

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
48	C.8.3	Connector Streets	Abeyta, A.	My home is located in the Bosque Montano sub-division on Yippee Calle Ct close to Winter Haven and Montano street 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. Also, with the proposed extension, the long stretch of Winter Haven will surely encourage more speeders. 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.	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study.	
140-145	Maps F.16 through F-22	AMAFCA & MRGCD Facilities	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.
		Weeds, trash along westside of 57th St.	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. Many of these streets border commercial areas which are visible from numerous points along 57th Street. There is an appearance of neglect which 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. Concerned about the value of residential property, which is within the existing Coors Corridor Boundary, and just outside the Design Overlay Zone designated in the draft Plan. These public pedestrian areas should be viewed as a top priority in the Plan. It 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. Provided enforcement information.	
105	D.4.3	VP, Structure Height and Mass	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.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
29 -32, 40	Figures C-3 through C.6, C.5.4	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	Brewster, S.	<p>I am a Taylor Ranch resident who bicycles and buses for transportation around the Westside. My husband also 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; therefore, I have a few suggestions regarding the Coors Corridor Plan.</p> <p>Generally, in planning each roadway design I hope the planners put bicyclists' safety as a top priority. I am concerned that the current plan jeopardizes bicyclists' safety and dissuade bicyclists from using the new infrastructure. Statistics gathered by American League of Bicyclists from National Highway Transportation Safety Administration indicate that 726 bicycles were killed by automobiles in 2012. 40 % of those were hit from behind. More specifically, 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, like a landscaping strip, as opposed to just a painted 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 to the current plan for Coors which seems to use only striping as buffers.</p>		Consider potential change in consultation with NMDOT and other relevant departments and agencies.

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Connector Streets	Clark, S.	<p>Adverse effects of opening Winterhaven to through traffic to/from Bosque Plaza and Orilla.</p> <p>a) 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. If the northern half of Winterhaven becomes a throughway to Orilla, I am certain there will be a large increase in the volume of commuter traffic using Winterhaven. Many of us enjoy walking across Winterhaven to access the businesses of Montano and Riverside Plazas, but I don't think there are any formal crosswalks to protect us. I believe we addressed "speeders" with the City, including requesting possible "speed bumps" but this idea was deemed unacceptable (by the City). There is also a children's home along Winterhaven. I believe this change in traffic will result in an increased risk for pedestrian and bicyclists' injury and death. b) There are several moderate to large undeveloped commercial spaces along Bosque Plaza. Making Winterhaven a throughway will obviously result in an increase in traffic because of these businesses; not just shoppers but truck traffic as well. Sagebrush Church, at the eastern end of Orilla, has seen its membership mushroom in the past few years, necessitating traffic police intervention at the intersection of Orilla and Coors, for the huge volume of service attendees. Imagine how many of these churchgoers will use Winterhaven to access Sagebrush from Montano and Coors. Sunday mornings are currently our most peaceful during the week. c) This increased traffic will mean much more noise, ground and air pollution, litter and trash, which will affect not only our residential communities, but the adjacent bosque and its fragile ecosystem. The bosque is at the end of my one block street.</p>	No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study.	
67, 70, 73, 75	Tables C-4, C-5, C-6, C-7	Corridor Segment Recommendations	COA 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.		OK
147	Map F-23	Existing and Proposed Bikeways and Multi-Use Trails	COA 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).	The LRBS map is in error. The map should be updated as appropriate before adoption of the Coors Corridor Plan	
29-32	Figures C-3 through C-6	Multi-Modal Strategy	COA 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.
87	D.2.5 i)	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Policies	COA 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.		OK

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
50	C.9.1	Right-of-Way	COA Engineering Division	On page 50 under Section 9.1, a reference to "bicycle lanes" should be explicitly added to the six other structural elements of Coors Blvd. and Coors Bypass.		OK
91	D.3.10 iii)	Grading and Drainage	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.		Partial revision underway
119	F.2.5	Changed Conditions	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Include the Bosquecito property and Flyway public art project in the list. Additionally, the Montaña Picnic area is formally called the Pueblo Montaña picnic area.		OK.
76	Table C-7	Corridor Segment Recommendations	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 policies in Chapter C by road segment. 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.	
146-151	Maps F-22 through F-27	Existing and Proposed Bikeways and Multi-Use Trails	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	Maps need updated trail information for proposed and existing unpaved and multi-use trails.		OK
86	D.2.4	Grading and Drainage	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 northwest side of Montaña Bridge.	Not within plan scope. The request should be directed to the agency responsible for drains that have outfalls to the state park and bosque.	
13	Map A-9	Jurisdictions and Regulatory Sub-Areas	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.		OK.
45, 72	C.7.3., Table C-6 3.	Median Openings, Corridor Segment Recommendations	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.		Difficult access has also been raised as an issue by several residents of Bosque Meadows subdivision. Recommend that staff & transportation consultant meet with all stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore potential solutions.
23	Glossary	Open Space	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	"high impact recreation" should be removed from Open Space purposes		OK

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
71, 73	Figure C-18, Table C-6 8.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	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.		Consult with relevant department and make changes as appropriate.
111	Map E-1	Potential Public Viewsites	COA Parks & Rec, Open Space Division	o The Graham property is part of The RGVSP and does not necessarily have a special distinction from the rest of the Park. o Update trail data for the RGVSP north of Montano.		OK. Maps A-7 and A-8 on p. 11 and 12 should also be corrected.
112	Map E-2	Potential Public Viewsites	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.
112-113	Maps E-2 & E-3	Potential Public Viewsites	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.	
99	D.4.0	View Preservation Regulations	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.	
91	D.3.9 vii)	Landscaping	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."		OK
91	D.3.7.i) a	Multi-Use Trail Network	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 throughout Coors Corridor Plan document prior to adoption.
39	C.5.2 i)	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	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".		OK, although qualify that it applies to City trails; some may be County trails.
39	C.5.3	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	add "as part of development" at the end of the sentence.		OK, for clarity.
110	E. 3.3	Public Viewsites	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	add "and maintenance" to read ...should work jointly to develop a project design, implementation and maintenance strategy."		OK, for completeness.
83, 110	C.14, E.3	Public Viewsites	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	Please add definition for "Viewsite" for clarity		OK

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
109	E.2.2	Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements along Coors Blvd.	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.
110	E. 2.2. iii) b.	Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements along Coors Blvd.	COA Parks & Rec, Planning & Design	add "and to anticipate possible alignment of BRT in medians in the future".		OK.
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
93	Figure D-1	View Preservation Figures	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
101	Figure D-3	View Preservation Figures	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
101	Figure D-4	View Preservation Figures	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Regs	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
22	B.4.3.iii) b, 4th bullet point	Exceptions & Deviations	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.		Under consideration.
23	B.6.0	Glossary	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	please explain what MTP is, similar to the TIP definition		Draft definition
23	B.6.0	Glossary	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	please consult with Tony Sylvester (MRCOG) to ensure the accuracy of the RMRTD definition		OK
35	C.3.4	Highway Component	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	we use “dependability and timeliness” rather than speed and reliability.		OK
89	D.3.3 iv) b.	Landscape setback/buffer	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Transit 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 the period before BRT is implemented and a few locations in the Corridor where local (non-BRT) bus stops may not fit in the public ROW.
91	D.3.9 i)	Landscaping	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.		The Plan is trying to achieve a balance between different aims. Allowing 15% in Activity Centers is a possible compromise.
26	C.2.1	Multi-Modal Strategy	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Coors is a Major Transit Corridor. See Comp Plan II-83 for order of modes.	Coors is both a Major Transit Corridor and an Arterial per the Comp Plan. It 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.	
28	Figure C-2	Multi-Modal Strategy	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	could you please make Figure C-2 bigger than the photos on the page?		OK
32	Figure C-6	Multi-Modal Strategy	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.		OK
29-32	Figures C-3 through C-6	Multi-Modal Strategy	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.	Covered in C.2.1	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
40	C.5.4 ii)	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	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.		Consider clarifying language.
40	C.5.6	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	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.		OK
15	A.7.1 iii)	Plan scope, Transportation	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.		Consult with DMD and MRMPO
20	B.3.2 iii)	Public Projects	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	Will developers contribute to streetscape and pedestrian-oriented improvements as well?	This section is about public sector projects. Developers are expected to provide sidewalks, street trees, etc. in new developments.	Investigate how to address maintenance responsibility for sidewalks and landscaping that would be implemented to correct existing deficiencies (see E.2).
20	B.3.2 iv)	Public Projects	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	does this exclude the possibility of easements on private property for a "viewsite"?	No. See p. 110, E.3.4 and p. 22 B.4.3.iii) b, 5th bullet point	
51	C.10.1	Streetscape Design	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	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.]		OK, but use this opportunity to ensure that street furniture as well as landscaping maintain safe sight distances.
36	C.4.2	Transit Component	COA Transit, ABQ RIDE	(4.2) first paragraph, see note on page 29: Maybe a cross reference on all the cross sections to this section would provide "more explanation".		
38	C.4.5	Transit Component	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.	
99	D.4.0	View Preservation Regulations	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/Montano 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).	
83	D.14	Definitions of Transportation Terms	COA Transportation Development Services	Add to definitions: Single Point Diamond Interchange		Provide definition.
48	C.8.2 vi)	Driveways	COA Transportation Development Services	Re. Visibility: please add "Location must be approved by Transportation Engineer of governing jurisdiction".		OK



Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
90	D.3.4	Setbacks for Structures (other than walls and fences)	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.		OK
39	C.5.1.iii)	Sidewalks	COA Transportation Development Services	The responsibility for implementation and maintenance of sidewalks shall be as follows: a. text and b. text is incorrect. Transportation requests removal of this paragraph in its entirety. The COA Sidewalk Ordinance addresses responsibility.		Under consideration. Review Sections 6-5-5-1 et seq. (City) Sidewalk, Drive Pad, Curb and Gutter Ordinance" incl. § 6-5-5-18 re. sidewalk maintenance. Investigate maintenance of sidewalks within NMDOT facilities.
95	D.3.16	Signage	COA Transportation Development Services	Please add text: "Location must be approved by Transportation to ensure stopping/clear sight requirements".		OK
21	B.4.3 and Table B-1	Deviations	COA Zoning	Define dimensional and non-dimensional		OK
89	D.3.2	General Regs	COA Zoning	Should iii & iv go together		Clarify comment.
91	D.3.9i)	General Regs	COA Zoning	Refers to the landscaping standards of 15% - sector plan shows 20% - Clarify		OK
94	D.3.13	General Regs	COA Zoning	Solar access regulations for commercial buildings – Consider preserving solar access of adjoining residential properties only, not other commercial buildings		Under consideration.
95	D.3.16.i)c	General Regs	COA Zoning	Clarify "elevated segments". Add relevant references from Chapter C		OK
89	D.3.3i)	General Regs	COA Zoning	"See table c-1 – c-4 & c-9" Clarify/correct references to tables and mention NMDOT's authority over ROW		OK
19	B.3	Review & Approval	COA Zoning	Add a table for Review and Approval similar to Deviations		OK
19	B.3.1 ii) d.	Review & Approval	COA Zoning	Add "Deviations to the DOZ shall be controlled by the process shown in Table B-1"		For clarity
104	Figure D-9	View Preservation Figures	COA Zoning	Revise elevation view in diagrams to match angles of view windows		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
105	D.4.3 ii) b. 1.	View Preservation Regs	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"		Revision underway for future EPC consideration

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
50, 68, 69	C.9.0, Figure C-17, Table C-5 1.	Right-of-Way	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.	
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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.		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
85	D.1.3	DOZ introduction	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	Who determines what is specific to a particular land and what is not?		For clarity
86	D.2.4.	Grading and Drainage	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.	
87	D.2.4. iii)	Grading and Drainage	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
91	D.3.1	Grading and Drainage	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.	
89	D.3.3.i) b	Landscape Setback/Buffer	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].		Consider situation where the existing ROW exceeds what is proposed in the Plan.
91	D.3.9 vi)	Landscaping	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	Why? 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. 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.

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
94	D.3.15 iii)	Lighting	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.	Amend for consistency with the Zoning Code (§14-16-3-9), the City APD's Crime Prevention Unit's guidelines and other relevant City policy
3	A.3.1	Plan area boundary	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	This might allow someone to plat themselves out of the plan.	Addressed by B.5.2. The City would request a boundary change. A property-owner cannot plat himself out.	
19	B.3.1 ii) d	Review & Approval	Easterling Consultants LLC - Floyd, H.	What are the criteria? It might be clearer to specify which exceptions/deviations cannot go to the ZHE.	Addressed by B.4.3 and Table B-1.	For clarity (same as response to COA Zoning)
90	D.3.4 i)	Setbacks for Structures (other than walls and fences)	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.	For clarity.
105	D.4.3 ii) a.2	View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height	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.	
103, 105	Fig. D-8, D.4.3 ii) a	View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height & Mass	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?		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
106	D.4.3 iii) b	View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height & Mass, North of Paseo del Norte	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
107	D.4.3 iii) d.	View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height & Mass, North of Paseo del Norte	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?		Revision underway for future EPC consideration

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
107	D.4.3 iii)	View Preservation Regulations, Structure Height & Mass, North of Paseo del Norte	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	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.	Revision underway for future EPC consideration
104	Fig. D-9	View Preservation Regulations, View Windows	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?		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	Eatman	<b>Traffic</b> 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. <b>Noise</b> - 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 lane is added, a tall sound wall would be needed along Bosque Meadows subdivision to mitigate the noise and motion of vehicles.	Noise abatement is addressed in C.12 p. 53.	The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
28, 41, 71	Figure C-2, C.6.1, Figure C-18	Multi-Modal Strategy, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	Eberhardt, B.	Map shows traffic congestion levels along Coors Blvd - we note that the area between Bosque Meadows and Eagle Ranch (roughly) is designated as "over congested". YES, we concur - entering and/or leaving our development is already a problem. And esp. a problem 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. This means THERE IS NO STOP OF FLOW OF TRAFFIC! Coors Blvd traffic is stopped to allow Sagebrush traffic out - meaning for Bosque Meadows there is always flow heading North. So at no time is there a cessation of traffic - 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.		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 8.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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 PI? 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.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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.		
89	D.3.3 iv)	Landscape setback/buffer	Gallegos, K.	I own a home at 5704 Cactus Flower, NW and another at 5104 Mirada Drive, NW, in the plan area. My choice to own property in the area is my love of the view from the west side to the east. My comment regards the berm that is on the east side of Coors on the La Luz property. It blocks a good portion of the view from Coors when traveling north. I learned from a previous EPC hearing that the residents of the La Luz townhome subdivision chose to pile that dirt (the berm) there when they were having work done on their property. One of the commissioners briefly questioned it, but it was never followed up on. If one of the main intents of the Plan is to preserve the view corridor, this berm would be a violation of that intent. I am wondering if it's possible to have that pile of dirt removed in order to restore the view there. It happens to be the only stretch where you completely lose the view when traveling in the plan area.	Investigate, but believe it was approved. 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.	
50, 58, 59	Figure C-14, Table C-2 1., C.9	Right-of-Way, Central to I-40	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 a lot. 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 <b>opposed</b> to adding <b>landscaping/landscaping strips</b> in the Coors area or any area where residential homes and businesses would have to be vacated. <b>Those areas could save feet</b> for someone's home or business. <b>Use medians for the dedicated bus lane</b> 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? <b>There are narrow parts on Central where residences and businesses are NOT proposed to be vacated</b> [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.	
53	C.12.1	Traffic Noise	Hernandez, M.	I ask for <b>tall buffer/noise wall</b> for <b>residential</b> areas in the Coors Corridor Plan especially <b>between Hanover and Iliff</b> .	Noise mitigation is addressed in the Plan.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
42	C.6.3	Signalized Major Intersections	Kanester, J.	The northbound <b>elevated roadway</b> on Coors from I-40 extending over Sequoia would destroy small businesses and homes in its path and add traffic confusion. The proposed <b>interchange at Coors/Montaño</b> will not help and is opposed by most nearby residents and recreational users. Additional construction in the area will create a traffic nightmare. The biggest problem is <b>West-East commuters</b> . 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, see full comment att.]	The two roadway projects are recommendations and are advisory to the NMDOT who control the Coors ROW. Environmental and engineering analysis would be undertaken to determine their feasibility and effectiveness. The Plan is addressing the Coors Corridor and do not undermine other transportation planning efforts underway in the metropolitan area.	Consider adding a recommendation for a travel demand management program in the public projects section (chapter E).
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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.		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
100	D.4.1, §1	View Preservation Definitions	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."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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. "		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
100	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
103	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
104	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
104	D.4.1	View Preservation Definitions	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)."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
105	D.4.3 ii) a.	View Preservation Regs	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> ."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
105	D.4.3 ii) b.	View Preservation Regs	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> ."		Revision underway for future EPC consideration
26, 36	C.2.0, C.4.0	Multi-Modal Strategy, Transit Component	Lopez, V.	I am a resident of Bosque Meadows. I am very pleased with the proposal. As I see it, it will ease the increasing problem of traffic on the west side, promoting the use of public transportation (making Albuquerque just a bit more green).	Supports multi-modal transportation strategy in Plan.	
39	C.5.4	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component	Lopez, V.	Another concern, as a bicycle rider, is that the bike lanes proposed should be provided some barrier from traffic. Without cement curb barriers, I fear there will be more deaths. Coors may then see an increase in the amount of "ghost bikes," and I doubt this is the type of art that the city wants along this corridor. Not to mention the loss of citizens.	C.5.4 ii) allows for cycle tracks in the longer term if bicycle demand is substantial.	Clarification is under consideration
39, 51	C.5.1, C.10.0, E.2.0	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component, Streetscape Design, Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	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.	Supports pedestrian and streetscape improvements.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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). I know 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, I would like the city to consider placing a light at the entrance of Bosque Meadows, which leads to the Open Space Center. With the additional weekend traffic coming from the Sagebrush Church, which is given priority in traffic by having numerous APD officers controlling the light AND blocking off lanes, I would hope that the same concern would be given to the west side permanent residents.		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
50, 58, 59	Figure C-14, Table C-2 1., C.9	Right-of-Way, Central Ave. to I-40	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. As a federally licensed facility, 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.[See full comment, incl. citations from Telecommunications Act 47 U.S. C. § 253(a), (b) & (d) (1996) and exhibits, att. to staff report]	No change at this time. City Legal is being consulted. Implementation of BRT would involve extensive environmental, technical and financial evaluation.	
76	Table C-7 5.	Driveways, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	Left Turn Access - Table C-7 on page 76 of the Coors Corridor Plan specifically addresses drive way accesses north of Irving at 400 ft, 600 ft, and 800 ft. These points include left turn access for our business. It suggests consolidating access at 1) 400ft and 600 ft, and 2) 600 ft. and 800 ft. Our south entrance is our main entrance, which accesses our Sales, Service and Parts departments. Also, all deliveries made to the dealership use this driveway access. The large delivery trucks require this access point because it offers the necessary room needed for their big vehicles. It is also the only left turn access exiting the property. Our center entrance northbound access has already been 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.	Plan recommends consolidating access <i>if property is redeveloped</i> .	



Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
46	C.7.3 ii)	Median Openings	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	BRT – If implemented, it appears that a Median BRT option would eliminate left turn access to our business from northbound Coors. 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. The median was added approximately 3-5 years ago. Losing another access would negatively impact our business. Our customers currently complain of the difficulty they have accessing our business due to the limited access from northbound Coors.	Correct if implemented per recommendation. The City would work with property-owners to provide alternative access opportunities (see C.8.0).	
75	Table C-7 1.	Right-of-way, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass	Melloy Dodge, 9621 Coors, north of Irving	The Curbside BRT option concern is that we have recently made costly landscape improvements that may be in jeopardy due to the potential property needed for the BRT lane and or the addition of a sidewalk. I am not sure how this would affect our improvements, but am concerned that the plans were approved by the City and DOT if changes would be necessary so soon after. Also mentioned in the plan is the 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 (p. 167), a BRT project is a lengthy process involving environmental, engineering and financial evaluation.	
95	D.3.16	Signage	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.	
71	Figure C-18	La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	Melloy, B., vacant property at NEC Coors/Eagle Ranch	The proposed Connector Street appears to be on the eastside of our property.	Correct, along the relocated canal.	
71	Figure C-18	La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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 signal is temporary.	
71, 72	Figure C-18, Table C-6 1.	La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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?	General location is shown. BRT stations would be constructed within right-of-way as illustrated in sections on p. 30-31.	
18, 20	B.3.1 i), ii) c., B.4.1	Review & Approval, Exceptions & Deviations	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.		

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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. Why do we have such a tiny space, very dangerous, especially when a 2nd car from our division squeezes in to wait to go south? That prevents the 1st car from seeing traffic coming south from Paseo. It is sheer stupidity from people who 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. But people don't obey laws. 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: traffic at a standstill.		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
39, 109,	C.5.1, E.2	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	Rose, J.	Requesting pedestrian facilities between Bosque Meadows neighborhood and destinations north and south along Corridor that are within walking distance, including Cottonwood Mall. [summarized, see full comment att.]	These are addressed in the Plan.	
48, 68	C.8.3, Figure C-17, Table C-5	Connector Streets	Stucker	1) We have recently retired and are very interested in this plan and how it affects our home here in Bosque Montano on Winterhaven. We welcome any <b>beautification of Coors Road</b> 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. 2) 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 <b>bike paths</b> . 3) 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. <b>Winterhaven</b> 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.	3) No change at this time, since connector is subject to feasibility study.	
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	Studerus, T.	The traffic problem along Coors Road in Bosque Meadows area is somewhat related to the Coors Corridor Plan according to an e mail received from our two neighborhood block captains. Therefore, for the record, I would like the EPC to keep this issue in mind.		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
94	D.3.14	Architecture	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R.	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
66-72	Tables C-4, C-5, C-6	Corridor Segment Recommendations	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?	Addressed in Plan.	
96	D.3.17	Drive up service windows	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).	
20	B.4.3 and Table B-1	Exceptions & Deviations	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. Please refer to pages 20-22 in the draft plan for examples of these exceptions and ambiguous guidelines.	The cited section aims to provide more guidance and predictability for applicants, neighborhoods, staff and decision-makers.	
96	D.3.18	Gated communities and Walled Subdivisions	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 WSSP. More discussion is needed on walled subdivisions.	Addressed in Plan.	
42	C.6.3	Grade-separated roadways and interchanges	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Grade separation: The draft plan mentions proposed grade separations across Coors at several locations. Residents wonder how the elevated Coors overpass will affect adjacent businesses, property owners and nearby neighborhoods. How will it be designed for pedestrians? Residents have expressed that they do not support a grade separation at the Coors and Montano intersection.	[Clarify whether "residents" refers to members of TRNA and/or some other group]	
86, 91	D.2.3 iv), D.2.4 i) & ii), D.3.10	Grading and Drainage	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Grading and Drainage: The language in the 1984 regarding contour grading and terracing should be maintained- to follow the natural slopes versus using severe cut and fill practices that we have seen in the last decade. They create ugly developments.	Specific examples of bad practices would be helpful. In VP sub-area, need to balance controls on grading with limits on structure height & mass. Need to avoid the situation where precluding cut and fill precludes development allowed by zoning.	
89	D.3.3	Landscape setback/buffer	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	
48	C.8.3	Local connector streets	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Local connector roads: More discussion is needed on the proposed connector roads.	Insufficient information to respond to.	
22, 36	B.4.3 iii) b 4th bullet point,	Park & Ride	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R.	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
	NA	Public Review Process	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 at EPC and later at Council.	
85	D.1.4	Screening of roof-top equipment	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed. It appears the draft says nothing about screening HVAC equipment	This is addressed by general regulations in the Zoning Code (§14-16-3-18 (C)(6)). Since regulations in the DOZ are intended to complement or replace regulations of the Zoning Code to tailor them for 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.
NA	NA	Semi-rural communities	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Semi Rural areas: Taylor Ranch is comprised of single family residential, several apartments' complexes near Coors, and a few semi rural areas near the river and in Alban Hills. This makes a nice variety of uses in the Taylor Ranch area. 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?	See response re. Transit Component	
95	D.3.16	Signage	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	More discussion is needed	Insufficient information to respond to.	
53	C.12	Traffic Noise	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	Noise Walls: The 2014 plan mentions noise walls for mitigating noise. Some of the least desirable developments are walled subdivisions built right up to Coors, blocking views, making Coors unattractive with walls and creating a tunnel effect. Shouldn't we be looking at designing the roadway to be quieter without the noise walls? What are the alternatives?		Consult with transportation team about range of noise abatement options.

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
36	C.4	Transit Component	Taylor Ranch NA President & Land Use Director - J. Wolfley & R. Horvath	How much more density is required for the BRT system to function properly?	The Plan does not change zoning (land uses). Although additional residential density could support a future BRT system on Coors Blvd., it is not essential, as 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. For example, the 790 Blue Line bus service is already standing-room only during UNM academic year, indicating significant demand for transit.	
99	D.4	View Preservation Regs	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.	
99	D.4	View Preservation Regs	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.	
39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 8.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Component, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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.	
39, 73	C.5.1, Table C-6 1.	Right-of-way, Paseo del Norte to Coors Bypass	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. Safety is a prime consideration in any road design.	
41, 71	C.6.1, Figure C-18	Signalized Major Intersections, La Orilla to Paseo del Norte	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?		The access issue has also been raised by City Parks' Open Space Division. Recommend that City staff & transportation consultant meet with stakeholders, including NMDOT, to discuss situation and explore alternatives.
53	C.12	Traffic Noise	Torres, H.	How will the traffic noise pollution be addressed?	See C.12.	

Page	Section	Subject	Commenter (Last Name or Organization)	Comment	No Change	Potential Change/Staff Action
68, 70	Figure C-17, Table C-5 8.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, Dellyne/Learning to La Orilla	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/Montaño (Figure C-8 p. p. 48) includes sidewalks on Montaño that are grade-separated from Coors.	
42-43	C.63. ii), Figure C-9	Signalized Major Intersections	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.		Consider whether the design of the recommended interchange, and other major projects in the Coors ROW, could include public art and/or aesthetic enhancement, given one of the plan's aims is to improve the visual character of the Corridor. Investigate options with NMDOT, City DMD and Cultural Services/Public Art Program.
51	C.10.1	Streetscape Design	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 BRT project, which may be designed to run in the median rather than curbside.	
36	C.4.1 3.	Transit Component	Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	Installation of a upgraded/ new turquoise style bus stops at SIPI. ( I see a number of our Native American students standing waiting for a bus, with no protection from the elements on a daily basis). I would like to honor and respect these young people by providing this for them.	The policy calls for shelters at all local bus stops as one of 4 transit priorities in the Coors Corridor. Implementation would be by ABQ RIDE.	
			Watson, S., 3605 Yipee Calle Ct NW	- Increase enforcement of sign ordinance regarding temporary signs ( ie; beer, pizza,etc. and political campaign signs) - Encourage property owners ( best example: Montano Plaza Shopping Center) to	Outside the scope of a long-range plan as these are enforcement issues.	