

**CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM  
PROJECT MEETING REPORT**

**Project #:** 1005238  
**Property Description/Address:** Coors Corridor Plan  
  
**Date Submitted:** 11/16/14  
**Submitted By:** Diane Grover  
  
**Meeting Date/Time:** 11/12/14  
**Meeting Location:** West Mesa Community Center  
**Facilitator:** Diane Grover  
**Co-facilitator:** Jesse Eaton Lawrence

**Parties: (Those NAs represented in attendance identified at end of report in “Names and Affiliations of Attendees”)**

**Project Team**

Carol Toffaleti,	COA Planning Dept.
Carrie Barkhurst,	City Planning Project Team
Jessica Johnson,	City Planning Project Team
Russell Brito,	City Planning Project Team
Lawrence Kline,	ABQ Ride
Andrew Garcia,	ABQ Ride
Nancy Perea,	NMDOT
Maida Rubin,	MRCOG
Steven Montiel,	MRCOG
Chris Baca,	Parametrix, Project Team

**Neighborhood Associations**

Alamosa NA  
Alban Hills NA  
Andalucia HOA  
Avalon NA  
Crestview Bluff NA  
Encanto Village HOA  
Grande Heights Assn.  
La Luz Del Sol NA.  
La Luz Landowners Assn.  
Ladera Heights NA  
Ladera West NA  
Las Casitas Del Rio HOA  
Las Casitas Del Rio Unit 2 Subdivision HOA  
Laurelwood NA  
Los Volcanes NA  
Oxbow Park HOA

Oxbow Village HOA  
Paradise Hills Civic Assn.  
Pat Hurley NA  
Piedras Marcadas NA  
Quaker Heights NA  
Rancho Encantado HOA  
Rancho Sereno NA  
Rio Oeste HOA  
Riverfronte Estates NA  
Riverview Heights NA  
S.R. Marmon NA  
Skyview West NA  
South Valley Coalition of NA's  
St. Joseph Townhouse Assn.  
Stinson Tower NA  
Story Rock HOA  
South West Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN)  
South Valley Coalition of Neighborhood Assn.  
Taylor Ranch NA  
The Enclave at Oxbow HOA  
Villa De Paz HOA, Inc.  
Vista Grande NA  
Vista Magnifica Assn.  
Vista Montecito HOA, Inc.  
Vista West HOA  
West Bluff NA  
West Mesa NA  
Western Trails Estates HOA  
Westside Coalition of NA's  
Windmill Manor Place Subdivision HOA  
North Valley Coalition

**Background/Meeting Summary:**

This meeting held on November 12, 2014, and concerns the re-working of the Coors Corridor plan. It follows numerous meetings and 3 EPC Hearings, the last of which resulted in a 90 day period targeted at further discussions between neighbors and the City. Three such facilitated meetings have been scheduled and this report covers the first meeting at the West Mesa Community Center. The next 2 meetings will be as follows:

**Meeting 2:**

WHEN: Wednesday November 19, 2014, 6:30 to 8:30

WHERE: Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center, 4900 Kachina St.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA IMPACTED: Coors/Montano area (Western Trails/Namaste to Paseo

TOPIC: Transportation

**Meeting 3:**

WHEN: Tuesday, December 2, 2014, 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

WHERE: Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center, 4900 Kachina St.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA IMPACTED: View Preservation area of the Plan (East side of Coors, between Namaste and Alameda)

The first meeting began with Planner Carol Toffaleti advising of the resources available in the meeting from the project team present (see “**Meeting Specifics**” 1)b) below) She explained that the new plan would replace the 1984 plan, which is outdated after 30 years of substantial development along Coors Blvd. and an expansive increase in traffic in that corridor. She explained that a draft report will be issued one week before the January 8, hearing date. The City staff is looking to better meet the needs of the community and the plan will respond to discussions that have and will take place.

Chris Baca, of Parametrix, and as part of the project team gave an overview of the project. The plan covers Coors from Bridge up to Alameda, and includes the Coors Bypass, which did not exist in 1984. He explained that experience and projections indicate that as more lanes are built on Coors, the more traffic is drawn. The new plan is expected to be viable for 20+ years. There is a large emphasis from MRCOG on decreasing single occupancy vehicle traffic and maximizing on transit. New plan will include accommodations for traffic, transit, bicycles and pedestrian. The transit component will play a large part. The proposed plan is not to facilitate a specific project or accommodate any project, and any future projects will have to go through the full project development process including public meetings and input. The goal of the new plan is to get a base plan that will make sense as a starting place for future development. The plan itself will not make final decisions about particular areas, where elevated roadways may make sense, or other details specific to an area, but will create a framework for future project directions.

Residents and neighborhood representatives expressed numerous concerns including but not limited to Multi-modal access on Coors; bicycle traffic safety; elevated roadways; impact on local businesses; transit and traffic on Coors; Park and Ride access; crossing the river; the I-40 interchange and numerous others.

A representative from TV Station KNAT was concerned that some places that have less than 160 feet of right of way, the TV Station being one of them, and expanding Coors could encroach on their building, which sits right up to the sidewalk in front of the building. She pointed out that they are licensed by the FCC and have a unique facility because it holds a federal license to operate and broadcast from that specific location. Any change would have to go through the FCC and moving would create extreme challenges with alternatives being difficult to impossible. Chris responded that concerns will be addressed to mitigate impact appropriately and stated that entities (City, Federal Government) bends over backwards to work with any folks you may be impacted.

**Outcome:****Areas of Agreement:**

- There were no specific areas of agreement identified in this meeting

## **Unresolved Issues, Interests and Concerns:**

- Details on how specific areas will be treated as to elevated roadways; potential encroachments on businesses to facilitate additional lanes of traffic; and other such details related to certain intersections or neighborhoods. These details will be addressed with good opportunity for public input as projects are proposed
- Whether a dedicated transit lane will be internal or external along Coors

## **Meeting Specifics:**

- 1) Planner Presentation, Carol Toffaleti
  - a) Upcoming EPC Hearing scheduled for Thursday, January 8, 2015, will be the fourth such EPC hearing
    - i) Last hearing in October
    - ii) EPC will continue hearing plan in January giving community and staff more time to dialogue over how to reach resolution on outstanding issues
    - iii) Wants this to be a productive dialogue; wants to hear from community
  - b) Attendees who can act as resources
    - i) Russell Brito, City Planning Project Team
    - ii) Lawrence Kline, ABQ Ride
    - iii) Andrew Garcia, ABQ Ride
    - iv) Nancy Perea, NMDOT
    - v) Maida Rubin, MRCOG
    - vi) Steven Montiel, MRCOG
    - vii) Chris Baca, Parametrix, Project Team
    - viii) Carrie Barkhurst, City Planning Project Team
    - ix) Jessica Johnson, City Planning Project Team
  - c) New plan will replace 1984 plan
    - i) Much has happened since 1984 plan; new plan is long range plan
      - (1) Sets framework for policies for transportation and corridor appearance
      - ii) Traffic is forecast to continue to increase
      - iii) New plan contains regulation for development along corridor to include
        - (1) Landscape buffers
        - (2) Signage
        - (3) Improvements to streetscape
          - (a) Especially south of I-40; orphan strips that can be beautified
      - iv) Staff will be preparing another draft plan and staff report that will come out a week before the January 8, 2015, hearing.
      - v) Looking to better meet needs of community; plan will respond to discussions that take place
- 2) Presentation, Chris Baca
  - a) Area covered is from Bridge up to Alameda
  - b) Includes Coors Bypass which did not exist in 1984
  - c) Transportation element has changed substantially since 1984
  - d) Many public meetings held

- i) Discussed everything from making Coors a freeway part of a loop system to making it a smaller boulevard
- ii) Experience and projections show as more lanes are built the more traffic is drawn
  - (1) Even expanding to 5 or 6 lanes each direction shows comparable increase in traffic
- e) Want new plan to be viable for 20+ years
- f) Public involvement indicates community doesn't want Coors to be freeway
- g) Currently approximately 160 ft. of Right of Way (ROW).
  - i) Some areas more; some less
- h) Large emphasis from MRCOG on decreasing single occupancy vehicle traffic and maximizing on transit
  - i) Led to options in proposed plan where transit component plays major part
    - (1) 3 general-purpose lanes each direction
    - (2) Dedicated transit lane as the outside lane or down central median
      - (a) Study did not determine whether outside or median option is preferable
      - (b) Details will be looked at when a transit proposal is made later on
  - ii) Includes accommodation for traffic, bicycles and pedestrians
  - iii) Community indicated desire for consistent sidewalks and bike lanes along Coors
- i) Putting everything together, basic roadway fits within 160' ROW
- j) Extra turning lanes will be needed at some exception intersections
- k) Transit
  - i) To access transit along Coors, need to design stops where people have an area to wait and get on and off busses.
- l) Elevated roadways
  - i) 3 areas where grade separations were presented
    - (1) North of I-40 where concern is traffic backing up onto the interstate. Local access will be maintained
    - (2) Intersection of Montano and Coors: long range plan indicates potential for grade separation in the future
    - (3) Southbound to Eastbound free flow flyover is considered for Coors and Paseo del Norte
- m) Some studies indicate that the whole interchange may need to be looked at
- n) Intent for the transportation issue is to plan a perspective where we look at the overall footprint and basic elements of the project to give guidance to new projects that are proposed
- o) Stretch south of I-40 includes area where ROW is more narrow and City needs to look at the effect on local business
- p) Proposed plan is not in reaction to a specific project or accommodating any project
  - i) Any future projects will have to go through the full project development process including public meetings
- q) Goal of new plan: get a base plan that will make sense as a starting place for future development
- 3) Neighbor's questions and concerns
  - a) Multi-modal access on Coors
    - i) Plan will cover high occupancy vehicles, transit, individual vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians

- ii) Intent of plan is to address multi-modalism
- b) Bicycle traffic/safety – Coors seems inappropriate; unsafe
  - i) Plan will address bicycles
  - ii) There is also the Bosque trail that parallels Coors
  - iii) Bicycle community is diverse and many want to travel Coors
  - iv) Per Carrie Barkhurst plan is proposing a wider bike lane on Coors
  - v) An elevated roadway at I-40 would leave bike lanes down on the lower parts
    - (1) Currently leaving I-40 you have the choice to go on Frontage Road or the main part of Coors
    - (2) After change you'd go slightly further elevated.
      - (a) If you were going to businesses you could go on lower road which would be continuous
- c) Elevated Roadways
  - i) Whether parts are at grade or elevated will require some study and public meetings.
  - ii) Won't be firmed up during this part of the process
  - iii) Privacy for homes
    - (1) Neighbor expressed concern that if elevated roadways were used people could look down on neighboring homes (particularly neighborhoods North of I-40 such as Villa de Paz)
      - (a) Chris stated that the grade would be dropping to street level quickly
      - (b) Cars traveling 40-45 mph would be moving too fast to see into yards or homes
      - (c) If elevation was pursued, process would call for public meeting and discussion
- d) Impact on businesses
  - (1) Some impact along the West side of Coors but not huge amounts. Impacts are relatively minor
  - (2) Concern for impact on businesses where elevated roadways reduce access some on the west side
  - (3) If elevated roadway at Quail, northbound traffic would not be able to get off at Quail
  - (4) Neighbor curious about impact analysis on businesses
    - (a) Chris stated not done within this study.
    - (b) Different options exist within plan for at grade and above grade areas so that decisions can be made on impact to businesses along Coors
      - (i) Will determine environmental and socioeconomic elements
  - (5) Neighbor expressed desire to support and maintain smaller businesses and keep them and their economic base in the City
    - (a) Chris stated plan isn't designed to harm small businesses
    - (b) Trying to make Coors better place to go to rather than go through
      - (i) Investing in transportation will make Coors a more desirable destination
    - (c) Looking to improve community
- e) Proposals
  - i) One proposal shows busses down the center.
    - (1) Accessed by crosswalks to the center where there will be raised platforms
  - ii) Second proposal shows BRT on the outside with travel lanes in the middle
  - iii) If BRT is in the middle, we can't have median breaks for the full length
    - (1) Left turns would only be at signalized intersections

- iv) Quail would stay similar to now but with a bus component
- v) Another option at Quail would be a northbound grade elevation to continue over Quail for traffic heading further northbound than the business district, coming down near St. Joseph.
- vi) Final designs have not been vetted yet; details not defined
  - (1) Would be opportunity for much public involvement
- f) Detail in plan
  - i) Per Chris they can't do detail until there are specifics. Reworking the Coors Corridor Plan is more about covering overall options so that specifics can be put in place as specific areas and projects are approached
- g) Park and Ride (Response from Lawrence Kline, ABQ Ride)
  - i) Up to now have been using informal associations with businesses to utilize pieces of private lots
  - ii) Currently looking at St. Joseph's and Montano Plaza
  - iii) Applebees property had been an option until they acquired the space
  - iv) Would prefer for park and rides to be on the West Side for inbound.
  - v) Some drainage ponds on the West Side could be decked over to create park and ride on top
  - vi) Neighbor supports transit yet is frustrated with lack of Park and Rides
    - (1) People use little parking lots from which they are evicted
    - (2) Lawrence stated that City usually rents park and ride land
      - (a) Businesses are healthy and no longer want to rent space
      - (b) Trying for coordination of agencies that buy land
        - (i) City is not a developer per se
- h) ROW
  - i) 160' ROW on most of Coors
  - ii) Increased ROW to extend frontage road
    - (1) Some acquisition would need to occur but not much
    - (2) In some spots we may have sidewalks narrower than 8'
    - (3) Not all black and white – will have to address some sites as we go
    - (4) More ROW discussion will occur at the next two meetings per Carol Toffaleti
- i) TV Station KNAT
  - i) Representative from station concerned that some of building is currently 1 yard from sidewalk at Iliff and Hanover
    - (1) Chris showed drawing and stated that he would guess sidewalk may touch the building, but sidewalk could be narrowed.
    - (2) In worst case scenario, if road went through building they would look at the cost of impact and how to make TV Station whole
      - (a) State and Federal Government bend over backwards to accommodate
      - (b) Lengthy process to assure owners are made whole
    - (3) TV station representative read statement
      - (a) KNAT is licensed by FCC
      - (b) Unique facility because it holds a federal license to operate and broadcast from that specific location
        - (i) Any change would have to go through FCC
        - (ii) Moving would create extreme challenges

- (iii) Representative will get letter to planner Carol Toffaleti on 11/14/14
  - (c) Concerns will be addressed to mitigate impact appropriately
- j) Crossing the River
  - i) Paseo del Norte and Central
  - ii) East/west corridors are being studied
  - iii) Will need to plan for the whole City and other projects will address this
  - iv) Rio Metro is doing one study; ABQ Metro is doing another
  - v) This is not just about transit but about moving people
  - vi) BRT is only one element
  - vii) Would be multiple routes
    - (1) There is a big employment imbalance in the City
    - (2) Need to get across the City for jobs
    - (3) Currently Rapid Ride is stuck in the same traffic as everyone else
      - (a) Dedicated transit lanes carry people quicker and makes transit more viable
- k) I-40 Interchange
  - i) Neighbor asked if traffic entering I-40 would be addressed in plan
    - (1) Frequent accidents occur there and elevated option could add traffic at a higher rate of speed creating more accident risk
  - ii) Chris stated plan would not address the I-40 interchange
    - (1) There is a limitation to the number of lanes possible on I-40 at this location
    - (2) Grade separation option is being considered for northbound traffic leaving I-40 only
      - (a) No planned grade separation for southbound traffic entering I-40
  - iii) Is this a State Route?
    - (1) Yes
- l) How to avoid making Coors a north/south freeway while goal is to allow Coors to handle more traffic
  - i) Paseo del Vulcan could be an expressway type facility
    - (1) Does not have signals
    - (2) Northwest loop and ROW exist going around the City per Chris
      - (a) Some of those extend going south
      - (b) DOT is making improvements on NM 6.
      - (c) Making Coors bigger to carry more traffic would be billion dollar investment
        - (i) Much could be done in the region with that kind of money
        - (ii) Money could be better spent in planning elsewhere
    - (3) Steven from MRCOG states that planning looks at 20-25 years into the future and programs funds toward those needs
      - (a) Paseo del Vulcan has nothing planned in the immediate future
      - (b) Looking at creating an interchange contingent on the master planned developments.
        - (i) Depending on regional priority, looking at 2026 for interchange
        - (ii) Cost to develop Paseo del Vulcan would be \$93 million which we don't have at this time.
        - (iii) Northwest loop is farther out in time
      - (c) Don't want to build infrastructure before the need exists
- m) Population Projections

- i) Neighbor worked for a company who did population projections for cities including Albuquerque
  - (1) Believes there are few things less reliable
  - (2) Doesn't believe you can count on these projections in making decisions
  - (3) The further the projection goes out in time the less reliable they are
- ii) Neighbor from West Bluff neighborhood
  - (1) From I-40 to Sequoia on east side of Coors is big concern
  - (2) Haven't heard anything about Unser, which is wonderful road and gives access to the freeway and serves the west side
    - (a) Coors is not the only alternative
  - (3) West Bluff NA is sensitive about raising road from I-40 northbound
    - (a) Inhibits access to homes
    - (b) Presents possibility of more pollution
  - (4) Chris states the main reason for elevating northbound exit is addressing the backup on the interstate
    - (a) If plan is approved the base option is to have everything at grade
    - (b) Alternate is elevated
    - (c) Before either is implemented greater public involvement will occur
- n) West Mesa NA perspective read from letter from Louis Tafoya, President
  - i) Louis and vice president Mike Quintana have attended the last three EPC meetings relative to Coors Corridor plan
  - ii) Opposition to the plans for adding one more lane to each side of Coors Blvd from I-40 South to Central Avenue has been expressed clearly
  - iii) Reiteration of concerns over forever changing the character of the neighborhood
    - (1) Negative impact on property values
    - (2) 20 years of dedicated work by community leaders to bring businesses and amenities to neighborhood
      - (a) Losing any business negates hard won efforts
    - (3) Median on Coors Blvd is aesthetic asset
      - (a) Promoting its destruction is a travesty
    - (4) Many businesses and homes would be razed to accommodate the additional lane
    - (5) Noise level will be horrendous
    - (6) Residences deserve a view of the Sandia Mountains as do the folks north of I-40 on Coors Blvd
    - (7) West Mesa neighborhood is unique as are Western Trails, Oxbow, St. Pious and Andalucia;
      - (a) Has or will have mixed residences-businesses
  - iv) Much vehicle traffic feeds into Coors Blvd but could go elsewhere. Updating the following could provide better movement of vehicle traffic than adding another lane to Coors Blvd.
    - (1) Unser Blvd.
    - (2) 98<sup>th</sup> Street
    - (3) 118<sup>th</sup> Street
  - v) Other Considerations for moving vehicle traffic in the Southwest Quadrant
    - (1) New bridge across the Rio Grande River to connect Gibson Blvd
    - (2) Expedite development of the Santolina Project on the Southwest Mesa

- (a) Our residents would surely shop there
- (b) This would greatly reduce the need to travel elsewhere.

**Note: Letter from Louis Tafoya will be submitted to Planner Carol Toffaleti by mail on Monday, November 17, 2014**

**Next Steps:**

- Two more meetings are scheduled as follows:
  - Meeting 2:  
WHEN: Wednesday November 19, 2014, 6:30 to 8:30  
WHERE: Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center, 4900 Kachina St.  
GEOGRAPHICAL AREA IMPACTED: Coors/Montano area (Western Trails/Namaste to Paseo  
TOPIC: Transportation  
  
Meeting 3:  
WHEN: Tuesday, December 2, 2014, 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.  
WHERE: Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center, 4900 Kachina St.  
GEOGRAPHICAL AREA IMPACTED: View Preservation area of the Plan (East side of Coors, between Namaste and Alameda)

**Action Plan:**

- EPC Hearing on January 8, 2015, after 1:30 P.M.

**Action Items:**

- Facilitator to mail letter from West Mesa NA President Louis Tafoya, to Planner Carol Toffaleti on Monday, November 17, 2014

**Application Hearing Details:**

1. Hearing scheduled for January 8, 2015 after 1:30
2. Hearing Time:
  - a. The Commission will begin hearing applications at 8:30 a.m.
  - b. The actual time this application will be heard by the Commission will depend on the applicant's position on the Commission's schedule (designated for after 1:30)
  - c. The agenda is posted on [www.cabq.gov/planning/epc/index](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/epc/index) on the Friday immediately prior to the EPC Hearing
3. Hearing Process:
  - a. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the City Planner.
  - b. City Planner includes facilitator report in recommendations.
  - c. The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision.

4. Resident Participation at Hearing:
  - a. Written comments must be received by 9:00 AM December 24, 2014 to be included in the Planner's draft report

Carol Toffaleti, Staff Planner  
600 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW, Third Floor  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
[cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov](mailto:cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov)  
(505) 924-3345

OR

Peter D. Nicholls, EPC Chair  
% Planning Department  
600 2<sup>nd</sup> St, NW, Third Floor  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

**Comments:**

**Names & Affiliations of Attendees:**

Ember Avila	Trinity Broadcasting
Steven Montiel	MRCOG
Maida Rubin	MRCOG
John MacKenzie	City DMD, Project Team
Jerry Worrall	Westside Coalition of NAs
Lawrence Kline	City Transit
Candy Patterson	Laurelwood NA
Frank Comfort	Laurelwood NA
Joyce DeHerney	Laurelwood NA
Judith A. Kanester	Villa de Paz NA
Andrew B. Garcia	City Transit
Nancy R. Perea	NMDOT
Rene Horvath	Taylor Ranch NA
Sharon Sharrett	Taylor Ranch NA
Dick Kirschner	Grande Heights Association
Johnny Luevan	
Sallie McCarthy	Oxbow Village HOA
Chris Baca	Parametrix, Project Team
Russell Brito	City Planning, Project Team
Jessica Johnson	City Planning, Project Team
Carrie Barkhurst	City Planning, Project Team
Carol G. Toffaleti	City Planning, Project Team

*Report will also be sent in one large email to representatives from all affected NAs*

## **Amendment to Facilitator's Report**

Project #: 1005238  
Date Submitted: November 19, 2014  
Original report submitted: November 16, 2014  
Facilitator: Diane Grover  
Planner : Carol Toffaleti  
cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov  
924-3345

### **Parties**

Change heading "Project Team" to "City and Agency Staff"  
Add "John McKenzie, City DMD Project Team" to list of "City and Agency Staff"

### **Background/Meeting Summary:**

1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, line 3:

Change: "period targeted at further discussions between neighbors"  
To: "period targeted at further discussions between stakeholders"

### **Meeting Specifics**

1)b)  
Add "John McKenzie, City DMD Project Team" between 1)b)vii) and 1)b)viii)

3)h)ii)(4)  
Change: "the next 2 meetings"  
To: "the next meeting"

3)m)i)  
Change: "Neighbor"  
To: "Neighbor from Grande Heights"

3)m)ii)  
Add: "could not attend but reported via Grande Heights neighbor"  
To: "Neighbor from West Bluff neighborhood"

### **Application Hearing Details:**

3)c)  
Change: "The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision"  
To: "The Commission will make a recommendation and parties have 15 days to protest the recommendation"

4)a)  
Change: "Written Comments must be received by 9 a.m. December 24, 2014 to be included in the planner's draft report"  
To: "Written comments must be received by December 18, 2014, to be included in the planner's draft report"