn Lanes)"		Revise for clarity

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
35	30-31	Figures C-4 & C-5	West Mesa NA Petition (147 signatures)	Regarding the widening of Coors Blvd., is concerned about the confiscation of property and businesses, the elimination of landscaped medians and the impact of travel lanes being too close to property walls resulting in damage from traffic accidents.	The Plan proposes a multi-modal strategy. The pavement of Coors Blvd. would only be widened to accommodate a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, with dedicated transit lanes and two stations between Central and I-40. The street sections in the Plan show that 12 - 20 ft would separate the actual pavement from the edge of the ROW or property line. Implementation of a BRT is subject to extensive technical and financial feasibility studies (see C.4.2 p. 36) and would be many years out. Part of the analysis would include identifying and evaluating all the impacts on adjacent properties--homes and businesses--and resolving them appropriately. Alternative access for businesses would be identified and secured before any medians or driveways are closed (see C.8 Access Management on p. 47-49). Safety of adjacent properties would be a primary concern of the agency/ies pursuing a BRT project. Regarding landscaped medians, they can be provided with the curbside BRT option.	
36	30-31	Figure C-4 & C-5	MRMPO	Strongly recommend aligning the bicycle lane next to the sidewalk and including the buffer zone between the bicycle lane and the motoring lanes. In general, the faster the speeds the more separated the modes need to be. As depicted, a cyclist would have to deal with heavy BRT on one side and fast moving vehicles on the other, which is acutely uncomfortable and deteriorates bicycle level of service.		Consider rewording C.5.4 ii) to better define "cycle track" and provide more flexibility for placement and design, per current best practice.
37	30-31	Figures C-4 & C-5	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Maybe a cross reference to C.4.2 [Transit Component] on all the cross sections with BRT would provide more explanation.		Add the suggested cross-reference
38	30-31	Figures C-4 & C-5	Taylor Ranch NA Board - J. Wolfley	TRNA supports the Plan vision for six auto lanes as the limit to effectively move cars in the corridor and for creating additional capacity via Bus Rapid Transit in two dedicated lanes.	NA	NA
<b>Highway Component</b>						
39	35	C.3.4	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	We use "dependability and timeliness" rather than speed and reliability.		Revise text for consistency with transit operator's usage
<b>Transit Component</b>						
40	36	C.4	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	BRT/Density/Semi Rural areas: Taylor Ranch is comprised of single family residential, several apartment complexes near Coors, and a few semi rural areas near the river and in Alban Hills. This makes a nice variety of uses. We would like to maintain these semi rural areas, and not lose them. Will there be pressure due to the BRT system to increase the density in the semi rural areas along this stretch? How can we maintain our semi-rural communities?	Virtually all the properties designated "rural" by the Comprehensive Plan that are both within the Plan area and under City zoning jurisdiction are City Open Space or single family residential areas.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
41	36	C.4	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	How much density is needed to support a BRT transit system? Does it take a lot of density to make it worthwhile to invest into a BRT system?	The two transit operators, ABQ RIDE and Rio Metro, identified a potential BRT network for the Albuquerque-Rio Rancho area in 2012 that includes Coors Blvd. Coors Blvd. is already heavily used by regional as well as locally-generated traffic, much of which crosses the river on one of the 6 bridges connected to Coors. Additional residential density would support a future BRT system on Coors Blvd., but is probably not essential to its feasibility because there is already significant demand for the 5 bus services that use Coors on some portion of their route. Note also that the Plan does not change existing zoning of properties in the Corridor, including the density of development.	
42	36	C.4.1	Sullivan, M.	Supports dedicated transit lanes and emphasizes the importance of providing park and ride to encourage transit use and contribute to the multi-modal effort.	NA	NA
43	36	C.4.1 3.	MRMPO	Encourages COA Planning to coordinate with MRMPO, ABQ-Ride and Rio Metro to strategically identify appropriate BRT station areas along with potential TOD sites. MRMPO houses many models, GIS data, socioeconomic data and technical expertise for these type of analyses and would be more than willing to assist the planning department where needed.	No change at this time. The general locations of BRT stations were derived from the transportation study that informed the Plan update. The agency involved in pursuing a BRT in the Corridor, e.g. Rio Metro or ABQ RIDE, would investigate more specific placement of stations in due course as part of the project. This would be coordinated with NMDOT who controls the ROW.	
44	36	C.4.1 3.	Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	Upgrade the bus stop at SIPI for the Native American students who currently stand to wait for the bus on a daily basis, with no protection from the elements.	The policy calls for shelters at all local bus stops as one of four transit priorities in the Coors Corridor. However, the request can also be passed on to ABQ RIDE independently of the Plan update.	
45	38	C.4.5	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Does figure C-7 need to be updated for RMRTD current preferred alternatives?	The figure is from the 2035 MTP, the basis for the transportation study that informed the Plan update. It would be inaccurate and misleading to use a different version.	



Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Component</b>						
46	29 -32, 40	Figures C-3 through C.6, C.5.4	Brewster, S.	<p>I am a Taylor Ranch resident who bicycles and buses for transportation around the Westside. My husband commutes by bicycle and was hit from behind recently by a car. Fortunately, he recovered from his injuries. We all benefit when people choose to ride their bike instead of driving. I believe Albuquerque can separate itself out as the bicycle-for-transportation mecca of this country if we plan for that. Suggestions for the Coors Corridor Plan:</p> <p>Put bicyclists' safety as a top priority. The draft plan jeopardizes bicyclists' safety and dissuades bicyclists from using the new infrastructure. Statistics from the American League of Bicyclists from National Highway Transportation Safety Administration indicate that 40 % of the 726 bicyclists killed by automobiles in 2012 were hit from behind. When a bike lane exists on a major thoroughfare, like Coors, a bicyclist should never be forced to ride for very far between a bus and a car, even with a striped buffer zone. That greatly increases the likelihood that the cyclist will be hit from behind or side by the bus or car. Other cities have demonstrated that far more bicyclists utilize lanes where they are separated from traffic by an actual barrier. Bicycle lanes can be placed next to walking paths without danger to pedestrians and the whole section be separated from traffic with a landscaped strip, for example. Other cities in U.S. and Europe have much experience with these designs (especially where bus intersections occur) and could offer workable/safer alternatives.</p>	Staff believes the issue is related to the curbside BRT option only (see p. 30 Figure C-4) and whether it would be safer and more convenient for cyclists to ride in a bike lane between the general purpose and the BRT lanes or between the curb and the BRT lane where cyclists would have to "mix" with BRT at station locations.	Consider rewording C.5.4 ii) to better define "cycle track" and provide more flexibility for placement and design, per current best practice.
47	39	C.5.2	Gallegos, A. B.	Consider creating a continuous bike and pedestrian trail running north and south along Coors similar to what was developed on Tramway. I appreciate where there are bike lanes on Coors, but am concerned for my own and others' safety as witness to drivers who text and use their cell phones, causing them to drift into bike lanes. I have nearly been side swiped on my bike a couple of times by vehicles traveling 50-60mph. For this reason, I am totally uncomfortable riding my bike to run errands, grab a bite to eat or for general recreation. Having a sidewalk to utilize is the only time I feel safe.	The Plan should be consistent with the higher ranked plans for the City and metropolitan areas (Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan and Long Range Bikeway System map in the MTP) to ensure that any bike facilities within the Corridor integrate with a more comprehensive network of bikeways and multi-use trail facilities. No continuous off-street trail is shown on Coors in either document at present, but there are segments of trails parallel to Coors in various locations, such as (roughly) between Western Trail/Namaste and Alameda, that run along the mesa and the bosque. The Plan also accommodates evolution of the designated network in the text (C.5.2) and typical sections (p. 29 - 31).	
48	39	C.5.2 i)	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Please change "specifications of the agency responsible for trail maintenance, typically the City of Albuquerque Parks Department" to read, "per Bikeways and Trails Plan Design Standards".		Revise but qualify that it applies to City trails; some may be County trails.
49	39	C.5.3	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Add "as part of development" at the end of the sentence.		Revise for clarity.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
50	40	C.5.4 ii)	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	It is unclear what is being proposed. Putting bicycles in a BRT lane on Coors does not seem like a safe concept.		C.5.4 ii) allows for cycle tracks in the longer term if bicycle demand is substantial. However, consider revising language to address the design of cycle tracks.
51	40	C.5.6	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	The second to the last sentence in the paragraph should read "An investment in high-capacity transit must be coordinated with pedestrian and bicycle access." As currently written it implies that ABQ RIDE or RMRTD is now responsible for building pedestrian and bicycle access.		Revise to clarify intent
<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Component, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte</b>						
52	39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 8.	Eberhardt, B.	In Section C.5.1 is mentioned continuous sidewalks on both sides of Coors Blvd - where will the sidewalk actually be along Bosque Meadows Pl? We have a 8-10 clearance on the Coors Blvd side of our development. That is a security path; though we do NOT have a Neighborhood Assoc as originally planned, some people do in fact maintain the stretch behind their wall.	Exact location of future sidewalk is to be determined. The plat and infrastructure plan for subdivision in the Planning Department's Design Review Section indicate that the existing "clearance" or "security path" along the subdivision is for drainage purposes and is owned by the City.	
53	39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 8.	Torres, H.	When the neighborhood was developed a walking security path was available. It has been a struggle to get the city and /or the county to help maintain it. We are experiencing an increase of homeless/transients loitering behind the neighborhood subdivision. Will new landscape be planted, to reflect the other sections of Coors?	The plat and infrastructure plan for subdivision in the Planning Department's Design Review Section indicate that the existing "security path" along the subdivision is for drainage purposes and is owned by the City. The Plan recommends continuous sidewalk along Coors with landscape strip between it and curb.	
<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Component, Streetscape Design, Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements</b>						
54	39, 51	C.5.1, C.10.0, E.2.0	Lopez, V.	I appreciate the addition of sidewalks and the focus toward beautification along the corridor. I believe that this will alleviate some of the clean-up concerns related to that space along Coors, that our neighborhood has struggled to maintain for years.	NA	NA
<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</b>						
55	39	C.5.2	MRMPO	The Long Range Bikeway System Map does not call for a sidepath/multi-use trail along Coors Blvd. in the proposed plan boundaries. Between Namaste and Sevilla there appears to be a sidepath, and a really wide buffer bicycle lane. This is a nice cross-section.	The policy refers to the Coors Corridor, not Coors Blvd. specifically. For example, multi-use trail segments or connections are designated in the LRBS along La Orilla east of Coors, at Paseo del Norte and at the Calabacillas Arroyo. Also, this is a long-range plan with a 10 to 20 year horizon. The policy addresses the possibility of a designated trail along Coors Blvd. in a future LRBS or City Bikeway and Trails Facility Plan. For information: on the eastside of Coors between Namaste and Sevilla, the "sidepath" is a sidewalk implemented as part of the adjacent private Andalucia development; the sidewalk on the west side of Coors in this segment is discontinuous; the on-street buffer bicycle lanes were implemented as part of a recent NMDOT project.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
56	39	C.5.3	MRMPO	It would be beneficial to include language stating that connections from businesses to Coors Blvd are not necessarily at streets; they should be included as much as possible.	The connections from businesses to sidewalks on Coors Blvd. and the Bypass would typically be implemented as part of adjoining development and redevelopment. Hence the references to regulations in the DOZ (D.3.6 and D.3.7).	Consider amending D.3.6 ii) to clarify that connections, as direct as feasible, should be from buildings to the nearest sidewalks in addition to bus stops.
57	39	C.5.1.iii)	COA Transportation Development Services	The language under a. and b. regarding responsibility for implementation and maintenance of sidewalks is incorrect. The COA Sidewalk Ordinance addresses responsibility. Remove this paragraph in its entirety.		Retain paragraph but consider revisions after consulting the Sidewalk, Drive Pad, Curb and Gutter Ordinance (§ 6-5-5-1 et seq. incl. § 6-5-5-18 re. sidewalk maintenance) and investigating how sidewalks within NMDOT facilities are maintained.
58	39, 109,	C.5, E.2	Stucker, S. & J.	We are avid cyclists, walkers and nature lovers and want to protect our Bosque for future generations to enjoy. As cyclists, we welcome any improvements to keep cyclists safe and able to have continued easy access to current and any proposed bike paths.	NA	NA
59	39, 109, 159	C.5.1, E.2, F.6	Rose, J.	Requests pedestrian facilities between Bosque Meadows neighborhood and destinations north and south along Corridor that are within walking distance, from La Orilla to Cottonwood Mall. "A year or two ago a woman was killed walking on the edge of Coors Road between the open space center and the bike shop. How many more people have to die? We are supposed to encourage walking. It can be cheap...a piece of asphalt will do." [summarized]	This issue is addressed in three sections of the Plan: transportation policy (Chapter C), public projects (Chapter E) and project prioritization (Chapter F, see last paragraph on p. 159). NMDOT would coordinate the design of pedestrian facilities within the Coors Blvd. ROW, including the choice of material.	
60	40	C.5.4	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Will the 8 ft. bike lanes on Coors be safe enough for bicyclists to use between the high speed traffic lanes and the proposed transit lanes? Should an 8 ft. bicycle lane even be on Coors?	Cyclists have a right to ride on the pavement of Coors Blvd. Staff believes the issue is with the curbside BRT option (see p. 30 Figure C-4) and whether it would be safer and more convenient for cyclists to ride in a bike lane between the general purpose and the BRT lanes or between the curb and the BRT lane where cyclists would have to "mix" with BRT at station locations. There is no issue with the median BRT option.	
61	40	C.5.4 ii)	Lopez, V.	Bike lanes should be provided some barrier from traffic. Without cement curb barriers, I fear there will be more deaths.		C.5.4 ii) allows for cycle tracks in the longer term if bicycle demand is substantial. However, consider revising language to address the design of cycle tracks.
62	40	C.5.4 ii)	MRMPO	Cycle tracks are not typically "buffered bike lanes". Generally, buffer-protected bicycle lanes are done with striping, whereas cycle tracks include a physical barrier, such as posts or parked cars, or are raised to separate them from moving cars. See <a href="http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/cycle-tracks/">http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/cycle-tracks/</a>		Revise for clarity.
63	40, 68	C.5.5 ii) b., Figure C-17	Sharrett, S.	Suggests underground pedestrian/bike crossing of Coors at La Orilla.	A grade-separated crossing at this location is recommended in the Plan.	
64	87	D.2.5 i)	COA DMD, Engineering Division	The Long Range Bikeway System Map should be used as a referencing tool when installing new bicycle facilities so they are coordinated with other projects and/or developers.	Addressed in the regulations rather than the policies.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Signalized Major Intersections</b>						
65	42-43	C.63. ii), Figure C-9	Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	Install public art/sculptures at the Paseo/ Coors Interchange. Upgrade/ improve facing of the Paseo fly over ( remove weeds, dead trees, and re-face structure which has faded and been repainted repeatedly in sections to mask graffiti over the years.		Investigate the technical and financial feasibility of integrating public art and/or aesthetic enhancements in the design of the recommended interchange, and other major projects in the Coors ROW, in coordination with NMDOT, City DMD and Cultural Services/Public Art Program.
<b>Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte</b>						
66	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Eberhardt, B.	The area between Bosque Meadows and Eagle Ranch (roughly) is designated as "over congested" on map in plan. Entering and/or leaving our development is already a problem, esp. on the weekends w/ Sage Brush church having hired off-duty police to control the lights and thus the flow of people entering or leaving the Sagebrush area. Coors Blvd traffic is stopped to allow Sagebrush traffic out - meaning for Bosque Meadows there is always flow heading North. At certain traffic times it is virtually impossible to exit or enter Bosque Meadows by crossing the median area. Please keep this in mind when considering the BRT station on Coors and Eagle Ranch Rd and dealing with congestion level.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
67	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Dehaiman, Y.	I believe that we need a light at Bosque Meadows subdivision. We can never turn left and what's worse is on Sunday, due to the police setting the lights for Sage Brush. I am not able to attend a meeting since I work out of town during the week.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
68	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Eatman	Traffic on Coors Blvd in the Bosque Meadows area has increased with the expansion of the Open Space Visitor Center and attendance at Sagebrush Church. People departing the church can now access Coors at the north exit without a stoplight. This creates a string of vehicles after services resulting in 10-15 minute waits to exit Bosque Meadows north or south. Emergency vehicles have difficulty entering Bosque Meadows from the north. There are many illegal U-turns from north and south at Bosque Meadows.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
69	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Fuller, S.	I am the Co-Captain of the NOAC for Brenton DR NW. I live in the Bosque Meadows neighborhood near Eagle Ranch and Coors. The entrance to my neighborhood is the same entrance to the Open Space Visitor Center. I have received a total of 7 inquires from my street alone regarding the proposed Coors Corridor project. We all would like to express concerns about safety and access. We already have a major safety issue exiting our subdivision heading south on Coors. We desperately need a light. With the very heavy increased traffic that Sagebrush Church has caused has made this task near impossible during Sunday services and any other major event they may have going on. We would like to know how the NMDOT will keep our safety in mind with this project.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
70	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Gallegos, A. B.	Address the serious traffic issues between La Orilla and Coors on weekends related to the congestion and delays resulting from the Sagebrush Church. On many weekends, there are traffic backups ups starting at Montano headed north bound and just south of Eagle Ranch headed south on Coors. Frustrated drivers attempt to cut across lanes to seek access on surface streets. Off-duty APD officers manipulating the traffic signals to assist with the traffic issues should not be the long term fix. As more and more R1 and R2 structures are developed on the Westside this will increase congestion on an already over used road. [summarized]	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
71	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Lopez, V.	Related to Bosque Meadows, it has been unsafe to turn left [onto Coors] because of the amount of traffic, as well as the amount of cars making u-turns at that intersection (even though there is a no u-turn sign posted). We must all sacrifice something in the name of progress, but safety should be the utmost concern. Since the light at SIPI is being removed, consider placing a light at the entrance of Bosque Meadows, which leads to the Open Space Center. The additional weekend traffic coming from the Sagebrush Church is given priority by having APD officers controlling the light AND blocking off lanes. I hope the same concern would be given to the West Side's permanent residents.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
72	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Rivera, G.	When the church added a second entrance on Coors between La Orilla and our division, I called someone to see if the embankment [or whatever it's called] could be removed so that we could have more space to drive south and merge onto southbound traffic on Coors. Other places on Coors Blvd have space in the center between north & south bound lanes to make left turns. That prevents the 1st car from seeing traffic coming south from Paseo. People don't wait their turn on Bosque Meadows when making a left turn onto Coors. Unless a sign is put up that says NO LEFT TURN we will continue to make left turns. There is a sign that says NO U TURNS into our division from southbound traffic and u-turns are still made. A light is needed at Bosque Meadows. It would slow traffic on Coors since many drive at 50/60 mph between La Orilla & Eagle Ranch Rd. So what if a light at Bosque Meadows slows traffic on Coors? As long as the growth in our city doesn't stop, we're going to have to learn to deal with traffic as in Los Angeles & all big cities [summarized].	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
73	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Studerus, T.	The traffic problem along Coors Road in Bosque Meadows area is somewhat related to the Coors Corridor Plan. I would like the EPC to keep this issue in mind. The possibility of a frontage road connecting Bosque Meadows neighborhood to Caminito Coors NW (to the north) should be considered.	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	
74	41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Torres, H.	It is currently and increasingly becoming very dangerous for us to access our homes on and off of Coors Blvd. It is not uncommon for us to wait for up to 15 minutes for a break in the traffic . Will we get a traffic light as we were promised when the neighborhood was built with the new plan as this is currently the only entrance/exit to our homes?	No traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows is warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. Note that the access issue has also been raised by COA's Open Space Division.	

**Grade-separated Roadways and Interchanges**

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
75	42	C.6.3	Don Chalmers Ford, Inc.	Relates to 3130 Coors – Quick Lane and 3500 Coors – Don Chalmers Coors Outlet: We want to ensure our investment and customer service is safeguarded by this plan. Our concerns relate to: - Currently, our properties share access roadways from Northbound Coors. We cannot support any effort that would further limit any access off of Coors to our properties. - Will we lose any of our land for the expansion of Coors. - What will the impact be of the elevated roadway on the Southbound Coors? - Would we be impacted by any signage changes for our properties?	The elevated roadway concept is a recommendation to address congestion on NB Coors from I-40, and is advisory to the NMDOT who controls the Coors right-of-way (ROW). Environmental, engineering and financial analysis would be undertaken to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of this concept or suggest an alternative solution, and inform the ultimate design.	
76	42	C.6.3	Kanester, J.	The northbound elevated roadway on Coors from I-40 extending over Sequoia would destroy small businesses and homes in its path and add traffic confusion. The proposed interchange at Coors/Montaño will not help and is opposed by most nearby residents and recreational users. Additional construction in the area will create a traffic nightmare. [summarized]	The roadway projects are recommendations and advisory to the NMDOT who control the Coors right-of-way (ROW). Environmental and engineering analysis would be undertaken to determine their feasibility and effectiveness, and inform their ultimate design.	
77	42	C.6.3	M&F Auto Sales Inc.	Relates to 2922 Coors BLVD NW: Opposed plans to widen Coors Blvd because adding a lane would devastate his business (est. 1997) and is unnecessary. Traffic only becomes backed up on Coors for about 30 minutes around the 5 o'clock hour. [summarized]	The elevated roadway concept is a recommendation to address congestion on NB Coors from I-40, and is advisory to the NMDOT who controls the Coors right-of-way (ROW). Environmental, engineering and financial analysis would be undertaken to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of this concept or an alternative solution, and inform the ultimate design.	
78	42	C.6.3	Plaman, Dr. M. & J.	Relates to 3100 Coors Rd N.W.: We are strongly opposed to the roadway changes proposed in the 2014 Coors Corridor Plan that will dramatically impact the east side of Coors Road from Quail to Sequoia. This location (est. 1985) is extremely valuable to the entire operation of our CareMore Chiropractic Centers health care business. It helps make up the shortfall for other locations. By doing this, we have been able to keep our 32 employees working and offer affordable health care in a number of underserved communities. We request that NMDOT and other agencies explore acceptable alternatives which limit the harm to existing businesses, employees and their families that depend upon this section of road for their livelihood. [summarized]	The elevated roadway concept is a recommendation to address congestion on NB Coors from I-40, and is advisory to the NMDOT who controls the Coors right-of-way (ROW). Environmental, engineering and financial analysis would be undertaken to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of this concept or an alternative solution, and inform the ultimate design.	
79	42	C.6.3	Retberg, A.	Objects to interchange at Coors/Montaño because it will destroy the character of the Andalucia neighborhood due to its detrimental impact on businesses at Riverside Plaza located north of the intersection and on the Open Space access to the bosque located to the southeast.	The roadway project is a recommendation and advisory to the NMDOT who control the Coors ROW. A full environmental and engineering analysis would be undertaken to determine its feasibility and effectiveness, and inform the ultimate design.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
80	42	C.6.3	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	The TRNA Board thinks the possible grade separation of Coors and Montano would have substantial negative consequences for the area. This intersection is officially the Taylor Ranch Community Activity Center, intended to be the place we come together as a community for a variety of business and social activities. A 25 ft. tall overpass structure less than a mile from the Bosque and Rio Grande would be visually obstructive, divide and separate neighborhoods and businesses and separate most of us from the Bosque. Overpasses for automobiles are usually a “no man zone” that is hostile to walkers and bikers. The grade separation is intended to improve wait times at the intersection, yet it is just one choke point of many around the River. Over time it too will become congested. In general, TRNA is concerned about how transportation projects will affect adjacent businesses and neighborhoods and increase traffic noise in surrounding areas. [summarized]	The tables for each corridor segment in C.13 (p. 54) include the potential changes that would result from the transportation policies and project recommendations. See 1. ROW and/or 2. Travel Lanes in Table C-2 for the elevated northbound lanes north of I-40 and Table C-5 for the Coors/Montano interchange. No change is identified for the south to east flyover at Paseo del Norte. The concepts in the Plan are illustrative. If pursued by NMDOT, and funded and implemented, the projects could be designed differently. Nevertheless, the Plan states that additional ROW would be needed in places where the existing ROW is less than the needed ROW (p. 50 C.9.1). Traffic noise would be one of the many environmental impacts that would be analyzed and addressed as part of the feasibility and design of a project.	
81	42	C.6.3 ii)	Rio Metro	Rio Metro would like to be a stakeholder in any effort to reconstruct the Coors/Paseo del Norte Interchange. Rio Metro's <i>Paseo del Norte High Capacity Transit Study</i> recognizes the potential need for a separate guideway for BRT vehicles traveling along Paseo through this interchange.	The lead agency for a project at this location would be NMDOT, who would coordinate with other agencies as appropriate, such as Rio Metro.	
82	42	C.6.3 ii)	Sullivan, M.	Endorses the recommended fly-over ramp from south-bound Coors to east-bound Paseo del Norte	NA	NA
<b>Unsignalized Intersections and Median Openings, Access Management for Adjacent Properties</b>						
83	45, 47	C.7, C.8	Taylor Ranch NA Board - R. Horvath	The 1984 plan already has a section on driveway accesses and median openings, etc. why change it? More time is needed to understand the proposed median openings and driveway accesses.	The 2014 Plan addresses existing conditions, which are more complex than the almost blank slate that the Plan dealt with 30 years ago. The new Plan also establishes policy for the next 10 to 20 years. The transportation study undertaken to inform the plan therefore resulted in more detailed and up-to-date policies for unsignalized access to Coors Blvd. and the Bypass. There is a requirement for a new unsignalized intersection for a street (public or private); and, if one is allowed, criteria for the type of access (full or partial), its spacing relative to signalized intersections, and its design. There is another set of criteria for a new driveway, i.e. access to one property, along with spacing and design. Either way, the basic threshold for an additional access to Coors or the Bypass is high: none is allowed unless access to another roadway facility is not available. The Plan also cautions that existing median openings may need to be closed if their operation undermine adjacent signalized intersections (C.7.2 ii)). Also, median design requirements will be adjusted if a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is designed in the median (C.7.3 ii)).	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Median Openings, Corridor Segment Recommendations</b>						
84	45, 72	C.7.3., Table C-6 3.	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Left turns from Bosque Meadows onto Coors for visitors to the Open Space Visitor Center can be challenging, especially during days of increased visitation. A wider median at this intersection (i.e. if a Bus Rapid Transit system were built) would allow for safer turns.	Residents of the Bosque Meadows subdivision requested a traffic signal at Coors/Bosque Meadows. A signal is not warranted per the study completed by NMDOT in 1/2014 and presented to residents & City staff by NMDOT on 7/24/14. NMDOT is undertaking further study and considering alternative solutions. A wider median may be an alternative.	
<b>Median Openings</b>						
85	46	C.7.3 ii)	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	It appears that the Median BRT option would eliminate left turn access to our business from northbound Coors, which would negatively impact it. Our business has already been affected by the loss of one left turn access point due to the construction of the median from Irving to Coors Bypass 3-5 years ago. Our customers currently complain due to the limited access from northbound Coors. [summarized]	The impacts of a Median BRT option on adjacent businesses would be evaluated as part of the feasibility study, and mitigated as appropriate if the option is implemented.	
<b>Connector Streets</b>						
86	48	C.8.3	Abeyta, A.	My home is located close to Winter Haven and Montano near Coors Blvd. My concern is the proposed extension of Winter Haven where currently it dead ends north of Montano. The proposed extension will add to the increasing amount of traffic, speed, and noise that occurs already. I would prefer that Winter Haven remain as is. However, some speed "bumps" or "humps" on Winter Haven now would be nice. At times, my house rattles when a semi-truck passes down Winter Haven. [summarized]	No change, since the connector street is subject to feasibility study.	
87	48	C.8.3	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed on the proposed connector roads.	Insufficient information to respond to.	
88	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Clark, S.	Concerned about adverse effects of opening Winterhaven to through traffic to/from Bosque Plaza and La Orilla. <b>a)</b> Commuters already use the southern end of Winterhaven to avoid the busy Montano/Coors intersection during rush hour. These vehicles often speed by at 45-50 mph in our 30 mph zone. With a connector, there will be an increase in the volume of commuter traffic using Winterhaven. Residents enjoy walking across Winterhaven to access the businesses of Montano and Riverside Plazas, but there are no formal crosswalks. Our request for "speed bumps" was deemed unacceptable by the City. There is also a children's home along Winterhaven. A connector could increase risk for pedestrian and bicyclists' injury and death. <b>b)</b> There are several undeveloped commercial lots along Bosque Plaza. The connector will increase traffic because of shoppers and truck traffic. Sagebrush Church, at the eastern end of Orilla, has seen its membership mushroom in the past few years. Many churchgoers will use Winterhaven for access. Sunday mornings are currently our most peaceful during the week. <b>c)</b> This increased traffic will mean more noise, ground and air pollution, litter and trash, which will affect our residential neighborhood and the adjacent bosque and its fragile ecosystem.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. [Note: the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions regarding the site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision the Bosque (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does however still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla.]	



Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
89	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Kunitz, S.	Winterhaven is already used to some extent as a through road for people to avoid the intersection at Montano and Coors. It is also used as an occasional raceway by people driving at excessive speeds. The noise pollution they create will only be made worse by the proposed changes. Moreover, for those of us who use cross Winterhaven on foot to go to the shopping plaza, the street will become considerably more hazardous. Indeed, rather than making it a through road, speed bumps ought to be installed to slow down the existing traffic.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. [Note: the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions regarding the site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision the Bosque (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does however still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla.]	
90	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Nieto, E.	The planned extension is not in the best interest of any of the homeowners nor drivers in the area as it will just increase speeding traffic, noise, and pollution to the area. With traffic flow away from residents in the area, this provides for a tranquil setting in the midst of a bustling major blvd (Coors) and several businesses around. Several residents and citizens frequent Defined Fitness gym and run/walk/bike up and down Winterhaven Rd and are able to do so without the added stress of possibly being struck by a vehicle. Solution is to add a dedicated continuous flow lane in the WB lane of Montano to NB Coors that allows vehicles to merge onto Coors without stopping (continuous striped lane). Currently during rush hour, vehicles turn off of WB Montano and onto Winterhaven then go WB onto Montano Plaza to avoid traffic and the light. Allowing traffic to continue NB on Winterhaven rd will not fix the traffic problem but will instead create more traffic and more potential for crashes as cars will now be turning left near the Village Inn restaurant. [summarized]	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. Also an interchange is recommended in the Plan that would provide the suggested flow lane from WB Montano to NB Coors. [Note: the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions regarding the site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision the Bosque (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does however still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla.]	
91	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Rivenburgh, R.	Objects to Winterhaven connector: The increase in traffic will have a severe negative impact on all subdivisions located east of Winter Haven if this plan stands as proposed. If extending Winterhaven is inevitable due to the need of a connector street for emergency personnel I would like Winterhaven developed into an attractive residential street. A landscaped median and stop signs would make nice additions. This would also cut down on the motorists who would use Winter Haven to circumvent the Montano-Coors interchange.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. The ultimate design would address safety and other considerations.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
92	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Sharrett, S.	Attached is the document regarding opposition to connection (vehicle connector) between Winter Haven NW and La Orilla, remitted July 7, 2006 and the decision to have only a pedestrian connector. It describes fully the reason to prevent consideration of a vehicle connector again, with the current Proposed 2014 Draft of Coors Corridor Plan. traffic problems at Coors and Montano have existed for some time because of no right turn lanes going north from Montano west.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. Staff confirms that the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions on site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision for Bosque Plaza (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla. The recommended interchange at Coors/Montano includes the right turn lanes from WB Montano to NB Coors.	
93	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Strosnider, T.	Objects to Winterhaven connector: As the Developer and Builder of Las Casitas Del Rio and Las Casitas Del Rio Dos Subdivisions through The Strosnider Company, we were told by the City of Albuquerque prior to development that "No" Through Traffic would be allowed at that time or in the future. The Environmental Planning Commission stated that All Commercial and Retail Traffic would have access off of Coors. There are 10 access points from the Commercial / Retail side (West) of Winter Haven onto Winter Haven and 11 access points from the residential side (East) of Winter Haven onto Winter Haven all between Montano (South) and the dead end of Winter Haven to the (North) approximately .5 of a mile. 21 access points onto Winter Haven with more Traffic and Speed, may be a Huge Liability Issue in the Making for the City of Albuquerque. As a former APD Reserve Officer I have witnessed the many citations issued due to extreme speeding and drag racing on Winter Haven (speed limit 30 mph) at all hours. Drivers turn north off of Montano and race to Montano Plaza Road NW and back on to Coors, heading North to bypass the intersection at Coors and Montano. There is The Children's Christian Home between the Las Casitas Del Rio and Las Casitas Del Rio Dos Subdivisions, with the bus stop right on Winter Haven, that makes this a Huge Safety Issue for the children.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. Staff confirms that the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions on site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision for Bosque Plaza (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla. The recommended interchange at Coors/Montano includes the right turn lanes from WB Montano to NB Coors.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
94	48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Stucker, S. & J.	We are concerned with the increased traffic on both Coors and Montano compared to 2003 when we bought our home here next to the Bosque. Winterhaven is not a through street and the No Left Turn onto Montano from Winterhaven has helped keep the traffic low on our street. However, traffic coming off Montano onto Winterhaven is still fairly busy, with little speed control. Since our home at 3616 Yippee Calle Ct NW sides to Winterhaven, we are very concerned about keeping this street as it now is and not becoming a through street.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study. [Note: the EPC has not sanctioned a vehicular connection between Bosque Plaza commercial center and Winterhaven or the shopping center to the south, in its decisions regarding the site development plans. The approved site development plan for subdivision the Bosque (1004167, 06DRB-01367, 10/04/06) does however still show a 24' private access and public drainage easement between Winterhaven and the center's internal street. This internal street, Bosque Plaza Lane, is shown as a 50' private roadway easement connecting Coors Blvd. and La Orilla.]	
<b>Driveways</b>						
95	48	C.8.2 vi)	COA Transportation Development Services	Re. Visibility: please add "Location must be approved by Transportation Engineer of governing jurisdiction".		Add language for clarity

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Right-of-way</b>						
96	50	C.9	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	How much more right-of-way (ROW) is needed along Coors Blvd. to add the transit and bicycle lanes? How much of the existing landscape buffer will be lost to expand the roadway? How will additional ROW affect adjacent residents and businesses? Some areas do not seem to have any ROW to add to a BRT system; how will that be handled?	The 1984 Plan established a ROW of 156 ft for Coors. The 2014 Plan establishes typical sections of 160 ft along Coors from Central to the Bypass, and along the Bypass itself. The exception is intersections that have a potential BRT station where the typical section is 200 ft, and if combined with turn lanes, 210 to 225 ft. The resulting difference ranges from 4 ft to 69 ft. to accommodate multiple modes. 11 potential BRT stations are proposed along a stretch of over 10 miles between Central and Ellison (see Figure C-14 through C-20 beginning p. 58). Existing "landscape buffer" on adjoining properties that are already developed may be reduced where BRT stations cannot be accommodated in the existing ROW. However, new development and redevelopment would need to comply with requirements, including a minimum 15-foot landscape setback/buffer (see D.3.3 i) on p. 89) at locations where additional ROW is needed.	
97	50	C.9.1	COA DMD, Engineering Division	"bicycle lanes" and "curb and gutter" should be explicitly added to the six other structural elements of Coors Blvd. and Coors Bypass.		Add suggested language
98	50, 68, 69	C.9.0, Figure C-17, Table C-5 1.	Dadian, P.	<p>My home is the biggest investment of my life and all of this affects the value of my home. It sits above Coors [west side] directly across from the Bosque School, and as it will be affected by both the Transportation and Design Overlay portions, I have the following questions and concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- My home is on infill with a slope down to Coors and am concerned about the fact that approximately 157 feet of right of way will be used, and will the stability of my lot be taken into consideration? At present, I already experience some vibration from the traffic and see car lights on my ceiling. While I was aware when the house was built that traffic would be a factor over the years the pollution has also grown. Hence my apprehension for this plan.</li> <li>- Are there plans for sound deterrent retaining walls that will not interfere with my view?</li> </ul> <p>I so hope that common sense will be used along this corridor, and while I realize that change is inevitable, the zoning and planning seem to be in direct conflict with what this major street can handle.</p>	The need for any additional ROW in in this particular location would be determined in the longer term, when NMDOT and other relevant agencies begin implementing the multi-modal recommendations in the Plan. Environmental and engineering analysis are part of that process. Noise abatement is addressed in C.12 p. 53.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Right-of-way, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass</b>						
99	39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 1.	Torres, H.	How close will the additional lanes be to our property lines? What will be done to provide safety from cars accidents from landing in our backyards where our children play.	Minimal additional right-of-way would be required to accommodate transit lanes along the Bosque Meadows subdivision, since it is between major intersections and no BRT station is identified in the immediate area. Impacts on adjacent properties are evaluated and addressed in the course of project development and design.	
100	75	Table C-7 1.	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	Re. the Curbside BRT option, concerned that we have recently made costly landscape improvements that may be in jeopardy due to the potential property needed for the BRT lane and a sidewalk. Concerned that changes would be necessary so soon after the plans were approved by the City and DOT. Re. requirement for retaining walls to be set back 10' from ROW: our approved landscaping improvement included a retaining wall located on our property line.	Approved landscaping and retaining walls are grandfathered in. Although the Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass segment is identified as Priority 1 (see p. 167 in F. Appendix), actual implementation of a BRT project takes time as it involves environmental, engineering and financial evaluation.	
<b>Right-of-way, Central Ave. to I-40</b>						
101	50, 58, 59	Figure C-14, Table C-2 1., C.9	May, C., Trinity Broadcasting Network	Trinity holds a license from the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") to operate KNAT-TV in Albuquerque from its main studio facility at 1510 Coors Road, NW. It is only authorized to carry out its broadcast operations at its current facility, and changes may only be made with prior approval of the FCC. It is imperative that no use, permitting, zoning, or other changes be made as a consequence of the 2014 Plan which would interrupt, seek to modify, or interfere with KNAT-TV's operations at Coors Road, NW. At its main studio on Coors Road, NW. KNAT-TV operates with a microwave antenna, antenna tower, and satellite dish antenna. These are unique, licensed facilities not subject to third-party changes. Trinity believes it is extremely important to fully balance the intentions and goals of the 2014 Plan with the unique and compelling needs of KNAT-TV as a broadcast facility licensed to serve the public interest and the greater Albuquerque community.[summarized, full comment, incl. citations from Telecommunications Act 47 U.S. C. § 253(a), (b) & (d) (1996) and exhibits, is att. to June 5th staff report]	Implementation of BRT would involve extensive environmental, technical and financial evaluation. Any property-owners affected by additional ROW needs would be compensated appropriately.	
102	50, 58, 59	Figure C-14, Table C-2 1., C.9	Hernandez, M.	My Aunt lives on Dolores with her backyard to Coors. My neighbor and friends are in that area. I do business in that area with restaurants between Hanover and Iliff traveling Coors. There is a lot of activity there, example: unauthorized dangerous U-turns. I would like to keep the area from Coors east free of traffic and as quiet as possible. I am opposed to adding landscaping/landscaping strips in the Coors area or any area where residential homes and businesses would have to be vacated. Those areas could save feet for someone's home or business. Use medians for the dedicated bus lane so as not to vacate residential areas or businesses. Why do we need a dedicated bus lane which would only be traveled every twenty minutes? There are narrow parts on Central where residences and businesses are NOT proposed to be vacated [for BRT].	The Right-of-Way policy and typical street sections in the Plan provide two options for accommodating multiple modes of travel on Coors Blvd. over the long term to address increasing traffic.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Streetscape Design</b>						
103	51	C.10.1	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	In fifth sentence, could street furniture be added to the definitions of the plan making reference to bus stop amenities, and could landscaping be defined to include street furniture? That way bus stop amenities become a permissible part of the landscaping. [See also comment re. D.3.3 iv) b.]		Make addition, but also include language to ensure that street furniture as well as landscaping maintains safe sight distances.
104	51	C.10.1	Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	Complete median landscaping as exists west of La Luz and Andalucia to improve overall appearance.	Median landscaping would be implemented as part of road projects in the Coors ROW (C.10.1) or City-initiated public projects (see E.2 p. 109). In both cases, they will need to be coordinated with a potential BRT project, which may be designed to run in the median rather than at curbside.	
105	51	C.10.2	COA Planning, Project Staff	Accommodate possible changes to City operations by not specifying which departments are responsible.		In last sentence, delete "(typically by the City Parks Department)".
106	51, 109	C.10, E,2	Stucker, S. & J.	We have recently retired and are very interested in how the Plan affects our home here in Bosque Montano on Winterhaven. We welcome any beautification of Coors Road as it is definitely lacking in comparison to other roads in our area. It should reflect the beauty it frames to both the East along the Rio Grande and the volcanos to the West.	Addressed in Plan.	
<b>Public Viewsites</b>						
107	52	C.11.2	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	How much density is the plan promoting on the eastside of Coors Boulevard in the view preservation areas? Are public viewsites meant to replace lost views along the eastside of Coors?	The Plan is not promoting any particular density in the View Preservation area. Density usually refers to residential density or the number of dwelling units (DUs) per acre. It is controlled by the underlying zoning not by the Design Overlay Zone (DOZ) in the Plan. It is unclear what is meant by "lost views". Policy C.11 is about enhancing the public's enjoyment of scenic views from Coors north of Western Trail/Namaste by incorporating viewsites in the public ROW for pedestrians and trail-users. Potential locations for public viewsites on and near Coors in the area north of Western Trail/Namaste are identified in Maps E-1 through E-3 (see p. 111 - 113).	
<b>Traffic Noise</b>						
108	53	C.12	Eatman	With increased traffic on Coors, residents whose back yards border with Coors notice increased noise level on a regular basis. Whether a bus or 4th [general purpose] lane is added, a tall sound wall would be needed along Bosque Meadows subdivision to mitigate the noise and motion of vehicles.	Noise abatement criteria and procedures would be followed, as described in the Plan.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
109	53	C.12	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	A tunnel of walls along a roadway is very unattractive and would be detrimental to the Parkway concept for Coors. 1) Walled developments have been built right up against Coors, blocking views and providing only a blank wall to look at. Will noise walls be built for the walled subdivisions that were built so close to the roadway? It seems wrong for the public to pay for noise mitigation. 2) In new development, the draft should require sufficient building setbacks and sound-deadening insulation near Coors to abate the traffic noise. Quiet asphalt should be specified and reapplied as necessary to Coors Blvd. Elevated roadways should be analyzed for noise impacts before they are built, to see if the traffic noise will increase and extend further out to surrounding neighborhoods. 3) Propose using language from the May 2007 draft plan [same as policy 10 on p. 44 of 1984 plan][summarized]	The Plan calls for noise abatement to be integrated into the engineering study phase of future roadway projects, and for noise walls to be designed with consideration for other applicable regulations, such as pedestrian access, wall design and view protection. The cost of noise walls or other abatement measures within the ROW would be included in any given roadway project. Since major projects are typically funded from a range of sources including federal funds, they would be borne by the taxpayers at large. There is no code requirement to sound-proof buildings due to traffic noise, per the City's Chief Building Official.	To clarify that noise abatement measures would apply to future projects and not retroactively, insert phrase in C.12.1: "The City and the NMDOT shall consider measures to abate traffic noise as part of future engineering studies performed <u>for major roadway projects recommended</u> within the corridor." [For information: see NMDOT Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise at <a href="http://www.dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Plans_Specs_Estimates/Design_Directives/2011/IDD-2011-02.pdf">http://www.dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Plans_Specs_Estimates/Design_Directives/2011/IDD-2011-02.pdf</a> ; Federal Law Public Law No. 92-574, 86 Stat. 1234 (1972) Noise Pollution and Abatement Act of 1972, codification amended at 42 U.S.C. 4901-4918 (1988); City Noise Ordinance, which addresses noise from individual motor vehicles only in § 9-9-9.]
110	53	C.12	Torres, H.	How will the traffic noise pollution be addressed?	See section C.12 in the Plan.	
111	53	C.12	West Mesa NA Petition (147 signatures)	Express concern about the impact of widening Coors Blvd on noise levels. Distrusts the City and NMDOT because a noise wall tied to the rebuilding of the I-40/Coors interchange on the east side of Coors in the Hanover-Iliff area was never implemented. [summarized]	The Plan calls for noise abatement to be integrated into the engineering study phase of future roadway projects and for measures to be implemented as appropriate.	
112	53	C.12.1	Hernandez, M.	Asks for a tall buffer/noise wall for residential areas, especially between Hanover and Iliff.	The Plan calls for noise abatement to be integrated into the engineering study phase of future roadway projects and for measures to be implemented as appropriate.	
<b>Travel Lanes</b>						
113	63	Table C.3.2	COA Planning, Project Staff	In Policy column, delete "and an auxiliary lane in each direction" and move sentence beginning "Future Study -..." below text for BRT in same cell. In Existing Condition (2012)/Potential Change column, reword 1st sentence "Identify and secure sufficient ROW at various locations from Quail Road through Sequoia Road to accommodate elevated northbound lanes." and move it below text for BRT in same cell.		Revise for accuracy and clarity.
<b>Corridor Segment Recommendations</b>						
114	67, 70, 73, 75	Tables C-4, C-5, C-6, C-7	COA DMD, Engineering Division	On page 67 in Table C-4, on page 70 in Table C-5, and on page 73 in Table C-6, Item 8 under Existing Conditions/Proposed Change, it states that on-street bike lanes are not provided when indeed they do exist over these sections of roadway. For Table C-7 bike lanes exist only in the northbound direction from Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass.		Make appropriate corrections

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Corridor Segment Recommendations, Central to I-40</b>						
115	58	Figure C-14	West Mesa NA Petition	Concerned about the difficulty of accessing neighborhoods [east of Coors Blvd.] due to the proposals for Coors Blvd.	No changes are proposed in the 2014 Plan to the existing intersections of Coors with neighborhood streets, which includes 5 signalized intersections. The West Mesa neighborhood east of Coors in this segment is well-established and pre-dates the 1984 Plan.	
<b>Corridor Segment Recommendations, St Josephs to Paseo del Norte</b>						
116	66-72	Tables C-4, C-5, C-6	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	While TRNA has been very supportive of mass transit for the Westside, the proposed BRT system will require an added transit lane. What can the community expect in terms of needed ROW to add the extra transit lane and 8 ft. bike lane? How much landscape buffer will be lost?	The potential needed ROW is addressed in the cited tables, and varies. The impact on existing landscape buffer, if any, would also vary. The lead agency for a BRT project would want to minimize the amount of additional ROW required as much as possible.	
117	68, 70	Figure C-17, Table C-5 8.	Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	Improve pedestrian crossover at Montano and Coors which is nearly impossible to traverse	Continuous sidewalks along Coors are to be provided in this area. The conceptual design for an interchange at Coors/Montano (Figure C-8 p. p. 48) includes sidewalks on Montano that are grade-separated from Coors.	
118	71	Figure C-18	Melloy, B., vacant property at NEC Coors/Eagle Ranch	The proposed Connector Street appears to be on the eastside of our property.	Yes, the proposed alignment is along the relocated Corrales Main Canal. No change, since the connector is subject to a feasibility study (see p. 48 C.8.3).	
119	71	Figure C-18	Melloy, B., vacant property at NEC Coors/Eagle Ranch	The elimination of the SIPI road signal could negatively affect the value of the property.	The status of the signal has always been temporary. Due to its proximity to the Paseo del Norte/Coors interchange, it would be removed when the interchange is improved, and alternative access between SIPI Rd. and Eagle Ranch Rd. would be provided for the properties in the SE quadrant of the intersection.	
120	71, 72	Figure C-18, Table C-6 1.	Melloy, B., vacant property at NEC Coors/Eagle Ranch	The proposed BRT station appears to be on our property. The Coors Corridor Plan indicates that "additional ROW is necessary at the intersection of Eagle Ranch and Coors". How will this affect our property?	The general location is shown. BRT stations would be constructed within the right-of-way as illustrated in Typical Sections on p. 30-31. Additional right-of-way may be needed to accommodate a BRT station, and any affected property-owner would be duly compensated.	



Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
121	71, 73	Figure C-18, Table C-6 8.	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	The Plan could describe how improved public transportation would allow for increased access to the Open Space Visitor Center (OSVC). Example: Page 73, Section 8: A multi-use trail leading to the OSVC along the La Orilla Channel from a BRT stop at Eagle Ranch Road would provide citizens more opportunities to visit the OSVC and adjacent trails in the RGVSP.	A multi-use trail is proposed along the canal in other Plans as shown on the map on p. 150.	
122	72	Table C-6 1.	COA Planning, Project Staff	Correct errors in Existing Condition/Potential Change column. Existing ROW should be "- South of La Rambla Street: 205 feet, - North of La Rambla Street: 156 feet"		Make correction.
<b>Corridor Segment Recommendations, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass</b>						
123	76	Table C-7	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	If available, specify the details of the Calabacillas pedestrian/bicycle grade separation in Section 8.	No details are available at this stage. The tables present the multi-modal policy recommendations by road segment. The corresponding Policy C.5.5 ii) on page 40 states that the type and specific location of proposed pedestrian/bike crossings will be determined by future planning & engineering studies.	
<b>Driveways, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass</b>						
124	76	Table C-7 5.	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	Our south entrance on Coors is our main entrance, which accesses our Sales, Service and Parts departments. All deliveries made to the dealership use this driveway because it offers the necessary room for large trucks. It is also the only left turn access [onto Coors] exiting the property. Our center entrance northbound access was eliminated with the construction of the median from Irving to Coors Bypass. The north entrance to our property is via Westside Dr. I am not aware of any consolidation opportunities with this access, but eliminating it would be devastating for our business as well as the dealership located to our north.	The existing driveways on Coors are grandfathered in. The Plan recommends consolidating them <i>if property is redeveloped</i> . Alternative access would be secured before existing access is eliminated. The Plan does not recommend closure of the driveway on Westside Dr.	Staff believes there is an error in the table (ref. 2) in the comment). Reword "600 feet and 800 feet" to read "800 feet and 1,100 feet."
<b>Definitions of Transportation Terms</b>						
125	83	C.14	COA Transportation Development Services	Add to definitions: Single Point Diamond Interchange		Add: " <b>Single-point diamond interchange:</b> A form of diamond interchange with a single signalized intersection through which all left turns utilizing the interchange must travel. All right turns into and out of ramp approaches are generally free flow."
126	83, 110	C.14, E.3	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Please add definition for "Viewsite" for clarity		Draft a definition and propose an appropriate placement for it in the Plan.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Design Overlay Zone (DOZ)</b>						
127	85	D	Sharrett, S.	The 1984 guidelines and standards do not need to be altered. There are few parcels of land left for developers and there is no reason to lessen the standards, ie. on density, signage, views, 24 hr businesses or drive ups. The Neighborhood Associations and private citizens have fought hard to safeguard the environmental and historical landscape of the Rio Grande and surrounding lands of the Bosque and request that the EPC look specifically to transportation problems. [summarized]	Conditions and City policy in higher-ranked plans have changed over the past 30 years and plans are required to be updated periodically. Land has been acquired by public agencies to safeguard valley landscapes and historical resources.	
<b>Grading and Drainage</b>						
128	86	D.2.4	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Provide for drainage that mitigates the levels of trash coming from outflows located in the Rio Grande Valley State Park (RGVSP), especially at the end of Namaste Road in the San Antonio Oxbow and in the bosque on the northeast side Montañño Bridge.	Not within the plan's scope. The request should be directed to COA DMD-Stormwater, which is the agency responsible for these drains and outfalls.	
129	86	D.2.4.	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	This section seems redundant with p. 91 3.10 ii) .	These are policies that provide the intent for the regulations.	
130	86, 91	D.2.4 i) & ii), D.3.10	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	On p. 86 of the 2014 CCP, the words "should" be changed to "shall", so that the statement is stronger. The limitation on grading of slopes of 10 % or greater is not mentioned. We want to avoid lax cut and fill practices. Older developments in Taylor Ranch built on steep slopes did a good job at terracing down the slopes and providing a better visual effect along our streets. The cut and fill practices that have occurred in the last decade have produced the least attractive developments along Coors. Include policy 2.7 on p. 57 of the 1984 CCP.	Current City practice in Rank 3 planning documents is for policies to express the intent of the plan and to provide guidance for development, and for regulations to specify requirements and guidelines. Therefore the use of "should" is appropriate in policies and of "shall" in regulations of the 2014 CCP. One confusing aspect of the 1984 CCP is that several policies are worded as regulations but are outside the design overlay zone chapter (Issue 4). In the 2014 plan, an Urban Design policy and the Grading & Drainage policies call for developers to respect the natural topography and vegetation of a site and to avoid building on steep slopes. Regulations D.3.10 ii) c. and d. are stronger than the 1984 CCP because they require a grading permit for <b>all</b> developments, not just those on slopes of 10% or greater.	
131	87	D.2.4. iii)	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	In some areas this may increase flooding depending on the timing of the overall system. It is better to leave any ponding other than Water Quality or reuse ponding to the discretion of the City Engineer/Hydrologist.		Consult with City Engineer/Hydrologist
132	91	D.3.1	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	This section is redundant with Section 2.4. I would recommend removing Section 2.4 and using this language.	These are the regulations, whereas D.2.4 is the policy.	
133	91	D.3.10 iii)	COA Hydrology	I appreciate you trying to give developers the heads up on the new stormwater control requirement, however, it is still in its infancy and it is not clear yet what will be "mandatory". Since the drainage and flood control ordinances were mentioned in paragraph (b), I think it would be better to delete iii) altogether.		Staff proposes to revise and convert this section to guidelines for applicants

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>View Preservation Policies</b>						
134	86	D.2.2	Taylor Ranch NA Board - R. Horvath	These policies are not worded clearly and will be open to different interpretations. They should express the importance of the visual impression along Coors Blvd. through quality design and architecture, preservation of the scenic views and natural features. Please reinstate the following language from Issue 4 of the 1984 CCP [see comment letter for specifics], which appear to have worked: general policies a.1 and 2. - views within and beyond the corridor including the rationale and a.3. - new development, which apply to the entire length of the Corridor; general policy a.4 - existing development and the associated design regulation; policy c.1 - view preservation and the associated regulations that apply north of Western Trail on the east side of Coors [= the View Preservation sub-area]. There are only a few locations that have views of the escarpment and volcanoes remaining; building height and placement will be critical to preserve them. Reinstating policy a.4 could help encourage old shopping center sites along Coors to fix up their landscape.	Several of the 2014 Plan Goals (A.6.1 iv), A.6.3 i), ii), and iii)) in combination with the View Preservation Policies (D.2.2), Urban Design and Development Policies (D2.3) and Grading & Drainage policy D.2.4 iv) express the intent of enhancing the public's experience of the Corridor through streetscape and urban design. The streetscape requirements and improvements in the Plan (C.10 and E.2), the General and View Preservation Regulations implement them. Chapter B details the review and approval process for new development and partial redevelopment. Re. "fixing up existing landscape", apparent deficiencies on developed properties can be reported to Code Enforcement for inspection and any appropriate action. It is not realistic for the City to undertake a comprehensive sweep of the 11-mile long corridor.	Replace the 1st sentence under D.1.1 on p. 85 with: <u>"The purpose of the Design Overlay Zone (DOZ) is to establish quality standards for urban development and redevelopment that enhance the Corridor's appearance over time, respect its scenic and natural setting and support multi-modal access."</u>
<b>View Preservation Figures</b>						
135	93	Figure D-1	COA Planning, Long Range	Slightly confusing because there is no textual explanation about which angle to choose for the height maximum (45° or 60°). The image seems to indicate the 45° applies to the first floor only, and the 60° applies to the second floor. However, it is unclear if this is the deciding factor, or if the orientation of the street/building is the deciding factor, as in Figure D-2. It may add clarity to describe in the regulation text that the 60° angle plane applies on the east, west, and south property lines, and 45° angle plane applies on the north property line.		A proposed revision is attached to the August staff report.
136	101	Figure D-3	COA Planning, Long Range	According to the text description, it seems like the View Frame line should be moved slightly southwest to be located on the property corners. It would also be beneficial to label the first site line, which is also the "Edge of View Area." Alternately, a legend could identify the site lines; as shown the label is somewhat buried in the middle of the diagram.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
137	101	Figure D-4	COA Planning, Long Range	The concepts of View Area and View Frame may be more clearly explained by modifying Figure D-4 to demonstrate the individual View Frames that constitute the View Area, similar to Figure D.6. It is unclear what the "Min. Setback" label refers to or its significance.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
138	104	Figure D-9	COA Zoning	Revise elevation view in diagrams to match angles of view windows		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
<b>View Preservation Regs</b>						
139	99	D.4	Fishman, J. for owners of undeveloped property in Andalucia South (SE of Coors/Montano)	Clarification of regulations in 1984 Plan is long overdue. They should balance community interest with development rights of land-owners. Note that buildings farther from Coors can be higher due to perspective, not just due to lower grade.	NA	NA
140	99	D.4	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	View regulations were set up to preserve the spectacular views of the mountains, bosque, and valley. It is an asset the community highly values and provides a positive impression of Albuquerque. They should be kept intact.	Revisions are warranted due to changed conditions, for consistency with higher-ranked plans and to make document clearer for all users.	
141	99	D.4	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Development along Coors has been implemented with the expectations governed by the 1984 Coors Corridor Plan. Property values in the corridor have been established by the existing plan. The draft plan, with its lower expectations and numerous exceptions will negatively impact the value of existing development which adhered to the higher standards contained in the 1984 Plan.	There are continuing opportunities for review and dialogue with Staff about the intent and content of the Plan.	
142	99	D.4	La Luz Landowners Assn - M. Barlow	Retain the view preservation regulations of the 1984 CCP, which are more succinct, understandable and allow fewer loopholes than the draft Plan. They established expectations for lower density and heights and have generally been followed. Remaining sites are not unbuildable. They may not be as profitable initially but in the long run the development restrictions are better for business, property values, quality of life and the reputation of Albuquerque. Except for Tramway, the Coors view corridor has no equal in the City.	The 1984 regulations may be more familiar to some stakeholders, such as residents, but have not generally been easy to understand, apply or enforce over the decades. The 2014 Plan aims to provide more predictability than the 1984 Plan, not loopholes, by specifying review procedures and criteria for justifying deviations.	
143	99	D.4.0	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Emphasize the importance of the intersection of Coors and Montano on the east side near the Bosque School and the Pueblo Montano Picnic area.	The Coors/Montano area is included in the View Preservation sub-area and development would be subject to its regulations for structure height and mass. In addition, policies (D.2.2 & D.2.3) and site design and landscape buffer/setback regulations in the Design Overlay Zone require that development be sensitive to any adjacent Major Public Open Space.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
144	99	D.4.0	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	In accordance with the plans goal 6.3 (.iv) to increase density in appropriate locations to support transit use, could the view preservation regulations be adjusted to allow higher density in Activity Centers?	There is only one activity center, Coors/Montaño Village, to which the View Preservation regulations apply (see p. 137 Map F-13). This activity center is virtually all developed and/or governed by approved site development plans. The majority of the terrain is also at least 10 ft. below the grade of Coors Blvd. The Plan specifies criteria that may justify a deviation to the regulations, including significant job-creation and support for transit use (see p. 22, B.4.3.iii) b).	
145	99	D.4.0	MRMPO	Recommends that land uses and max densities allowed in the underlying zoning (C-1 and C-2) within the View Preservation sub-area not be trumped by the view preservation regulations. Flexibility to the view regulations for transit oriented development should be encouraged.	Land uses are not within the scope of the 1984 or 2014 Plans. The Plans aim to achieve a balance between different aims: improving the transportation function (and appearance) of the Corridor, protecting the unique views to the Sandias in the VP sub-area, and facilitating development appropriate to its context. Categorically favoring one goal over another is not consistent with this approach. Some flexibility for transit-supportive development is already provided in the deviation process and the general building height regulations (see B.4.3.iii) b) and revised D.3.12 ii) b.)	
146	99	D.4.0	Rio Metro	The policy intent, while desirable, may conflict with the need to support higher densities near transit stations. The proposed height and massing standards may have the unintended consequences of: encouraging buildings to be constructed well below the grade of Coors Blvd., thereby precluding main entrances that face Coors and direct pedestrian access to these buildings; buildings being set back farther from Coors and from potential transit stations, so that greater than single-story construction can be achieved; conflicts between developers where one's building affects the view area/window of another; and creating many non-conformities to existing businesses and homes.	The Plans aim to achieve a balance between different aims: improving the transportation function (and appearance) of the Corridor, protecting the unique views to the Sandias in the VP sub-area, and facilitating development appropriate to its context. The View Preservation regulations affect a relatively small sub-area within the plan area as a whole, where scenic, natural and public resources warrant special protection. View windows are only allowed north of Paseo del Norte, where the commercial lots near Coors are at most two deep, before the terrain drops abruptly to the residential area in the river valley below.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
147	105	D.4.3 ii) a.	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Change text (new is underlined): "a. Height 1. No more than <u>33%</u> of the total height of a structure may penetrate above the Horizontal View Plane... 2. No portion of the structure, including but not limited to parapet, building mounted sign and rooftop equipment, may extend above the <u>Sandia mountain ridgeline.</u> "	The 1984 Plan applies the 33% limit to multi-story buildings only and is ambiguous about one story buildings. The 2014 Plan proposes a slightly higher 50% limit that applies to individual structures, balanced by a limit on their individual mass or horizontal expanse.	
148	105	D.4.3 ii) b.	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Change and add text (new is underlined): "b. Mass 1. No more than 30% of an individual structure's width <u>(as seen in the View Area)</u> shall penetrate above the Horizontal View Plane. 2. All structures on the development site shall obscure no more than 50% of the View Area <u>as observed from each Sight Line location on Coors ROW.</u>		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
149	105	D.4.3 ii) b. 1.	COA Zoning	Reword: "No more than 30% of an individual structure's horizontal expanse, as seen in the view area, shall penetrate above the horizontal view plane"		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
<b>View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height &amp; Mass</b>						
150	103, 105	Fig. D-8, D.4.3 ii) a	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	If the site is relatively flat this only allows an 8' tall building? Would it be possible to specify a minimum building height (perhaps 18-20') that is always permissible and anything taller must then comply with the diagram?		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
151	105	D.4.3 ii) a.2	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	If you have already obscured the mountain, why not go taller?	Up to the Sandia mountain ridgeline is the maximum vertical distance that can be obscured by structures, as established in the 1984 Plan. This threshold has been and continues to be valued by the residential community of the West Side, in particular residents in the area north of Western Trail/Namaste on both sides of Coors Blvd.	
152	105	D.4.3	Black Farm Estates HOA	The owners of the Black Farm Estates Homeowners Association have previously built walls along their property lines to afford a greater amount of privacy and security to their individual lots. Due to the fact that the Black Farm Estates HOA borders Coors near Irving, it's possible that the Corridor Plan will impact the future walls being built on the lots. Since not all of the lots are completely developed at this time, will the approval of the Coors Corridor Plan prevent the rest of these lot owners from building additional walls along their property lines? We will ensure that the future homeowner-built walls will match the height and design of the current walls. If this Coors Corridor Plan will prevent this, then we respectfully request the chance to dispute this decision.	Black Farm Estates is located in the View Preservation sub-area north of Paseo del Norte. There is a steep slope and significant difference in elevation (at least 30 ft) between Coors Blvd. and the buildable area of the nearest vacant lots in the subdivision. Rear walls on developed lots in the northern part of the subdivision were built at the base of the steep slope. The height of walls in future development should not be unduly restricted by the proposed regulations.	
<b>View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height &amp; Mass, North of Paseo del Norte</b>						

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
153	106	D.4.3 iii) b	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	How does this window apply when the tracts are owned by different parties? When controlled by one party the view window regulations offer a very good option. But much of the property still to develop north of Paseo Del Norte is single small lots surrounded by properties that are owned by other parties.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
154	107	D.4.3 iii)	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	Commercial properties are affected almost exclusively as the residential subdivisions in this area are 20' or more below street grade. Approximately 11 commercial lots that have not already been developed that are primarily between 1-3 acres with most being 1 acre. They all have adjacent tracts that have already developed on at least one side. These lots are all within subdivisions where the access/frontage roads have been constructed and lots have been graded. The lot elevation has been set to within a couple of feet. Based on the height restrictions, they would be restricted to building heights from 8-12'. Although the View Window option seem to allow more flexibility in the height regulations, it is hard to see how any of these lots will qualify. Since 10' building heights are not viable and the View Window option is not applicable to the majority of the lots north of Paseo Del Norte it would seem reasonable to remove this area from the View Preservation Regulations or have a separate View Presevation Regulation for this area. Perhaps the few remaining lots could be subject to a base height restriction (perhaps 18-20') unless it is demonstrated in a view frame analysis that a taller building would not further restrict views of the Sandia Mountains as viewed from Coors at a 45 degree angle. In essence taller buildings would be allowed if they fit within the view "shadow" created by existing buildings. [Summarized see full comment att.]	The April 2014 draft allows view windows at an angle of 45 to 90 degrees, which addresses some of the concern. The suggestion of a base allowable height is addressed above.	A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
155	107	D.4.3 iii) d.	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	It seems that a Site Plan approved by the EPC should have legal standing. Why would something in addition be required?		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
<b>View Preservation Regulations, View Windows</b>						
156	104	Fig. D-9	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	It would be helpful to show how the 40' is measured in this diagram. Is it measured from along the Coors ROW, or from View Window line to View Window line?		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
<b>View Preservation Definitions</b>						

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
157	100	D.4.1	COA Planning, Long Range	Explain in the introduction paragraph on page 100, Design Overlay Zone, that development within the DOZ is expected to provide an exhibit with a View Frame & Area Plan, View Frame & Area Elevation, View Plane Section, and View Window Elevation, as illustrated in pages 101-105. These are required to demonstrate compliance with the Design Overlay Regulations D.4.2 – D.4.6. This would also set reader expectations in advance of the full Application Requirements on page 106.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
158	100	D.4.1	COA Planning, Long Range	Define sight line first, view frame second, and view area third. This is the conceptual order that you would use to approach developing a view analysis. Then explain that the Figures D-3 through D-7 illustrate these concepts. The third paragraph, second column, should start out with the italicized words "Sight Line." to be consistent with the other definitions.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
159	100	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Restructure the definitions so that they flow in a logical manner. Amend and add definitions. Redraw and add diagrams.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
160	100	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Add definition and 2 diagrams: §1 - "Sight Lines begin at the edge of the roadway and extend to the mountains. In the plan view they are drawn at a 45° angle to the Coors ROW looking approximately Northeast. Sight Lines are chosen to intersect with the highest features of a proposed building. As many sight lines can be chosen as necessary to capture all of the highest features of the building or group of buildings." §2 - "Sight Lines start at a point 4' above the current Coors roadway at the east edge of the east most driving lane. Each sight line extends to the Sandia mountains. "		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
161	100	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Replace with text and 2 diagrams: "A View Frame is a vertical rectangular frame drawn 90° to a given sight line (in the plan view) at the highest point on the proposed building. The top of the view frame is established by the highest point of the Sandia ridgeline in the view frame. The bottom of the view frame is the elevation of the Coors ROW where the sight line begins. The left and right edges of the view frame are an upward projection of the property lines where the view frame crosses the property lines."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
162	100	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Replace with text and diagram: "View Area is the collection of the view frames used in the analysis."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.



Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
163	100	D.4.1, §1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Replace with: "The following definitions explain the terms used in the regulations for view compliance. In general, the key relationships between definitions are these: Sight Lines form the basis for view analysis View Frames are based on Sight Lines View Areas are based on a collection of adjacent View Frames."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
164	100	D.4.1	COA Planning, Long Range	<i>General.</i> The procedure for completing a view analysis and the defined terms are not as clearly explained as in the currently adopted Coors Corridor Plan. It is slightly confusing how all of the elements relate to one another, which is also true of the current Plan. It may be appropriate in the staff report to identify what concepts from the current version are being removed or changed and explain why they are inappropriate.		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
165	103	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Replace with text and diagram: "Horizontal View Plane is used in section views to establish building height limits. The plane is at an elevation 4' above the current (at the time of application) Coors ROW where the sight line begins; see Sight Line definition above. It extends across the entire property toward the mountains."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
166	104	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Replace with: "A View Window is a vertical rectangular portion of the View Area that provides an unobstructed view of the mountains above the View Plane. It applies only to properties north of Paseo del Norte."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.
167	104	D.4.1	La Luz Landowners External Affairs Cttee & Board of Directors - P. Gallagher	Add text and diagram: "Building mass is the relationship between a proposed building and its surroundings in a given View Frame(s). Mass is measured as a proportion of the projected area of the building to the total area of the relevant View Frame(s)."		A proposed revision to the View Preservation Regulations section is attached to the August staff report.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>General Regs</b>						
168	88	D.3	West Mesa NA Petition	Views of the beautiful Sandia Mountains from the Corridor south of I-40 should be protected in the Plan	The Plan aims to strike a balance between protecting scenic resources of the Corridor and encouraging additional development on the West Side per property-owners' entitlements. Like the 1984 Plan, it recognizes that the existing views from Coors to the Sandias vary along the Corridor. While the Sandias are visible from the West Mesa south of I-40, they are less prominent than north of Western Trail--more distant and at a more equal grade to the street. The neighborhoods south of I-40 were also largely zoned and developed prior to 1984. The Plan does not wish to reduce property-owners' existing entitlements without strong justification. Note however that the regulations seek to maintain the open-ness of the Corridor between Central and I-40, and therefore the opportunity for views, by maintaining a 15 ft landscape setback/buffer in developments along Coors (D.3.3 i) p. 89), limiting building heights based on an angle drawn from the outer edge of Coors rather than its centerline (D.3.12 ii) b. p. 93), and limiting the size and height of signs (D.3.16 p. 95).	
169	91	D.3.9i)	COA Zoning	Refers to the landscaping standards of 15% - sector plan shows 20% - Clarify		Planning staff is recommending that the regulation be consistent with the Zoning Code, i.e. that landscape area be 15% of net lot area.
170	94	D.3.13	COA Zoning	Solar access regulations for commercial buildings – Consider preserving solar access of adjoining residential properties only, not of other commercial buildings	No change for now, but consult with Zoning and Building Safety staff	
171	95	D.3.16.i)c	COA Zoning	Clarify “elevated segments”. Add relevant references from Chapter C		Make change
<b>Landscape setback/buffer</b>						
172	89	D.3.3	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	
173	89	D.3.3 ii)	MRGCD	A 5 foot setback from the right-of-way for MRGCD facilities such as the Corrales Main Canal might be acceptable for a wall or fence but is not recommended for any residential or commercial structures, which might be negatively impacted by maintenance activities that produce dirt and flying rock, herbicide spraying and recreational use. A minimum 20 foot setback is recommended for buildings. Additionally, the best protection for the community ditches or acequias (if they exist within the planning area) is to have a similar setback from the outer edge of the maintenance roads or trails along them. [Summarized]		Consider increasing the setback from MRGCD facilities for buildings only. Research whether any community acequias exist in plan area.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
174	89	D.3.3 iv)	Gallegos, K.	I own homes at 5704 Cactus Flower and at 5104 Mirada Drive in the plan area because of my love of the view from the west side to the east. The existing berm on the east side of Coors on the La Luz property blocks a good portion of the view from Coors when traveling north. I learned from an EPC hearing that the La Luz townhome subdivision piled that dirt (the berm) there when they were having work done on their property. One of the commissioners questioned it, but there has been no follow-up. If one of the main intents of the Plan is to preserve the view corridor, this berm would be a violation of that intent. Is it possible to have it removed in order to restore the view? It is the only stretch where you completely lose the view when traveling in the plan area.	Investigate status of this berm. Note that the draft Plan, unlike the existing Plan (p. 91 2.), does not list berms as a potential buffer treatment in the landscape setback along Coors Blvd.	
175	89	D.3.3 iv) b.	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Bus shelters and associated amenities should be allowed here. [See also comment re. C.10.1]		Potential future BRT stations would be accommodated in the public ROW, not within a landscape setback/buffer. However, the Plan can address locations in the Corridor where local (non-BRT) bus stops may not fit in the public ROW.
176	89	D.3.3.i) b	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	What about 35' from back of curb? There are some areas where there is excess ROW that is very unlikely to ever be used even for turn lanes. This is especially true along Coors Blvd [NM448, north of the Bypass].	No change. NMDOT has discretion to deal with situations where the existing ROW exceeds what is proposed in the Plan.	
177	89	D.3.3i)	COA Zoning	"See table c-1 – c-4 & c-9" Clarify/correct references to tables and mention NMDOT's authority over ROW		Make changes
<b>Site Design</b>						
178	89	D.3.2	COA Zoning	Should iii & iv go together	Clarify the comment.	
<b>Setbacks for Structures (other than walls and fences)</b>						
179	90	D.3.4	COA Transportation Development Services	Text: i) ii) iii) iv) must be rewritten, Transportation takes exception to paragraph. The setback requirements established in the sector plan conflict with providing adequate sight distance of driveways and intersections. Sight distance must have priority over setback in these situations, and this needs to be noted in the sector plan.		Revise text to prioritize sight distance.
180	90	D.3.4 i)	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	So 35'+5'=40' For small lots adjacent to Coors/Old Coors this becomes a pretty heavy burden. I wonder if there could be a sliding scale that decreased this buffer for smaller lots?	The landscape buffer/setback is to maintain a minimum buffer along Coors Blvd.(D.3.3. i) b)). It ranges from 15 ft to 35 ft. A reduction is already allowed north of Western Trail/Namaste Rd. on either side of Coors Blvd.: in situations where a turn lane is required to access development, or additional ROW to implement the multi-modal facilities and/or the three major road projects in the plan requires condemnation of adjoining private property. The additional 5 ft of setback is only required if the 35 ft buffer is on a separate parcel and under different ownership from the development site.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Walls and Fences</b>						
181	90	D.3.5 i)	Fishman, J. for owners of undeveloped property in Andalusia South (SE of Coors/Montañó)	Allow perimeter walls within the landscape setback/buffer in order to encourage more creative design. See example of wall along Andalusia residential subdivision which is offset at intervals and combined with landscaping to create an attractive streetscape. As worded, regulation will result in stretches of straight wall.		Revise language
<b>Landscaping</b>						
182	91	D.3.9 i)	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	why is the percentage more than the zoning code requirement of 15%? That makes it much harder to increase density near transit stops.		There are 2 basic components of landscaping: landscape area as a percentage of the total site area (excluding building footprints); and how much of this landscape area will be covered by vegetation (when the plants have reached maturity). In the Zoning Code, the minimums are 15% and 75% respectively. In the Plan, the minimum landscape area is 20% and the required vegetative cover is 50% in a landscape setback/buffer and 75% elsewhere on the site. The 1984 Plan required 20% in parking areas only, and this was extended to the entire site by the 2007 draft plan that was withdrawn from the EPC process. Since then, the traffic forecasts and transit goals from the 2035 MTP have informed a multi-modal strategy for the Corridor, and staff believes it would not undermine the policy balance the Plan is trying to achieve to change 20% to 15% as in the Zoning Code.
183	91	D.3.9 vi)	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	Purpose of regulation? What is coarse gravel?		The intent of this guideline is to discourage a material that does not fit in with the Rio Grande valley environment. Revise to clarify that it refers to cobble and applies north of Namaste as well as east of Coors, where land is part of the river valley not the mesa environment.
184	91	D.3.9 vii)	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	delete "at least 3 ft. from either side of the trails.....for maintenance purposes" and replace with "and in compliance with City Trail Design Standards."		Revise language
<b>Multi-Use Trail Network</b>						
185	91	D.3.7.i) a	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	add "Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan, as adopted," to the adopted City Plans referenced in this sentence.		Update title of facility plan.
186	92		PNM		NA	NA
<b>Architecture</b>						
187	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	In 1st paragraph, eliminate: "They are not intended to discourage innovative forms and materials, nor establish a uniform style throughout the Corridor."	No reason given. This sentence is important in a plan with a 10 to 20 year horizon to encourage creative and functional design and allow for evolution in styles and aesthetics.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
188	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include policy 4.b.2 - building setback, height and bulk from p. 88 of the 1984 CCP.		The site design regulation is a more appropriate place to add language about the relationship of buildings to the roadway and to each other. On p. 88, insert at the beginning of D.3.2 ii) : "Buildings should be located and designed to provide a pleasing and functional relationship to the roadway and to adjacent or related buildings and structures."
189	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include policy 4.b.1 - site design from p. 88 of the 1984 CCP.	Addressed by regulation D.3.2 i) on p. 88 rather than by a policy.	
190	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include policy 4.b.10 - architectural design from p, 99 of the 1984 CCP	Very similar language is in the 1st paragraph (statement of intent) of regulation D.3.14 Architecture.	
191	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural design guideline 1. regarding human scale on p. 99 of the 1984 CCP	This guideline is somewhat vague. Building scale is addressed in 14-16-3-18 of the Zoning Code, and in the View Preservation and Multi-Family Residential regulations of the Plan.	
192	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural design guideline 2. regarding energy considerations on p. 99 of the 1984 CCP	This guideline is somewhat vague. Energy efficiency is addressed through the Building Code. The screening of solar panels is addressed in regulation D.3.14 viii) of the Plan.	
193	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural design guideline 3. regarding "trademark" buildings on p. 100 of the 1984 CCP, which is more direct. There are several franchise buildings along Coors north of I-40 that have followed this guideline - McDonalds and Dairy Queen for example. They blend very nicely with the nearby architecture of the shopping center. We don't want to undermine this accomplishment,		Revise language by deleting last phrase in D.3.14 ii) beginning ", unless it fully complies..."
194	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural design guideline 4. regarding identity of residential units on p. of the 1984 CCP	Addressed by regulation D.3.18 ii) b on p. 97.	Expand intent of D.3.18 by inserting after "break up the mass": ", articulate individual units".
195	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural detail regulation 1. regarding parapet walls on p. 100 of the 1984 CCP.	Addressed by regulation D.3.14 vii) on p. 94.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
196	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural detail regulation regarding screening of mechanical equipment on p. 100 of the 1984 CCP. It should be maintained within the plan rather than relying on the zoning code.	This is addressed by general regulations in the Zoning Code (§14-16-3-18 (C)(6)). Since regulations in the DOZ are only intended to complement or replace regulations of the Zoning Code in order to tailor them to the Coors Corridor, there is no need in this case to duplicate the Zoning Code.	The only possible situation that may warrant special language in the DOZ is where Coors is elevated (over I-40 to Quail) or may become elevated due to the road projects recommended in Chapter C (p. 42 C.6.3, concepts in Figures C-8 through C-11). The Plan could clarify if the roof-top equipment should be screened from view from the frontage road/turn lane accessing the site or from the elevated portion of Coors Blvd. In addition, consider inserting a table that lists the general zoning regulations of the Zoning Code that may apply to development in the Corridor
197	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural detail guideline 1. regarding building entries on p. 101 of 1984 CCP		Strengthen regulation by adding a new viii) in section D.3.14 : "Main entries shall be highlighted with architectural features integral to the building such as wall recesses or roof overhangs that also afford protection from the elements." Renumber the next regulations accordingly.
198	94	D.3.14	Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Include architectural detail guideline 2. regarding predominant building color on p. 101 of 1984 CCP		
<b>Lighting</b>						
199	94	D.3.15 iii)	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	Does this apply to only new uses or will it affect existing uses as well? With the increase of copper theft events in the city it seems to owners in the area that most of the lighting serves a security purpose. Perhaps this could be modified to allow the lighting but with careful attention to light direction and screening for neighborhoods?		Development and approved, current site development plans and building permits that exist at the time of adoption are grand-fathered in. Consider revising language for consistency with the Zoning Code (§14-16-3-9) and the City APD's Crime Prevention Unit's guidelines.
<b>Signage</b>						
200	95	D.3.16	COA Transportation Development Services	Please add text: "Location must be approved by Transportation to ensure stopping/clear sight requirements".		Make change
201	95	D.3.16	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	Signage – The Coors Corridor Plan requires monument signage. Our business has a pole sign, which was approved in 2001. It does meet the size regulations of 75 sq ft. Will this sign be grandfathered?	Yes.	
202	95	D.3.16	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Drive up service windows</b>						
203	96	D.3.17	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Drive up service windows: There is a reason to limit the number of service windows which the plan does not capture. There needs to be more discussion on this.	The Plan does not change zoning (land uses).	
<b>Gated communities and Walled Subdivisions</b>						
204	96	D.3.18	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Walled and gated communities: Don't gated communities conflict with the WSSP? Gated communities are discouraged in the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP). More discussion is needed on walled subdivisions.	Addressed in Plan.	
<b>Multi-Family Residential Development</b>						
205	97	C.3.18.i) e.	MRGCD	MRGCD facilities have very different functions than arroyos and should be discussed and analyzed separately.		Revise language
<b>Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements along Coors Blvd.</b>						
206	109	E.2.2	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Please add Solid Waste Department to the City Departments referenced here.		Parks staff have explained Solid Waste should be included because they are responsible for maintenance of landscaping in the medians.
207	109	E.2.2	COA Planning, Project Staff	Identify maintenance responsibility for sidewalks and landscaping that would be implemented to correct existing deficiencies.		Consultation needed.
208	110	E. 2.2. iii) b.	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Add "and to anticipate possible alignment of BRT in medians in the future".		Add suggested language
<b>Potential Public Viewsites</b>						
209	110	E. 3.3	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Add "and maintenance" to read "...should work jointly to develop a project design, implementation and maintenance strategy."		Add suggested language.
210	111	Map E-1	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	The Graham property is part of the RGVSP and does not necessarily have a special distinction from the rest of the Park. Update trail data for the RGVSP north of Montano.		Correct Map E-1, as well as Maps A-7 and A-8 on p. 11 and 12.
211	112	Map E-2	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Include the Flyway public art project at the northeast corner of Bosque Meadows and Coors, the Bosquecito property and other Open Space properties west of the Piedras Marcada Pueblo site.		Further consultation needed to address.
212	112-113	Maps E-2 & E-3	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	What are the criteria for choosing the viewpoints listed? (#12 and #17)	E.3.2 on p. 110 lists the factors used to recommend location of viewsites.	
<b>Existing and Proposed Bikeways and Multi-Use Trails</b>						
213	114	E.4	MRGCD	We assume the trails indicated for MRGCD facilities on the maps were derived from the MTP Plan. The feasibility of any trails would be considered by the MRGCD on a case by case basis.	Addressed through the Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS) in the MTP and the City's Bikeways & Trails Facility Plan. The Plan does not designate new trails.	
214	147	Map F-23	COA DMD, Engineering Division	The green line identifying a multi-purpose trail should be a bicycle lane between Central Ave. and Fortuna Road (per the Long Range Bikeway Systems map).		Coordinate correction with Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan.
215	146-151	Maps F-22 through F-27	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Maps need updated trail information for proposed and existing unpaved and multi-use trails.		Correct maps, in coordination with Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan.

Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
<b>Changed Conditions</b>						
216	119	F.2.5	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Include the Bosquecito property and Flyway public art project in the list. Additionally, the Montañño Picnic area is formally called the Pueblo Montañño picnic area.		Make revisions
<b>Traffic Congestion Profile</b>						
217	127	Map F-3	MRMPO	Replace with the most current profile for Coors Blvd. from 2012.		Make change
<b>AMAFCA &amp; MRGCD Facilities</b>						
218	140-145	Maps F.16 through F-22	AMAFCA	Change title to Drainage Facilities. Many of the facilities designated as AMAFCA are owned and maintained by the City of Albuquerque. We spend considerable time and effort to inform the public and other agencies of our maintenance facilities, and don't want a published document to conflict with our Drainage Facilities Map. (marked up maps provided)		Correct maps.
<b>Miscellaneous</b>						
219			Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	There appears to be three main portions in the draft plan: transportation, design guidelines and view preservation. The community has raised many questions concerning the new plan. It is too immense to tackle all three portions in the draft at once. More time is needed to address all the issues raised. It has been suggested that the plan be broken into more manageable portions for public review and comment. It would be wrong to approve a plan the community is not happy with. We would all end up dealing with its shortcomings and problems associated with poorly planned unattractive developments.	There are continuing opportunities for review and comment through the EPC process and later at Council.	
220			Taylor Ranch NA, Land Use Director - R. Horvath	Please include Mr. David A. Crane's commentary (1984 CCP pg. VIII) in the 2014 Plan. It provides an endearing perspective on the need to preserve the unique features along Coors Blvd. with a strong Sector Development Plan. His commentary is still appropriate today.	The commentary dates from a 1970 urban design study commissioned by the City. While it may be timeless and universal in certain respects, the commentary is not specific to the Coors Corridor nor as relevant to it today given that most of the land in the Corridor is now either public (e.g. City Open Space, State Park), developed or approved for development. Development in the Coors Corridor would continue to be regulated by special regulations under the updated Plan.	



Comment #	Page	Section	Commenter (Name/Organization)	Comment	No Change	Change
221			Atkins, A.	Concerned about the lack of upkeep and maintenance, (primarily weed/grassy overgrowth, trash, abandoned grocery carts, etc.) along the pedestrian areas west of 57th Street leading into the residential areas of Quail, Redlands, Sequoia and St. Josephs. These border commercial areas which are visible from numerous points along 57th Street. The appearance of neglect contributes to a decline of neighborhoods along this path of the Corridor. It is my understanding that the removal of unsightly trash and overgrown vegetation along these pedestrian connections is the responsibility of the City of Albuquerque. Is concerned about the value of residential property, within the existing Coors Corridor Boundary, and just outside the Design Overlay Zone designated in the draft Plan. These public pedestrian areas should be a top priority in the Plan and would be of tremendous benefit to the entire Westside community, it would ultimately enhance our city's image of a jewel in the desert. [summarized]	Outside the scope of the long-range Coors Corridor Plan. Staff provided enforcement information to the commenter.	
222			Gallegos, A. B.	Propose a turning (arrow) signal from westbound Sequoia to southbound Coors. I have continually experienced during the school year sitting through up to three cycles because traffic is backed up in the intersection all the way north of St. Joseph's. Due to the high volume of traffic and the current design of Coors the problem has continued to worsen.	The proposal to change an existing signal is an operational matter that is outside the scope of this long-range plan, but the commenter may wish to pursue it with the NMDOT.	
223			Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase enforcement of sign ordinance regarding temporary signs ( ie; beer, pizza,etc. and political campaign signs)</li> <li>- Encourage property owners ( best example: Montano Plaza Shopping Center) to improve condition of property, ( ie: remove dead trees/bushes, install landscaping in barren areas, remove weeds and litter on a regular basis.)</li> </ul>	Outside the scope of a long-range plan, as these are enforcement issues. They can be reported to the City at any time by calling 311.	