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PROCESS

The Bridge Boulevard Corridor Plan Team conducted a charrette from May 9-12, 2012 at the Bernalillo County Multi-Purpose Center, close to the Bridge Boulevard corridor in the South Valley. The agenda for the charrette is attached in the Appendix. The charrette brought together the team’s diverse perspectives to generate a range of options for improving the corridor. By its definition, a charrette is a collaborative, open, and intensive design effort focused on generating multiple concepts for a particular project, whether it is a single building, a block, or in this case, a three mile corridor. Given the length of the corridor, this charrette focused on three distinct areas of Bridge Boulevard: 1) the Gateway area near the Rio Grande, 2) Five Points, and 3) Tower Employment District at the western end of the corridor. These areas were selected because they are representative of the corridor as a whole and they have a relatively high potential for redevelopment.

Prior to the charrette, the team created a series of image boards and character studies to help guide the design process (see Appendix). Each district of the corridor was analyzed for its redevelopment potential, zoning, existing uses, and architectural character. The team also assembled all the existing conditions analysis that had been completed to date, including market conditions, traffic and circulation, and historical characterization of Bridge Boulevard. This trove of information was distilled and summarized to help inform the charrette. (See Appendices)

The charrette started with a well-attended public gathering, including 76 community residents and team members at the Bernalillo County Multi-Purpose Center, the site of the next three days of activity. Commissioner Art de la Cruz gave introductory remarks and challenged the design team to generate concepts that were true to the character of the area and resulted in positive change. After a brief overview presentation on the corridor, the audience engaged in a productive discussion about the corridor; what they envisioned, what they valued, and what they saw as opportunities. All the graphics prepared for the charrette were on display and participants were encouraged to post comments. Some of the key insights provided that night include:

- Respect the character of the South Valley - Celebrate
the agricultural tradition, open space, and acequias
  - Maintain authenticity
  - Concentrate/Cluster commercial development at
    nodes
  - Make the Gateway area attractive and inviting

For a full list of comments/feedback from the first night, see the appendix at the end of this document.

On Thursday, May 10th, the charrette team focused on generating multiple options for the Gateway, Five Points, and Tower Employment Districts. Working in two separate groups, one focused on transportation and one on land issues, the participants generated a wide range of concepts for how to improve the corridor. The group that focused on land uses referenced the summary market analysis and recommendations from EPS for housing and commercial uses that would be appropriate in each district. The group focused on transportation developed three radically different options for addressing the goals of increasing access to corridor and maintaining current travel times. Towards the end of Thursday, members of the Steering Committee dropped by to review progress. They commented on the range of options and encouraged the team to focus on the options that fostered local businesses and strengthened the surrounding neighborhoods.

On Friday, May 11th, the charrette team focused on more detailed concepts based upon the feedback from Steering Committee members and from the group's perspective. The Transportation Team focused on developing a “Mainstreet” option, along with more detailed concepts for key intersections along the corridor. The Land Use Team concentrated on more detailed concepts for Five Points and the Gateway District.

On Saturday, select representatives of the team hosted an open house to share the results of the charrette. With over 30 people attending, the open house evolved from individual conversations about the materials to a larger group discussion about the overall concepts. These comments are discussed in the “community feedback” section of this document.
LAND USE

Taking from the village centers and districts concept, the land use charrette team utilized the various reports for land use, transportation, and market analysis to conceive of ways to redevelop the corridor. One concept that was formed early on was that of making the Gateway District the front door, one that would welcome citizens and visitors alike. Five Points was then envisioned to be the living room for the corridor and south valley, where local goods and services could be found. Tower Employment District would then contain employment opportunities for the region.

This general concept shaped the visioning for catalytic projects that would contribute to the village centers concept. These catalytic projects were derived from the market analysis and from comments and concerns of community members, which are meant to strengthen the sense of place as well as economic development.

Community sentiment predominantly favors the creation of a self-sustaining corridor, complete with strong connections between activity nodes, which would contain goods, services, and entertainment options. The community is primarily concerned with livability within the area, placing greater value on it than on transporting citizens through the corridor, efficiently. Therefore, a pedestrian-first approach was applied to the land use conceptualization.

Greater concentrations of density and activities are envisioned along Bridge Boulevard. This is done to take advantage of access along the thoroughfare, as well as way to preserve off-corridor agriculture and the rural characteristic of South Valley, while simultaneously accommodating future residents.

In general, flexible patterns of land use were derived to allow for are integration with the various transportation scenarios.

Gateway District

The Gateway District is, as its name suggests, the gateway to not only Bridge Boulevard but also to the larger South Valley. Construction of Gateway Park, a regional-scale open space, provided the activity node from which to
consider other land uses.

It was largely agreed upon that the corridor would be greatly enhanced by providing a physical and metaphorical connection with the National Hispanic Cultural Center. Doing so necessitates the physical upgrading of the bridge to provide a more powerful multimodal connection. This would include enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities, in addition to lighting and interesting, well-designed features.

Next, the creation of a well-designed public access point to the river was envisioned. The Rio Grande State Park is universally seen as a community asset, and the community desires a connection to it for recreational and social gathering purposes.

Along Bridge Boulevard, the design team also created design concepts for retail courtyards with shared parking courts. Such a concept aims to maximize existing retail space as well as create additional public space located behind existing structures that front Bridge Boulevard.

Bridge Boulevard within this district is envisioned to include a stronger grid-like circulation and mobility network, as well as denser land uses, particularly near the Isleta Boulevard intersection. The concept aims to facilitate the provision of greater housing choice for a large segment of the population. The various transportation scenarios are consistent in their treatment of this intersection as the focal point for the district.

**Five Points District**

Five Points District is unique in that it contains large, underutilized property parcels adjacent to a busy intersection. Therefore, redevelopment opportunities are numerous. Three general development scenarios were conceived. Commonalities among the designs included strong pedestrian connectivity throughout

---

Reconfigured access points to create retail courts

Refashioned rear ingress/egress of existing structures to allow for additional retail uses
Gateway land use with standard intersection and realigned La Vega Drive

Gateway land use with round-about at Isleta Boulevard/Bridge Boulevard intersection
the site, as well as the allowance for the multiple transportation scenarios. Each also reconfigure Five Points Road, eliminating the fifth point of the intersection, while maintaining north/south access with Sunset Road. The emphasis for each was to provide a wider variety of commercial space to bring goods and services closer to residents of the community. Two of the concepts incorporated multifamily housing as a way to add residential options to the community and create a buffer between existing neighborhoods and new commercial space.

#1 Strip commercial
This scenario did not consider a mix of uses, instead opting to fill the parcels with a movie theatre, grocery store, drug store, some in-line retail, and micro-retail. While the design allows for pedestrian access, the style of development does not exhibit strong urban design principles.

#2 Five Points Plazas
This concept utilizes existing structures to anchor the development, fashioning the structures into enhanced indoor mercados, with flexible open spaces adjacent that can double as outdoor commercial spaces. The development would be set back from the intersection, allowing for flexible open space at the intersection. Multifamily housing is envisioned for the rear of the site, transitioning to the adjacent single-family residential area.

#3 Five Points TOD
This concept utilizes urban design principles to orient development around pedestrian access. Structures are placed nearer to the intersection to allow for access, as well as the creation of a visual focal point for the unique intersection. Five Points Road near the intersection would become a festival street that would allow for street vending, such as food trucks and other mobile vendors. Taller structures would be placed along Bridge Boulevard, with less intensive residential uses placed in the rear to transition to the adjacent single-family residential areas. Uses envisioned for Five Points TOD include a movie theatre, grocery store, drug store, two vertical mixed-use structures with multifamily housing on the upper levels and commercial at ground level, live-work units along Sunset, junior retail pad sites, senior apartments, and townhomes.
3. Five Points Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Perspective view of a reconfigured Five Points Road into a short, flexible pedestrian way.
Tower Employment Center
The scale of the Tower Employment Center presents unique challenges and opportunities. The large parcels and access to major thoroughfares, in particular, make the area attractive for commercial and employment related development.

The scenarios envisioned for the area incorporated varying circulation possibilities that would be necessary to make the existing property parcels more viable for development. The east side of the district, east of Old Coors Road, is envisioned to contain housing. The parcels are large enough to provide opportunities for multifamily, senior, and single family residential uses. Residents here would be able to take advantage of unrivaled views of the metropolitan area and mountain ranges.

The Arenal Main Canal and adjacent retention pond present excellent opportunities for the county to provide quality open space for residents and visitors, alike. Users would be able to access open space with great views. A recreational trail along the canal and a public park are envisioned for the site.

Scenarios for the district also look at ways that land use can work with transportation to create enhanced connectivity at the intersection of Old Coors Drive, Tower Road, and Bridge Boulevard.
MOBILITY

Option #1 Bridge as a Mainstreet
The Bridge as a Mainstreet cross section makes use of the existing right-of-way width while providing facilities for transit, isolated parking, pedestrian and bicycles. A raised median was added to provide improved access control and driver expectation for vehicles accessing and departing from Bridge Blvd. It could also provide opportunities for pedestrian refuge islands for mid-block crossings. The narrower lanes have a calming effect on vehicular traffic and will tend to slow down traffic. This option provides the future opportunity to reserve one of the general purpose lanes as a bus/HOV lane during peak hours. This will help to encourage the use of the transit system or carpooling. However, there will have to be considerable improvements in the transit headways and routes in order to support this configuration.

This alternative acknowledges that travel times and congestion in the corridor will increase over time and was developed with Bridge as a destination in mind. This alternative will be modeled with roundabouts at two key locations within the corridor, Isleta and Five Points,

Option #1: Bridge as a “Main Street”

![Option #1: Bridge as a “Main Street” diagram]

Main Street concept for bridge
to determine feasibility. It is anticipated that improved operation of these intersections will help to alleviate the congestion due to lack of capacity increases. These improvements can be implemented with a limited amount of additional right-of-way that will likely be restricted to the intersections. The roundabouts also provide opportunities for the surrounding land use modifications to be successfully implemented.

Option #2 Flexible Lanes
The four flexible thru lanes can provide for the current volumes that Bridge experiences for commuter traffic. The flexibility of reversible lanes in the future will also allow for additional lanes in the main traffic flow direction to be provided while reducing the number of lanes in the non-peak direction. These flexible lanes will employ the use of moveable barrier that would be moved daily to orient lanes to the traffic flow needs. Left turns from Bridge Boulevard will be restricted to reduce impacts to the through movements. Users will need to employ the “South Valley Left” which involves making a right turn at the desired intersection and performing a u-turn to head in the intended direction. These u-turn movements will have to accommodate a large truck resulting in a large diameter and the need for significant real estate.

A two-way protected bike lane known as a cycle track has been included in this alternative. The cycle track will allow for bicycles traveling in both directions to be physically separated from the high speed vehicular traffic. This will largely limit the access for bicycles to the businesses on the side opposite the track. It is anticipated that the elimination of the left turn phase from Bridge will allow a reallocation of “green time” to accommodate a phase in the signal for bicycle crossings.

With the exception of the turn around locations the flexible lanes will fit within the existing right-of-way. Current and planned land uses would suggest that this alternative would be employed from the river crossing to Goff Ave. It would be able to be used in combination with the Bridge as a mainstreet section from Goff to the
Option #3 Multi-way Boulevard

The Multi-way Boulevard will accommodate access to businesses for both commuter traffic and local traffic. The four flexible through lanes can provide for the current thru traffic volumes that Bridge experiences. The flexibility of reversible lanes in the future will also make accommodating anticipated traffic growth an option. Left turns from Bridge Boulevard will be restricted to reduce impacts to the through movements. Users will need to employ the “South Valley Left” which involves making a right turn at the desired intersection and performing a u-turn to head in the intended direction. These u-turn movements will have to accommodate a large truck resulting in a large diameter and the need for significant real estate for right of way. The elimination of the left turn phase from Bridge Boulevard will allow for the reallocation of “green time” for the signal that accompanies the through direction. This will help significantly increase the corridor’s ability to handle current and future capacity needs.

The local road system will allow for business access, parking and multi-modal access such as transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This slower local street will be physically separated by a raised, landscaped median with spaced access to the through lanes. The local businesses will have very wide sidewalks that will provide for sidewalk cafes or other inviting uses.

The multi-way boulevard will require a significant amount of additional right-of-way. The planning level analysis assumed that 80’ of additional width will be required in the corridor. This will have a significant impact on the property owners and is estimated to result in the need for several total takes. The upfront investment for right-of-way only is anticipated to be in the range of $12M.
MARKET FEASIBILITY

Economic Drivers
The primary drivers for potential land use concepts are three-fold:

• Capture the income that already exist in the South Valley and enable greater circulation of those dollars, resulting in greater economic activity and benefit to South Valley businesses and residents,

• Import new economic activity by positioning the South Valley as a compelling destination for Albuquerque residents, and

• Evaluate the breadth of market potentials represented on the western end of the corridor and tap into regional market interest for retail, office, and residential uses.

Each of these drivers has been used to define market concepts for catalytic development nodes at the Gateway area (generally located between the River and Isleta Boulevard, the Five Points area, and the western mesa between Old and New Coors Boulevard.)

Submarket Apportionment
Concerning retail development potentials, the 665,000 square feet of potential retail space represents the total potential for the entire South Valley over the 20-year planning horizon (See Table below). The ability to capture a portion of this demand primarily depends on the ability of the County, property owners, and developers to work together to implement the economic driver concepts stated above. That said, a reasonable working assumption is that the corridor could capture between 25.0 and 33.3 percent of the total, which translates to 160,000 to 220,000 square feet. This capture depends on the ability to attract larger regional retail uses on the western end of the corridor as noted in the following section.

Eastern versus Western submarket Characteristics
It is important to recognize the different market characteristics of the Bridge Corridor from the River to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Leakage Capture 2010</th>
<th>Leakage Capture 2010</th>
<th>New 2020</th>
<th>New Potential 2030</th>
<th>Total 2010-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets / Grocery</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Stores</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer, Wine, &amp; Liquor Stores</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convenience Goods</td>
<td>110,700</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopper’s Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Furnishings, &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>30,250</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, &amp; Music Stores</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shopper’s Goods</td>
<td>341,350</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Goods</td>
<td>795,950</td>
<td>464,000</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007 Census of Retail Trade, Economic & Planning Systems
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South Valley market data
West Mesa. Generally, the segment that extends along the valley east of the mesa is cohesive with common commercial and residential uses. However, the western portion of Bridge Boulevard relates to a larger market with different characteristics. Generally, the parcel sizes are much larger, the access to north-south arterials is better, and the ability to draw from a larger trade area results in greater development potentials. The catalytic projects anticipated for the Gateway and Five Points areas call for horizontally mixed use development, with a high level of emphasis on walkability, sustainable land use concepts, and synergistic qualities with existing land uses on the corridor. The projects anticipated for the western end are more autonomous, based on the scale, auto orientation, and industrial nature of current uses. The west mesa sites have the potential for large-scale retail, residential, and/or office uses, depending on the motivation of property owners and the ability to attract users from the western portion of the Albuquerque region. The sites in this area could also be integrated into larger Albuquerque Economic Development (AED) plans to leverage regional efforts.

Market Concepts
Based on the research completed by EPS, the integration of primary and secondary data, and the economic drivers identified for the corridor, EPS has summarized development concepts for each of the nodes, as listed below.

Authentic Albuquerque
Goal is to attract dollars from the larger metropolitan area (or out of state).
- Draw new/outside visitors to Bridge Boulevard to experience the ‘real’ Albuquerque.
- Leverage visitor traffic from the National Hispanic Center. This facility has an extensive event calendar and includes many civic events that already draws people from around the Albuquerque region.
- Create a collection of restaurants to serve as an activity anchor and destination for visitors from the entire region.
- A single site could have up to five to seven restaurants, with approximately 15,000 square feet.
- Conventional retail could be added, ranging from 15,000 to 30,000 square feet.
- Create a common plaza for outdoor dining to enhance the sense place and provide a critical mass of activity on the corridor
- Supplement potential activity node with ancillary space for retail and service businesses.
- Leverage the recently completed (to be completed) park at Bridge and Isleta as a regional attraction by creating a large farmer’s market and authentic sense of place.
- Support the emergent sector of local agriculture in the South Valley with the facilities needed for this sector to succeed.
- Enhance and promote access to the one of the best assets of the region -- the direct frontage on the Bosque.
- Develop market rate condominiums and townhomes to complement the retail node.
- Locate the core of activity on the far eastern edge of the corridor to simplify (and shorten) drive time for visitors and serve as a gateway to the rest of the corridor and South Valley.

South Valley Node of Commerce
Goal is to keep South Valley dollars circulating in the community and reduce the current level of leakage.
- Serve local needs with merchants geared to the South Valley market.
- Create economic “barbell” with larger anchors supporting smaller local retailers.
- Develop anchor consisting of a Hispanic grocer (25,000 square feet) and drug store (15,000 square feet).
- Incorporate a movie theatre complex for locals (four to six screens), as the South Valley is currently underserved given its population levels.
- Based on the number of screens, the building could range from 11,000 to 23,000 square feet, with a total site area of 73,000 to 150,000 square feet.
- Consider outdoor plaza between Five Points Road and Sunset Road that could be lined with micro-merchandizing and create a pedestrian core and sense of place.
- Add 10,000(+) for larger stores and 10,000(+) for micro-retailing.
- Leverage the adjacent post office and bank to reinforce Five Points’ market position as a node of commerce.
- If site design can accommodate, consider a senior low-income tax credit project in the rear portion of the site to provide for a greater mix of uses and enhance pedestrian accessibility.
West Side Mesa

Goal is to diversify the Bridge Boulevard market and consider more conventional development patterns that address market needs of the larger Southwest Mesa area.

- Recognize importance and growth potential of adjacent Southwest Mesa
- Work with AED to understand how local land supply fits with larger Albuquerque regional economic development strategy.
- Leverage adjacency to Southwest Mesa and direct frontage on New Coors Boulevard to capture regional retail market share.
- Locate a new shopping center on Bridge that draws from larger market support and requires less infrastructure cost than elsewhere in the South Valley
- Consider big box anchors within a power center.
- Leverage views from the southwest mesa and relatively larger development parcels to inject 450 to 850 units of attached housing at a range of densities
- Move senior housing to this site, in the event the central location does not have sufficient land supply, create senior housing development that provides the full continuum of care (independent living to critical care).
- Consider a social services campus, based on proximity to existing County services buildings.
- Other options include health care or an employment center.
COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Community members were involved in the charrette process from beginning to end. Wednesday evening began with an open house that included opportunities to contribute to the process through one-on-one dialog with the team, as well as a public forum for discussion.

Thursday and Friday were conducted with an open invitation for community member to check in on the team and provide comments and critiques. Both days included a short presentation of the day’s work to discuss, compare, and critique developing concepts and designs.

By Saturday, all design scenarios had been defined, with illustrations of important concepts. The public was invited to an open house during the morning to review what had been accomplished and what was being proposed by the design team. Community member were invited to discuss concepts with design team members.

For the first half of the morning, community members were invited to review all design scenarios with individual team members. This enabled everyone to get a detailed understanding of the scenarios and talk in-depth on topics they were interested in. Mid-morning, community residents and team members convened for an overview of the process and to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the respective scenarios. The informal tone created an atmosphere of team members and residents jointly discussing the relative merits of the ideas, rather than an atmosphere of the team trying to “sell” a recommended alternative. Comments were received in three ways: From individual discussions with team members; from comments during the discussion; and from a poll of participants’ opinions on each of the roadway and district scenarios, respectively, using a ‘gradients of agreement’ scale. The scale allowed each participant to say how much they liked or disliked each scenario, from “1” (strong support) to “8” (strong opposition). (Each scenario assessment was independent of others; for example, a participant might strongly support or strongly oppose all scenarios.)

Comments:

Gateway
• The Gateway ideas, particularly with new commercial and residential development on the north side, and increased parking behind buildings on the south side, received unanimous support from community residents.
• There were a number of comments on how to improve the concepts, and how to integrate them with the roadway design scenarios. But overall, people appreciated the scenario concepts.
• Local residents expressed concern about absentee landlords that were not responsive to concerns about illicit activities and vandalism to properties.
• One particular community member wanted to see a more nuanced plan that reflected the potential change to individual properties.
• On the scale, nearly everyone rated it a “1”, with outliers going no lower than “3”.

Five Points
• There was strong support for the Five Points concept of closing off Five Points to motorized traffic, and preserving it for pedestrian traffic.
• Nearly everyone also liked the rationale of a larger, more continuous commercial area that the pedestrian path would support.
• Comments differed on the variations for diverting traffic over to Sunset, the possibility of a housing development, and the idea of a movie theater, etc. The major concept, however, had strong support. In fact, a local neighborhood association president stated that this would limit speeding on Five Points, which would be a benefit to the neighborhood.
• Not many comments on the proposed movie theater
• On the scale, all ratings were a “1” or a “2”.

Tower Employment District
• There was strong support for the general concept of a more rational way of zoning and platting property, as well as for the various ideas for putting commercial, residential, health and other uses on contiguous parcels.
• Residents of adjacent Alamosa Neighborhood liked concept of closing Bridge west of Old Coors.
• Overall concepts for creating medical node and retail center were well-received.
• All ratings on the scale were either “1” or “2”, except for one “8” (strong opposition).
Bridge as Main Street
- Participants liked the small community feel that the “Main Street” scenario preserved, but were uncomfortable about the constraints on traffic that it imposed.
- In the poll, several people strongly supported the scenario, several expressed lukewarm support, and at least two people strongly opposed it.

Flexible Lanes
- Participants were lukewarm at best about this concept. While people appreciated the importance of keeping traffic flowing, the requirement that a left turn could only be done by turning right and doing a U-turn on a side street was deemed impractical.
- On the scale, most people rated it a “4” or “5”, meaning that they did not have a strong opinion, with at least one person strongly supporting and one person strongly opposing it.

Boulevard
- Participants were nearly unanimous in strongly opposing this scenario. While the wider roadway offers access to all transportation modes and increases roadway capacity, this scenario would alter the corridor beyond all recognition, as well as being extremely expensive and disruptive due to right-of-way acquisition.
- On the scale, nearly all participants rated it an “8” (strong opposition), although there were two “1s” and a couple “no opinions”.

Applications/Roundabouts
- There was strong support for roundabouts at Isleta and Five Points.
- On the scale, all participants rated it a “1”, “2”, or “3”, with two people opposing it with an “8”. This level of support was a surprise to the team. However, when community residents were shown all the constraints and scenarios, individually and in the whole group discussion, many people came to the conclusion on their own that roundabouts might be the best solution.
- Several people indicated a preference for roundabouts based on experience elsewhere, and an appreciation that the Bridge Corridor could have roundabouts as well.

The overall tone of community feedback was quite positive. Participants expressed appreciation for the way the team tried to balance community ideas and roadway demands for the Corridor. There was lively discussion and debate on the individual ideas, and a number of suggestions for improvements. Also, community participants understood that the scenarios represent a “first draft” of ideas that must be further analyzed. However, everyone who participated had positive remarks about the process and the way that the team had interacted with the community. One community leader commended the County, saying that this process has been the most transparent he has been part of in over twenty years of community planning participation.
Livability Principles

- Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities
- Align federal policies and funding
- Target federal funding toward existing communities
- Improve economic competitiveness of neighborhoods
- Expand location and energy-efficient housing choices
- Provide more transportation choices
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COMMERCIAL
GATEWAY DISTRICT
~ 1,500 feet
~ 24 acres

Opportunities
- High visibility
- River access
- Route 66/84 history
- New Gateway Park
- Stronger existing urban fabric
- 100-foot Right-of-Way
- Acequia

Constraints
- Busy intersection
- Functionally obsolete structures
- Many curb cuts
- Narrow sidewalks
FIVE POINTS COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

~ 3,300 feet
~ 72 acres

Opportunities
- Large empty parcels
- Unique street configuration
- Community-scale public space
- Armijo acequia

Constraints
- 80-foot ROW
- Lots of empty parking lots
- Busy intersection
- Narrow sidewalks
- Antiquated zoning
GOFF DISTRICT

~ 1,350 feet
~ 20 acres

Opportunities

- City zoning
- Underdeveloped parcels
- Existing commercial center
- Arenal acequia

Constraints

- Large parking lots that detract from walkability
- Busy intersection
- Underperforming commercial/vacancies
- 80-foot right-of-way
ATRISCO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
~ 4,350 feet
~ 104 acres

Opportunities
- Agricultural heritage
- Acequias and drainages
- Underutilized parcels

Constraints
- Antiquated housing stock
- Many curb cuts
- 80-foot right-of-way
- Lack of neighborhood commercial services
TOWER EMPLOYMENT DISTRICT

~ 3,800 feet
~ 103 acres

Opportunities

- Large parcels
- Views to the east
- Coors Blvd access (high visibility)
- Underutilized/vacant parcels

Constraints

- Tower/Bridge/Old Coors intersection
- Incompatible land uses
- Tower Road lacks pedestrian/bike infrastructure
- Dilapidated structures
- Lack of property maintainance
DRAFT AGENDA

Bridge Boulevard Charrette

May 9-12, 2012
Bernalillo County Multi-Purpose Center
2008 Larrazolo Lane
South Valley

Wednesday, May 9th
6:00 Welcome from Commissioner
6:15 – 6:30 Why a Charrette? Will/Tim
  • How a charrette helps define the Corridor Plan for Bridge Boulevard
  • Deliverables: what we expect as outcomes from next two days of work
6:30 – 7:00 Overview of Bridge Corridor:
  • What we know to date
  • Market Trends – Andy/Chris
  • Key Transportation and Land Use Findings – Carlos/Will
7:00 – 7:30 Feedback/Discussion with Steering Committee/General Public
7:30 Call it a night.

Key Exhibits for the Wednesday Night Session:
  • Overall Corridor
  • Individual Districts
  • Summary Market Trends
  • Key Findings to date
  • Study Purpose and Expected Outcome
  • Precedent Boards: Isleta Blvd., Colfax Avenue, SugarHouse Transit

Thursday, May 10th
Goal: For each District, develop alternative scenarios and explore range of options for catalytic projects and transformation of Bridge Boulevard. Divergent Thinking.....

8:30: Get organized into teams and agree on process/outcomes
9:00 -11:30: Focus on the eastern portion: the River to Goff
  • Key Issues:
    o Land Use/Zoning
    o Transportation/Traffic
    o Streetscape
    o Corridor Considerations: Transportation/Traffic/Streetscape
    o Livability
  • What are key funding opportunities?
  • What are short term actions that will improve the corridor?
11:30 - 12:00: Review work
12:00 - 1:00: Lunch – maybe visit/revisit key sections of corridor

1:00 – 3:30: Focus on the western portion: Goff to Coors
  • Key Issues:
    o Land Use/Zoning
    o Transportation/Traffic
    o Streetscape
    o Corridor Considerations: Transportation/Traffic/Streetscape
    o Livability
  • What are key funding opportunities?

3:30 – 4:00: Break
4:00 - 5:00: Assess progress and discuss alternatives w/ Steering Committee

Friday, May 11th
Goal: Convergent Thinking: Select Preferred Alternatives and Refine Work

8:30 – 9:00: Agree on Preferred Alternatives
9:00 – 12:00: Work on refining alternatives for eastern half: River to Goff
12:00 - 1:00: Lunch
1:00 – 1:30: Check in, ensure that work is on track
1:30 - 4:30: Work on refining alternatives for western half: Goff to Bridge
4:30 – 5:00: Wrap up and have exhibits ready for Saturday

Saturday, May 12th
9:00 – 12:00: Open House format; one board per concept and accompanying text
(one – three team members to represent the project)

Criteria for screening alternatives:
  • Walkability
  • Potential to increase Transit ridership
  • Strengthen Neighborhoods: Compatibility with adjoining area context
  • Economic Development: Potential to spur private investment
Economic Development: Potential to generate jobs
Potential to increase housing options
Impact on Mobility
Potential for funding

Charrette Team Members/Roles

HDR – Traffic and Overall Corridor considerations
Dean Bressler
Ed Pothoff

Van Citters Historic Preservation – Historical Context/Preservation
Karen Van Citters
Sarah Payne

DPS – Charrette Ring Leaders/Land Use/Overall Exhibit Production
Tim Trujillo
Sergio Yamada
Will Gleason
Mimi Burns

F&P
Carlos Hernandez – Transportation/Livability

EPS- Market Analysis/Reality Check
Andy Knudtsen
Chris Leutzinger

Karpoff Associates – Facilitation/Community Input
Tim Karpoff

Bernalillo County – Overall County Perspective/Traffic/Roadway/Housing
Commissioner Art de la Cruz
Dolores Herrera
Roger Paul
Richard Meadows
Joe Luehring
Nolan Bennett
Betty Valdez
Bridge Boulevard Redevelopment Plan

Comments Received at Kickoff Meeting and Open House

1. Create a place for people first.
2. Places to sit and corner parks – community first. Goiff/Isleta Plaza as an example.
3. Bridge/Coors intersections
4. Noise is loud – buffer from Bridge from Goiff to Atrisco.
5. Ground floor
   • Food/dining
   • Grocery store
   • Parking?
6. Can this happen?
7. Signs first?
8. Building improvements for signs and windows.
9. Police substations as crime deterrent – xeriscape park and gardens attached
10. Public parks and libraries – Connect gardens to elementary schools
11. A study is needed for parallel corridors and UNM and CNM growth
12. Valley as a “Garden District”
13. Bridge/Isleta as main street retail and higher density
14. SW slope (Coors/Tower) employment/commercial district with mass housing.
15. Senior housing at Five Points as opposed to west end of street; then it would be close to amenities.
16. Mixed housing – affordable/higher end in one unit helps to have a sense of pride, not just a project type.
17. Movie theater
18. Lots of green and landscape features, grasses
19. Ample public parking – eliminate street parking
20. Love the bridge (river) pedestrian idea and observation area.
22. Conflict between bikes and parked cars.
23. Be sure and nominate historical properties.
25. Tower ideas – NO! This is the “Bridge Development Plan” for Bridge Rd., NOT Tower! Problems with Tower and Bridge intersection just west of Old Coors.
26. Bridge: westside is growing!! Thoroughfare is king! Option #2 – flexible lanes.
27. Redevelopment of business areas should be less about parking lots and more about walking and vegetation.
28. The many comments about Bridge as a transportation corridor often focused on cars. Looking to the future, I can’t imagine that auto transport as we currently live it can possibly be like this 15 years from now. Transportation must be forward thinking. I am not pie-in-the-sky, but if we only imagine individual cars, we are actually living in the past.
29. Specific business to try to attract Trader Joe’s markets. Many in our area drive all the way to Louisiana to use this market. The two TJs in ABQ are busy all days, all hours, so they will not hurt those markets. TJs would also attract people to Bridge and can work better with farmers markets and other local businesses because of the type of people who shop there.
30. Talk with our ABQ mayor to see how we can collaborate on river project at Bridge. He wants to focus some money and time on making the river trails more inviting and accessible for tourists.
Bridge Boulevard Redevelopment Plan

and residents. Maybe some money to share. Also see what ABQ open space folks have planned for the area.