

**City of Albuquerque
Indicators Progress Commission
Minutes
August 21, 2026
12:00 – 12:55 PM (Virtual Meeting)**

Members Present

- Brittany Poss, Chair (Presiding)
- Andrew Estocin, Vice Chair
- Jennifer Frank Pontzer
- Alexis Tappan
- Robert Stokowy
- Michael Platenberg

Members Absent

- Dede Feldman
- Anthony Garland

Others Present

- Miriam Diemer, Associate Director, Department of Technology & Innovation

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Estocin called the meeting to order, noting that Chair Poss would preside over the substantive agenda while he handled the administrative portion. A roll call confirmed a quorum was present.

2. Approval of Agenda

A motion to approve the agenda for August 21, 2026 was made and seconded.

Motion approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the July 17, 2026 meeting minutes was made and seconded.

Motion approved unanimously.

4. Work Plan Status Update

Chair Poss reported that the Commission is continuing to identify indicators for the 2026 Indicators Progress Report. The Commission is somewhat behind the timeline proposed in the work plan but is not at risk of missing its overall schedule. Chair Poss thanked subcommittees for meeting and completing the indicator survey distributed by staff, and offered interns from her office to assist Ms. Diemer with data collection once indicators are finalized. New commissioners confirmed they have received a copy of the work plan.

5. Review of Subcommittee Indicator Recommendations

Chair Poss presented a summary of survey results in which commissioners indicated support for or opposition to indicators proposed by subcommittees for each Desired Community Condition, along with open-ended comments. The Commission discussed two overarching themes before reviewing individual goals: (1) general agreement on using rates rather than raw counts where possible, for better year-over-year comparability; and (2) an ongoing tension between indicators that measure the City's institutional performance ("big C" city) versus the broader community ("small C" city), with the Commission generally favoring indicators tied to City impact where data allows.

The Commission also discussed several Desired Community Conditions that rely on City survey data which has not been collected this year. Commissioner Pontzer suggested retaining the most recent available survey value rather than substituting a weaker indicator, and noting in the report that the figure will be updated once new survey data is available. The Commission agreed with this approach. Ms. Diemer clarified that the 2026 report will still be produced in paper format; a dashboard-based reporting model remains a future proposal pending adoption of a new ordinance.

6. Discussion of Indicators for the 2026 Report, by Goal

Goal 1 – Human and Family Development: The Commission reached agreement on indicators including percent of families with children under 18 living in poverty and the homelessness point-in-time count. Rent burden and graduation rate each drew one commissioner's objection but were otherwise supported. The Commission discussed at length the use of 311 call volume as an indicator of institutional resilience and agreed it was not a meaningful measure; alternative options discussed included the number of City contracts or partnerships with nonprofit and human-services organizations, and quarterly reporting data from City-funded youth and family service providers. The Commission agreed to have staff research nonprofit partnership data as a possible alternative. The insurance-rate indicator for physical and mental health was retained for now, with the Commission agreeing to revisit it as time allows.

Goal 2 – Public Safety: The Commission agreed on existing indicators for the safety of people, property, and transportation, noting that the Safe Streets Index adequately captures pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic safety. For the Desired Community Condition that institutions are trusted and effective, the Commission agreed to retain the prior survey-based indicator pending updated City survey data. For neighborhoods that are clean and well-maintained and public responsibility for a safe environment, the Commission discussed replacing the previous indicators (number of sharps drop-off locations and number of neighborhood cleanups) with 311 call data related to weeds, graffiti, and hazardous waste, which commissioners felt would be a more replicable and comprehensive measure. Ms. Diemer agreed to inquire with City staff about the feasibility of pulling this data.

Goal 3 – Public Infrastructure: The Commission found broad agreement on proposed indicators, including consideration of composite scores (e.g., walk score, transit score, bike score) in place of the current "percent of residents within a five-minute walk to transit" measure. Extended discussion addressed the Desired Community Condition on utilities, which commissioners noted bundles several distinct concepts (affordability, availability, and multiple utility types including electricity, natural gas, water, and broadband). The Commission discussed pursuing a utility-affordability index, such as comparing utility bills to median income, and agreed more generally to be transparent in the report where a single Desired Community Condition bundles multiple concepts, noting the Commission's intent to refine and clarify these indicators in future reporting cycles.

Goal 4 – Sustainable Community Development: The Commission found general agreement on indicators for diverse and accessible communities, including use of a Park Score Index. For the Desired Community Condition that people shape where they live, the Commission agreed to replace the existing outdated survey-based indicator with number of volunteer hours logged, noting that this data is readily available through the City's volunteer office.

Given time constraints, the Commission agreed to complete review of the remaining four goals at the next meeting.

7. Data Collection Planning

Ms. Diemer requested that Chair Poss and the Commission identify, for the indicators discussed, which data the City will need to pull directly (e.g., from 311) versus which data the Commission's own resources could gather, so that staff can begin collection ahead of the next meeting.

8. Draft Assessment Matrices and Summaries

This item, along with discussion of writing assignments for the 2026 report, was not reached due to time and was rolled forward to the next meeting agenda.

9. Public Comment

No public comment was received.

10. Recap of Action Items

- Chair Poss will compile an updated list of proposed indicators and data sources for Goals 1 through 4 based on today's discussion.
- Staff will begin identifying and pulling available City data (e.g., 311 data) for the indicators discussed.
- Commissioners who have not yet completed the survey for the remaining four goals are encouraged to do so before the next meeting.

11. Items for Future Meetings

The next meeting will include review of indicators for the remaining four goals, discussion of draft assessment matrices and summaries, and initial discussion of writing assignments for the 2026 Indicators Progress Report.

12. Other Business

Commissioner Pontzer thanked Chair Poss for leading development of the indicator survey and moving the Commission's work forward.

Chair Poss and Ms. Diemer reported on a meeting with Councilor Rogers regarding the Commission's proposed ordinance change, which the Councilor is open to carrying; her policy analyst will coordinate next steps with the Administration's Government Affairs office. Councilor Rogers is also pursuing separate budget ordinance amendments that would more firmly embed the IPC within the budget ordinance to strengthen City department accountability. Those budget amendments were introduced separately; Ms. Diemer noted the Commission's ordinance change will be pursued on its own track since it falls outside the budget process.

13. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved unanimously. Vice Chair Estocin adjourned the meeting.