

Comment Response for Building Hope Public Charter School Neighborhood Assessment (City of Albuquerque comments dated September 25, 2025)			
Comment Number	Page Number (of the Report)	Comment	Response/Comment
1	28-29	On pages 28 and 29 for Coors/Tucson there are statements on the WBR and SBL movements that due to high delays it is expected that project traffic will find a different route. If you can add just a line of explanation as to where you rerouted traffic in the model. As it is it sounds like you are saying that they will just somehow get to the project site.	Additional explanation has been added to the document.
2	28-29	Also on pages 28 and 29 for Coors/Tucson states that project traffic is expected to impact SBL in 2027 build but not in 2037 build, but Table 7 shows SBL increase in delay from the no build to the build for 2037. Please add an explanation.	Additional explanation has been added to the document.
3	29	Page 29 Coors/Sequoia and Coors/Redlands both state a movement is not expected to impact traffic but also have increase from the no build to the build for 2037. Please add explanation.	Additional explanation has been added to the document.

Mendoza, Lorenzo

From: Christian, Keith
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 2:02 PM
To: Armijo, Ernest M.
Cc: Nuffer, Lauren; Brady Hutchins; Mendoza, Lorenzo
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Building Hope Public Charter School NIA Resubmittal

Thanks, Ernest!

Thanks so much for your review and comments! I understand where you are coming from. I will review these specific items you have outlined and get an updated version to you early next week.

I will provide an updated version to you and to Margaret. Have a great day!

From: Armijo, Ernest M. <earmijo@cabq.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 2:33 PM
To: Christian, Keith <Keith.Christian@kimley-horn.com>
Cc: Nuffer, Lauren <lauren.nuffer@kimley-horn.com>; Brady Hutchins <bhutchins@bhope.org>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Building Hope Public Charter School NIA Resubmittal

Keith,

I have just finished my review. Overall the report is good, but I do want a couple items addressed.

1. On pages 28 and 29 for Coors/Tucson there are statements on the WBR and SBL movements that due to high delays it is expected that project traffic will find a different route. If you can add just a line of explanation as to where you rerouted traffic in the model. As it is it sounds like you are saying that they will just somehow get to the project site.
2. Also on pages 28 and 29 for Coors/Tucson states that project traffic is expected to impact SBL in 2027 build but not in 2037 build, but Table 7 shows SBL in crease in delay from the no build to the build for 2037. Please add an explanation.
3. Page 29 Coors/Sequoia and Coors/Redlands both state a movement is not expected to impact traffic but also have increase from the no build to the build for 2037. Please add explanation.

Just so you know, I am not necessarily concerned about the movement with minor increases in delay without project impact, it is that I need the report to be a bit more descriptive with these situations. Many times after a project is built residents will blame any increase in traffic or delay on new projects and they ask for copies of the traffic study. As they are not typically engineers they do not understand the nuances of how traffic flows and lock onto items like these to prove that you or we as the reviewers have made a mistake. I ask for these because I have had to deal with public expectations quite often. Just remember to write you reports with the expectation that laymen will review them at some point. If you could add just a bit of descriptive explanation to the report so we can bullet proof it, it would be very helpful. I am ready to approve once that is done.

Thanks,

