

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

**BruProject #:** 1005238  
**Property Description/Address:** Coors Corridor Plan

**Date Submitted:** 11/23/14  
**Submitted By:** Diane Grover

**Meeting Date/Time:** 11/19/14  
**Meeting Location:** Don Newton/Taylor Ranch 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
John MacKenzie	COA DMD, Project Team
Andrew Gingerich,	NMCOG
Nancy Perea,	NMDOT
Maida Rubin,	MRCOG
Steven Montiel,	MRCOG
Grant Brodehl	MRCOG
Bruce Rissieri	ABQ RIDE
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 was held on November 19, 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 second meeting at the Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center. The next and final scheduled facilitated meeting will be:

**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 meeting began with a presentation from Carol Toffaleti, COA Staff Planner for this project. This meeting covered Coors Corridor from Western Trail up to Paseo del Norte. This is the second and last meeting which will discuss the transportation element.

Carol stated this plan is done in coordination with NMDOT, MRCOG, local transit agencies and neighboring governments (Rio Rancho). The draft plan is to update the 30 year old plan. She reviewed changes that have occurred in the area over the last 30 years. She discussed what the plan is hoping to accomplish, and went over some of the elements of the plan

Chris Baca gave a short presentation and discussed the base concepts of the plan, and some of the things being considered. The plan will give a framework for all kinds of development over the next 20 years.

The majority of the meeting time was spent on getting questions and input from residents. Concerns included but were not limited to the Coors/Montano intersection and the possibility of an elevated roadway; other elevated roadways being proposed; some specific intersections; the proposed Bus Rapid Transit system (BRT), increasing right of ways (ROW); and bike safety.

One neighbor stressed that neighbors seemed to have made it clear that they are not happy with the prospect of an elevated road at Coors and Montano, and stated that the EPC wanted other options. She did not see where any other options were being presented.

The meeting was extremely respectful with everyone leaving room for all to contribute without interruption

**Outcome:**

**Areas of Agreement:**

- None noted

**Unresolved Issues, Interests and Concerns:**

- Placement of elevated roadways
- Revised draft plan is in process, not yet complete
- Funding sources for all the work
- Specifics on given intersections and transit lane placement, which are not intended to be firmed up in the new plan

**Meeting Specifics:**

- 1) Presentation, Carol Toffaleti
  - a) This is a long range plan for the Coors Corridor
    - i) 11 mile corridor, mostly within the city

- ii) Under NMDOT jurisdiction
  - (1) State has purview over access to the corridor; maintenance; improvements to the roadway
- iii) Done in coordination with
  - (1) NMDOT
  - (2) MRCOG
  - (3) Transit agencies in the area
  - (4) Neighboring governments (Rio Rancho)
- b) Draft Plan is update of 30 year old plan
- c) A lot has changed on the corridor since 1984
  - i) Is the main north/south arterial for the west side
  - ii) Connects to six river crossings
  - iii) Carries both local and regional traffic
  - iv) Population and traffic are forecast to increase over the next 20 years
    - (1) 20 years is roughly the horizon of the new plan
  - v) Population has doubled between 1990 and 2010
  - vi) Area has increased as proportion of City population
  - vii) Additional growth has resulted in longer commute times
  - viii) Travel delays are forecast to become even longer
    - (1) From NW Transit Center to UNNM is forecast to take 90 minutes in 2035
- d) Coors is part of a larger metropolitan transportation system
  - i) From Los Lunas to Rio Rancho
  - ii) Adopted every four years by board representing local governments and NMDOT
  - iii) Emphasizes managing traffic by maximizing efficiency of road systems and expanding alternatives to cars.
  - iv) Emphasis on transit in particular
  - v) Provides policy guidance for funding
  - vi) One of several major arterials in the area
  - vii) Potential corridor for BRT system that the City is pursuing on Central
- e) Strategy considered a range of solutions
- f) Public transportation committees and engineering models agree that the freeway is not what is wanted at Coors
- g) Framework will guide new development and potential for potential big projects
  - i) BRT
  - ii) Grade Separated roadways
- h) ROW
  - i) In 1984 plan ROW was 156'
  - ii) Now proposing ROW of 160'
  - iii) Will also specify how more may be needed at some locations
    - (1) Potential BRT Station
    - (2) Some intersections
- i) BRT
  - i) Quick, frequent, convenient means of transportation
  - ii) Meant to attract more people to leave cars behind
- j) Grade separations are proposed for north of I-40 at Coors and Montano; Coors and Paseo del Norte

- k) BRT and Major projects will take many years to evaluate
  - i) Studies
  - ii) Public involvement
  - iii) Compensation for any affected property owners
- 2) Presentation by Chris Baca
  - a) Base plan recommended for project is 4 lane concept
    - i) 3 general purpose lanes each direction
    - ii) 1 transit lane each direction
  - b) 1984 plan recommended 4 lanes each way
    - i) Currently not consistent; changes from 3-4 lanes
  - c) Two options for dedicated transit lanes for future study
    - i) Either on the outside or inside lane
  - d) Grade Separation possibilities
    - i) One just north of I-40
    - ii) One at Montano and Coors
      - (1) In base concept of plan this intersection will stay a regular signalized intersection as it is today
    - iii) One at Paseo del Norte and Coors
      - (1) There's already a grade separation with Paseo going over Coors
      - (2) Will add direct movement from southbound Coors to eastbound Paseo del Norte
  - e) Provision in plan encourages looking at alternate connections
    - i) Properties east and west of Coors to tie into additional connections that allow trips without getting on to or off of Coors
    - ii) Suggestion to connect Winterhaven to La Orilla
    - iii) Suggestion of connection from SIPI intersection along the channel near the Conservancy District
- 3) Neighbor's questions, comments and concerns
  - a) Potential Connector Roads
    - i) One appears from Delaney to what?
      - (1) Chris states there is nothing there now
    - ii) Neighbor asked if that means cutting through residences that are there now
      - (1) Chris stated that was just a suggestion to look at.
      - (2) At meetings with the public it was mentioned that there are areas where people can look over walls at a bus stop but not walk to it
  - b) Winterhaven
    - i) One neighbor stated this would allow people access without getting on Coors
    - ii) Would become a shortcut for people coming over the bridge
    - iii) Opportunity to speed down streets to get where they're going
    - iv) Currently residents can access by foot or bicycle
      - (1) 10 minutes by foot; 5 by bicycle
    - v) Chris stated that Winterhaven does that now with Montgomery Plaza
      - (1) People will cut through
      - (2) There's a fair amount of traffic there
      - (3) Based on projections traffic will build everywhere
      - (4) Winterhaven will probably get more traffic
      - (5) Going to La Orilla gives more connectivity

- (6) Other things would have to be looked at before implementation
- vi) Neighbor stated Winterhaven, especially from Montano Plaza Rd. to the cul-de-sac was built by Argus, the contractor for the Plaza.
  - (1) Was built as connector to the shopping center
  - (2) When developing Bosque Plaza it was reviewed and said clearly that connectors are already cut in and very specifically stated in the documents.
  - (3) Will be submitting those documents
- vii) Neighbor stated there are already about 20 ins and outs along Winterhaven from Montano to Bontierra.
  - (1) It is not reasonable to turn it into a Coors relief artery when so many people have to use that route to get into and out of their homes
  - (2) Children live there
  - (3) School busses go down the street
  - (4) Residents live there because it's pedestrian-friendly.
  - (5) Those who take 90 minutes in a car going west to east can take the bus
  - (6) There are 3 condo communities; a children's home; private homes; all on the cul-de-sac
- viii) Turning Winterhaven into connector street is impacting neighbor's equity and a neighborhood concept that is treasured
- ix) If more traffic allowed on Winterhaven it will exacerbate existing problems
  - (1) Already can't go through that area at peak times.
  - (2) Trying to get in and out for homeowners causes traffic accidents
  - (3) People already drive through too fast
- x) Neighbor asked if Winterhaven did connect would northbound traffic on Coors be able to turn on Learning, go across Montano and Winterhaven, and across to La Orilla?
  - (1) Chris stated no change south of Montano. Going north on Mirabella can only go east on Montano. No through traffic allowed.
- xi) Neighbor asked if Winterhaven was opened could it allow all Montano Traffic and would any studies or justification explain dumping traffic on to local streets
  - (1) Chris stated that other studies would have to be done to change the classification of a roadway. Details are not there now – just looking at a general concept.
- c) SE corner of Montano and Coors
  - i) What kind of development are we looking at and how much traffic will it generate?
    - (1) Carol stated she understands the Smiths proposal is coming in. Said area is mainly zoned for commercial use. What's left is still vacant.
      - (a) Traffic impact study (TIS) was done when proposals first came in
      - (b) TIS was based on commercial and apartments
- d) BRT System
  - i) Only works if dedicated lanes
  - ii) Is there any consideration to double up BRT lanes and include High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV); opening up to public in non-peak hours/
  - iii) Bruce Risieri with ABQ Ride stated that it had not been considered. Modeling shows adding lanes to Coors won't help.
    - (1) Adding lanes for busses reduces person-trips

- (2) Using BRT lanes for other traffic was not addressed when plan was being developed
  - (3) If we go forward with dedicated lanes and request federal funds we would have to look at all options including using lanes for other traffic
- iv) One neighbor was curious about ridership. Will it include people in Rio Rancho along with people along Coors?
  - (1) Bruce stated that it would include all of the above.
  - (2) Looked at bringing BRT down from Southern/Unser to the Journal Center. It is possible that route and this route could transfer
  - (3) The study was completed but pushed out for the Central Ave. project.
- v) Timeframe for BRT project
  - (1) Bruce Rissieri stated that funding has to be in place first. Expects will cost \$12-15 million per mile so maybe \$150 million total.
  - (2) Can do it to some extent in bits and pieces.
    - (a) Start with environmental assessments
    - (b) Move into design
    - (c) One of first steps is policy adoption
    - (d) Could be 5 to 10 year process depending on money
  - (3) Steven Montiel with MRCOG stated main goals are to look at how to synch land use and transportation and expand public transit and preserve existing roadway network
    - (a) Need to start looking at alternative land use patterns and how to get more jobs on west side and more people to support BRT.
- e) Federal Highway Transit Safety Administration (Safety Resource Center) study recommendations
  - i) Done to prevent people getting killed crossing street to catch a bus
  - ii) Neighbor wants to see this study's recommendations incorporated into the Coors plan.
- f) Smart Lights
  - i) Neighbor would like these on Coors like on Alameda.
  - ii) Adaptive signals should be considered on Coors
  - iii) Another neighbor asked what these are
  - iv) Steven with MRCOG responded they have intelligent Transportation System (ITS) look at deficiencies for corridors that are heavily congested
    - (1) One deficiency is lack of "smart" timing at signals.
    - (2) Can adapt timing of signals to heavy congestion (i.e. hold traffic on perpendicular routes for longer times to enhance traffic flow. Was applied at Alameda and improved traffic flow significantly
    - (3) Can also allow "Queue jumping" by busses
    - (4) Smart timing is priority for Coors as well as message boards to let people know of accidents
  - v) Neighbor asked if these are incorporated into the plan
    - (1) Carol stated that it is mentioned in the plan but probably not highlighted or described enough
  - vi) Steven said funding is coming in region-wide for this sort of technology
  - vii) Neighbor asked where it was being utilized

- viii) Steven said he can get a list and that Coors is numbers 5 and 6 on the list
- g) ROW
  - i) Adding another travel lane and an 8' bicycle lane is worrisome
  - ii) Driving through the area there are walled subdivisions built close to the road
    - (1) Don't see where you're going to get more ROW from
  - iii) Right now see 6 lanes and not a lot of ROW
  - iv) What areas are tight and what will you do in tight areas?
  - v) Chris responded that two areas where the ROW is narrower is Central to I-40 and I-40 to around Sequoia.
    - (1) Everything is built right against sidewalks
    - (2) It is already 4 lanes in a lot of those areas
    - (3) Not adding a BRT lane; changing an existing lane to BRT usage
    - (4) One of the tightest areas is by St. Pius High School. Plan does not go into that neighborhood; not taking down any walls; not enough money to do that
    - (5) Plan is to stay within existing ROW
    - (6) Some acquisitions at corners of major intersection but along a relatively short distance
- h) Grade separation at Montano and Coors
  - i) Neighbor wants grade separation explained and how pedestrians can get across Coors
    - (1) Chris stated they've looked at a couple of options. Looking more at a feasibility study than a final design.
    - (2) Montano is very steep.
    - (3) Have to look at whether to change the elevation.
    - (4) Taking Montano over Coors proved to be very difficult from an engineering standpoint.
    - (5) Looked at taking Coors up
      - (a) Had some comments about that and about "hybridizing" it
  - ii) Neighbor stresses that local feedback has been strong.
    - (1) Grade separating Coors and Montano is viewed as disruptive to the community built around the area.
    - (2) It's still showing in the plan exactly as originally shown
    - (3) EPC said after a couple hearings that they would like bold new ideas in the plan about travel demand management, BRT and things that increase the supply side of transportation
    - (4) Would like to see transportation experts write their paragraphs and add them to the plan
    - (5) On October 2, the EPC said they wanted new ideas.
    - (6) Community wants alternatives to the grade separation
    - (7) There was a strong recommendation from the EPC to do this and we don't see it in the plan still
      - (a) Steven said MRCOG has been really involved with plan offering comments.
      - (b) Would love to provide any technical assistance they can
      - (c) Another staff member is an ITS expert and would be happy to provide comment.
    - (8) Neighbor stated they want broad appeal with many techniques.
    - (9) At this point feel plan is imbalanced and focused on physical improvements



- i) Concern for traffic from I-40 to Coors Corridor
  - i) Seen plans for elevated roadway that will come down by St. Josephs
  - ii) Currently there is one small frontage road
  - iii) Already very congested narrow area. How will you get traffic in and out of the lower level where businesses are?
    - (1) Chris stated when MRCOG looked at traffic with DOT input, traffic exiting westbound I-40 to northbound Coors was an important component
    - (2) Looked at southbound as well but determined that what controls traffic is the on-ramp onto i-40
    - (3) Became apparent that they didn't want to elevate southbound; just northbound
  - iv) Neighbor said that lanes coming off I-40 are a problem
    - (1) Chris stated that access would be maintained at grade level.
      - (a) Would require engineering to work this out
      - (b) Would be a major project involving other studies and coordination with businesses
- j) Southwest Indian Polytechnic Institute Road
  - i) Shown in plan drawings talking about temporary signal
  - ii) Does not show what occurs with easterly road off Coors.
    - (1) Chris stated it does not show to be closed off either
    - (2) Would change to right-in, right-out
- k) Will westbound Paseo del Norte traffic take the ramp onto south on Coors?
  - i) Chris stated this area will probably see more change in the future because of studies looking at BRT to reduce traffic at Paseo del Norte intersection.
- l) Consideration of additional river crossings
  - i) Steven said no lead agencies were applying for this except for in Los Lunas.
- m) Alleviating congestion on Coors
  - i) Neighbor stated busses will be packed and road will be packed too.
    - (1) Chris stated Coors plan intent is to be part of a bigger solution.
    - (2) Won't solve everything on its own
    - (3) With adding mass transit dedicated routes will provide opportunities for people who work in other areas of the City.
- n) Neighbor said there hasn't been much talk about Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). If plan was adopted today couldn't it take decades to work their way into TIP?
  - i) Steven said he manages that program and the federal money that comes into the region.
    - (1) These projects are massively expensive.
    - (2) We can't program more than we have. COG receives \$50 to 60 million every 2 years and there are other regional priorities.
- o) Bicycle community
  - i) One of the cheapest things you can do to control traffic is attract people to bicycles.
    - (1) No one will ride on a street with cars going 55 mph and a bus coming up on the other side
    - (2) It is a waste of money and space to add a bicycle lane
    - (3) Attract people to get out of their cars by making bicycle riding safe
    - (4) Cheap to take a pedestrian buffer and make it safe for bicycles
      - (a) Many communities are doing this

- (5) We need a barrier between bicycles and traffic
- p) Plan revisions: Will there be more?
- i) Carol stated that planning staff will be producing another draft report before January 8, 2015, Hearing.
  - ii) Meetings are being held to give people another opportunity to refine and expand on the community issues to be incorporated into plan
  - iii) Will try to have revisions done as soon as possible but no estimated completion date
  - iv) Community is welcome to call Carol or keep up with the project web page.
- q) Landscaping
- i) Neighbor asked about un-landscaped stretch of Coors from La Orilla to Paseo del Norte.
    - (1) Understood Coors is state road and the state doesn't have any money for this
  - ii) Nancy Perea of NMDOT said that at this point the state is not putting any efforts into any median landscaping
- r) Multi-modal part of plan concerns neighbors
- i) Feel like you're trying to do too many things
  - ii) Once everything is together how inviting will it be for pedestrians?
- s) Park and Rides
- i) These need to be planned and begun now
  - ii) Can be transformed to BRT stations down the road.
    - (1) This is a short term assist
  - iii) There's only so much property left – needs to be looked at now
  - iv) Bruce said park and ride improvements are planned couple of years
    - (1) Portion of funding is designated for this over the next 3-4 years
    - (2) Targeted park and ride acquisition is part of getting out in front of development
- t) Emergency access lanes
- i) Bruce stated that on Central transit lanes are being sized so emergency vehicles can use the lanes

**Next Steps:**

- Revision of draft plan
- EPC Hearing

**Action Plan:**

**Action Items:**

- Planner Carol Toffaleti invited folks to call with questions
- Steven Montiel with MRCOG left business cards and invited folks to call with questions

**Application Hearing Details:**

1. Hearing scheduled for January 8, 2014
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

- 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 render a recommendation and parties have 15 day protest period to respond to the recommendations.
  - d. City Council will make the final decision.
- 4. Resident Participation at Hearing:
  - a. Written comments must be received by December 18, 2014 to be included in the Planner's draft report. Comments can be sent to:

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:**

Carol Toffaleti,	COA Planning Dept.
Carrie Barkhurst,	City Planning Project Team
Jessica Johnson,	City Planning Project Team
Russell Brito,	City Planning Project Team
John MacKenzie	COA DMD, Project Team
Andrew Gingerich,	NMCOG
Nancy Perea,	NMDOT
Maida Rubin,	MRCOG
Steven Montiel,	MRCOG
Grant Brodehl	MRCOG
Bruce Rissieri	ABQ RIDE
Chris Baca,	Parametrix, Project Team
Bill Dawson	
Angie Dawson	
Candy Patterson	Laurelwood

David Edwards	Taylor Ranch
Denis McCarthy	Oxbow Village HOA
Diane Flynn	Las Casitas del Rio II
Eugene Mullahey	Taylor Ranch
Forrest Adams	La Luz Landowners
Jerry Archibeque	
Louise Archibeque	
Jolene Wolfley	Taylor Ranch
Jonathan Turner	Agent
Jose L. Ortiz	
Ingrid M. Ortiz	
Joyce DeHarney	Laurelwood
Judith A Kanester	Villa de Paz HOA
Kathi Ingley	Windmill Manor Place Subdivision HOA
Larry Foor	Las Casitas del Rio Unit 2
Marian Pendleton	Taylor Ranch
Martin J. Haynes	
Michael Sullivan	Taylor Ranch
Mr. G. H. Martinez	
Pat Gallagher	La Luz Landowners
Rebecca Alvarado	
Rene Horvath	Taylor Ranch
Robert Phillips	
Rorik Rivenburgh	Las Casitas del Rio
Scooter Haynes	Cottonwood Trail HOA
Sharon Sharrett	TRNA, Winterhaven neighborhood
Steve Clark	Las Casitas del Rio
Steven Collins	Ladera West
Susan C. Brewster	
Thomas Borst	Tres Volcanes NA
Tim Strosnider	Las Casitas del Rio Unit 2

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

Project #: 1005238  
Date Submitted: November 26, 2014  
Original report submitted: November 23, 2014  
Facilitator: Diane Grover  
Planner : Carol Toffaleti  
cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov  
924-3345

### **Parties**

Change heading: "Project Team"  
To: "City and Agency Staff"  
Change: "Andrew Gingerich, NMCOG "  
To: "Andrew Gingerich, MRCOG"  
Change: "Grant Brodehl, MRCOG  
To: "Grant Brodehl, Rio Metro, MRCOG  
Change: "Bruce Rissieri"  
To: "Bruce Rizzieri"

### **Meeting Specifics**

3)a)i)  
From: "Delaney"  
To: "Dellyne"  
3)b)5  
Change: "Montgomery Plaza"  
To: "Montano Plaza"  
3)b)x)(1)  
Change: "Mirabella"  
To: "Mirandela"  
3)d)iii)  
Change: "Bruce Risieri"  
To: "Bruce Rizzieri"  
3)d)v)i)  
Change: "Bruce Rissieri"  
To: "Bruce Rizzieri"  
3)e)  
Change: "Federal Highway Transit"

To: "Federal Highway Transportation"

3)s)iv)

Change: "Bruce"

To: "Grant Brodehl"

3)t)i)

Change: "Bruce"

To: "Bruce Rizzieri"

**Application Hearing Details:**

1.

Add: "after 1:30"

To: "Hearing scheduled for January 8, 2014"