

Summary of Comments Received

Option 1

General comments

- Install more traffic lights to allow safer pedestrian crossing
- Install pedestrian activated crossing in lieu of adding more traffic lights
- Put in on-street parking when/where available
- Non-continuous median (raised or painted)
- There are some starting points for opportunities:
 - North and south of UNM property (Shoopshire to Hudson)
 - Griegos to San Lorenzo
- Wants
 - Visible street signs
 - Visualization of what segments could actually look like; having trouble visualizing what it might look like; for example, what would buffers look like?
 - Flexibility throughout the corridor
 - Safe crossings for bicyclists to access pathways near/on 2nd Street

Likes

- Less impact on business property
- More feasible (cost effective)
- How much on street parking is necessary?
- Retains median for landscape/turn lanes/pedestrians
- Retains buffers
- Has on-street parking
- Painted median (raised where necessary to accommodate pedestrian refuges and left turns)
- Landscaping in median with some trees, but avoid obstruction of view
- TWLTL
- Buffer to house utilities
- On-street parking (limit to need)
- Some on-street parking is essential
- Offers opportunities for flexibility in different sections of 4th Street

Dislikes

- Has on-street parking (i.e. encourages use of personal vehicles rather than public transportation)
- Continuous raised median
- Would like power line to be buried
- Trees in the median
- The Rank III Plan typical on the aerials is depicted as inflexible

Option 2

General Comments

- Shift the roadway so that property owners do not have to give more property than they are obligated to
- Potentially adjust median width
- Can landscaping on median be moved to buffers?
- Development of large properties will take over properties of smaller businesses
- Removal of one side's buffer to create room for businesses
- Raised medians with pedestrian refuges
- Signalized crossings
- Crossing at Alameda Drain Trail is critical
- Slow traffic
- Bus stop in front of UNMH (move northbound stop closer to trail to enable safer crossing)
- Eliminate on-street parking (especially Woodland to Fitzgerald) and use space to add more sidewalk width and landscaping with street trees
- Parallel parking

Likes

- Incorporates sector plan policy

Dislikes

- Impact on numerous businesses including the taking of buildings
- Right-of-way does not meander to minimize takes
- Median is continuous without compromise to limited section (where the buildings have to be taken)
- Building takes would impact property owners
- Parallel parking disrupts traffic flow
- Bury power lines
- Un-adopted typical section throughout 4th Street.

Option 3

General Comments

- Opportunities: City can drive the process for redevelopment

Likes

- Minimal property impact
- Better sidewalks
- Improved sidewalks in some areas
- Offers immediate improvements

Dislikes

- No median; left turn lane is in drive lane
- “Dead Peds”
- Limited buffers
- Rear-end collisions
- Minimal change
- Everything
- Too “*de minim us*”
- Doesn’t set the stage for positive redevelopment
- Potential limitation on supporting option 1 or 2 (would like Options 1 or 2 to always be options for the future)
- Utilities aren’t relocated