

# EPC Recommendations

---

City of Albuquerque  
Planning Department  
Development Services Division  
P.O. Box 1293  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Date: January 17, 2003

## OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

**FILE: Project # 1002358**  
02EPC-01768 SPR Special Planning  
Request

City of Albuquerque, CIP  
P.O. Box 1293  
Albuq. NM 87103

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE/CIP a request for the Environmental Planning Commission to review and hold a public hearing on the Mayor's Proposed Decade Plan for Capital Improvements, 2003-2012. Included in the Decade Plan are the general obligation bond programs of the Departments of: Cultural Services; Environmental Health; Family & Community Services; Finance & Administrative Services; Fire; Parks & Recreation; Planning; Police; Public Works; Senior Affairs; and Transit. Also included are the Enterprise Fund Capital Programs for the Departments of Aviation, Solid Waste and Public Works – Water/Wastewater Utility. And finally, the biennial Urban Enhancement Trust Fund program is a part of the Mayor's proposed program. Barbara Taylor, Staff Planner

On January 16, 2003 the Environmental Planning Commission voted to forward approval to the Mayor and recommended to the City Council of Project 1002358 /02EPC-01768, Mayor's Proposed Decade Plan based on the following Findings:

### FINDINGS:

1. This "Special Project Review" case is a request for review and comment by the public and for recommendations from the Environmental Planning Commission on the Mayor's Proposed Capital Program.
2. This program conforms to the requirements of F/S R-02-30; Enactment 34-2002 establishing policies and criteria for the selection of capital projects for the 2003 General Obligation Bond Program / 2003-2012 Decade Plan, and the 2004-2013 Enterprise Fund Decade Plan.
3. The Urban Enhancement Trust Fund program conforms to the requirements of O-10, Enactment 12-2000 establishing policies and procedures for the administration of the Trust Fund and selection of projects.

# EPC Recommendations

---

OFFICIAL NOTICE OF DECISION  
PROJECT #1002358  
JANUARY 16, 2003  
PAGE 2

IF YOU WISH TO APPEAL/PROTEST THIS DECISION, YOU MUST DO SO BY JANUARY 31, 2003 IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED BELOW. A NON-REFUNDABLE FILING FEE WILL BE CALCULATED AT THE LAND DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION COUNTER AND IS REQUIRED AT THE TIME THE APPEAL IS FILED.

Appeal to the City Council: Persons aggrieved with any determination of the Environmental Planning Commission acting under this ordinance and who have legal standing as defined in Section 14-16-4-4.B.2 of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code may file an appeal to the City Council by submitting written application on the Planning Department form to the Planning Department within 15 days of the Planning Commission's decision. The date the determination in question is issued is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the fifteenth day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as listed in the Merit System Ordinance, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal. The City Council may decline to hear the appeal if it finds that all City plans, policies and ordinances have been properly followed. If it decides that all City plans, policies and ordinances have not been properly followed, it shall hear the appeal. Such appeal, if heard, shall be heard within 45 days of its filing.

YOU WILL RECEIVE NOTIFICATION IF ANY OTHER PERSON FILES AN APPEAL. IF THERE IS NO APPEAL, YOU CAN RECEIVE BUILDING PERMITS AT ANY TIME AFTER THE APPEAL DEADLINE QUOTED ABOVE, PROVIDED ALL CONDITIONS IMPOSED AT THE TIME OF APPROVAL HAVE BEEN MET. SUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS ARE REMINDED THAT OTHER REGULATIONS OF THE CITY MUST BE COMPLIED WITH, EVEN AFTER APPROVAL OF THE REFERENCED APPLICATION(S).

Successful applicants should be aware of the termination provisions for Site Development Plans specified in Section 14-16-3-11 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code. Generally plan approval is terminated 7 years after approval by the EPC

Sincerely,

Victor J. Chavez  
Planning Director

VJC/BT/ac

cc: Janet Saiers, 1622 Propps NE, Albuq. NM 87112

# EPC Public Hearing

---

13. Project # 100235802  
EPC-01768 SPR  
Special Planning Request

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE/CIP a request for the Environmental Planning Commission to review and hold a public hearing on the Mayor's Proposed Decade Plan for Capital Improvements, 2003-2012. Included in the Decade Plan are the general obligation bond programs of the Departments of: Cultural Services; Environmental Health; Family & Community Services; Finance & Administrative Services; Fire; Parks & Recreation; Planning; Police; Public Works; Senior Affairs; and Transit. Also included are the Enterprise Fund Capital Programs for the Departments of Aviation, Solid Waste and Public Works – Water/Wastewater Utility. And finally, the biennial Urban Enhancement Trust Fund program is a part of the Mayor's proposed program. Barbara Taylor, Staff Planner (FORWARDED TO THE MAYOR'S OFFICE FOR APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL)

## STAFF PRESENT:

Pat Montoya, CIP  
Barbara Taylor, CIP

## PERSON PRESENT TO SPEAK IN FAVOR OF THIS REQUEST:

Janet Saiers

## THERE WAS NO PRESENT TO SPEAK IN OPPOSITION

MR. MONTOYA: Mr. Chair and members of the Commission my name is Pat Montoya, I am the Capital Implementation Program Official with the City of Albuquerque. Joining me today is Barbara Taylor, Manager of the Capital Planning Section CIP. We will briefly recap the planning process; in addition directors departmental staff are here to answer any of your questions. We know you have had a long day and Barbara and I have just a short summary presentation for you.

On behalf of the Mayor we appreciate the opportunity to present the 2003 General Obligation Bond Program and the Ten Year Plan. As you probably know the CIP Ordinance that the Mayor forward a Ten Year Capital Plan to EPC every two years. EPC in turn is required to hold a public hearing and forward your comments and recommendations to the Mayor. The meeting this evening fulfills that requirement.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

This document that which was attached to your staff report for your use in reviewing the Mayor's proposed Decade Plan for Capital Improvements. It contains a summary of three major programs including the 2003 General Obligation Bond Program, which must be approved by the voters. Department request for projects to be included in the 2003 which total just right under \$127,000,000.00 not including the \$9,000,000.00 council neighborhood set aside program. That program is not in your booklet today; Council selects those projects in about two months. The Enterprise Fund Capital Program and the Urban Enhancement Trust Fund Program are also included. Both of these programs receive final approval from the City Council. The 2004 UETF included in your report are the products of week reviews and recommendations to the Mayor by the appointed UETF Citizens Committee. GO bond funded departments submitted an excess of \$176,000,000.00 in project requests. In order to contain the program within the available bonding capacity it was necessary to reduce the scope of some projects or to defer the start date to the out years. The City Council and the Administration agreed that the emphasis on the 2003 GO Bond Program would be to rehabilitate and maintain existing capital assets and to remediate critical deficiencies. 89.5%, again I will repeat that 89.5%, of the Mayor's recommended program meets that objective.

I will highlight some of the key projects but first I would like to introduce Barbara Taylor who will briefly recap for you the guiding policies and the planning process.

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission the process by which projects are selected for inclusion in the General Obligation Bond Program is guided by the requirements of the CIP Ordinance and the Biennial enabling resolution. The CIP ordinance establishes the broad framework for planning the program. The criteria resolution establishes policies, priorities and project selection criteria for the planning cycle. The entire 2003 Resolution is included, in the manual with your staff report starting on page C-1. Policies, priorities and criteria contained in the resolution are based on the adopted growth policy legislation including the Comprehensive Plan, the growth policy framework, and policy regarding centers and corridors. Planned Growth Strategy legislation had not been adopted at the time the criteria resolution was considered. Available funding was allocated by department, but for this cycle the allocations were established as guidelines rather than rigid limits as was done in the previous cycle. Moreover during the planning cycle it was found that the city's 2003 bonding capacity would exceed the \$130,000,000.00 established in the enabling resolution. Consequently project requests now total just under \$136,000,000.00. As Mr. Montoya noted a very strong emphasis has been placed on rehab, maintenance, and remediation of critical deficiencies. This policy is consistent with adopted growth policies and also helps to reduce the stress on the operating budget.

Consistent with this emphasis there are a number of mandated set asides established in the criteria resolution primarily to replace aging vehicles. These include five million dollars for marked police vehicles, three million dollars for fire vehicles, one and a half million dollars for parks and recreation vehicles and heavy maintenance equipment. And there are small set asides for Bio Park and animal services vehicles as well. Finally project selection criteria were established by funding allocation category and were written specifically to incorporate the growth policy and fiscal goals established in the enabling resolution. With respect to the planning process we began with adoption of the enabling resolution in April. Following that, departments were requested to submit their project requests. During the summer of 2002 all requested projects were rated by a staff committee according to the adopted selection criteria. Based on the ratings projects were ranked from high to low. Approximately six percent of the funding in the 2003 GO Program will be allocated to low ranked projects and that compares to the requirement in the resolution of no more than ten percent.

# EPC Public Hearing

---

Starting in September departments presented their programs to the CIP committee, consisting of the CAO, his deputies, and the directors of the Planning Department and the Department of Finance and Administrative Services. The Director of Council Services also participates at this level. This committee evaluates project request for conformance to policy and makes the decisions that are required to contain the overall program within the available funding. The Mayor reviews those decisions and forwards his recommended program to you all. At the conclusion of this public hearing your recommendations will be sent to the Mayor. After consideration of those he will forward his final recommendation to the City Council. Council will finalize the plan that will be placed on the October ballot for voter approval. Thank you very much that is my sprint through the planning process.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: I have a question for you.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes sir.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: I am looking at the staff report that was submitted to us.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes sir.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: And on the second page it says "Funding for the 2003 General Programs general obligation bonds was established at \$130 million including \$9 million for the Council Neighborhood set aside. However, during the planning process it was determined that the City's bonding capacity has increased to \$133 million." But the next page over here is recommending \$135 million, how do we get from \$133 to \$135?

MS. TAYLOR: We have been through a couple of steps. The capacity is somewhere close to \$136 million. Between when we originally submitted the staff report and now the City Council passed an ordinance providing for one percent for energy conservation, \$1.3 million dollars roughly. And that amount of money has been added and takes us up above the \$133, which is where we were. I do not think I wrote that and if I mislead you I apologize but I do not think we meant to say that the absolute top limit was \$133 million.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Give me that one percent again.

MS. TAYLOR: Ordinance O-70 was adopted by Council early in December and it provides that one percent of the general obligation bond program will be allocated to projects that can be shown to have a payback and that accomplish the goal of conserving energy. And I can give you an example. We have found that LED lights in our traffic signals can save us quite a bit of money. So if you can demonstrate a payback over the life of the bond period which is typically ten years then the 1.3 million dollars will be a fund to which you can make application to accomplish these energy conservation projects.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Okay is that \$1.3 million dollars included in the million thirty-three? Where is that \$1.3 million dollars in here?

MS. TAYLOR: I think we gave a revised chart that you should have. Was that passed out?

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Here is what I am getting at okay. I go back and I add up all these columns right here under the recommended amount \$40.69 million, \$11.65 million, \$6.50 million, \$16.05 million, \$12.12 million, \$37.12 million and \$9 million and I came up with \$133.13 million so it is off by a \$1,340,000.00.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

MS. TAYLOR: I have the staff report that was on the table today which shows the total 2003 GO Bond Program at \$134.43 million plus one percent for the art takes you to a grand total of \$135.77.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Okay so what has changed from in the staff report is the community facility because that went from \$37.12 million on the package that we have here...

MS. TAYLOR: ...that is correct...

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: ...to right here to \$38.42 million.

MS. TAYLOR: That is right and the one percent for energy was included in the finance and administrative services.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: That is good, that explains that. I have a couple of other questions. Now I went through this whole report and I looked at this and I was just making an observation here (let me find the page). Page fifty-seven, it is looking at solid waste equipment replacement; this is probably similar throughout the whole report okay. But it just shows on a ten year plan \$4,288,000.00 per year over the next ten years. Wouldn't it be more realistic to budget some sort of inflation factor in there? Do we not consider inflation as to how much inflation is going to be over the years?

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I think we have a representative here from Solid Waste.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: I am not addressing just Solid Waste I am using that as an example, Police cars anything. I mean none of these budgets really take into account inflation okay. So I guess my question to you is this realistic to sit here and budget without taking into account inflation?

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman I think that if you were to look, for example at Family and Community Services, you're implying that the ten year plan is a plan to spend varying amounts of money. It is not necessarily so hypothetically that if I am spending \$10 million this year I will be spending in this two year cycle that I will be spending \$10 million plus inflation in the next two year cycle. Rather you calculate that you are going to do X amount of work in the next two-year cycle and that may finish three or four projects and so the numbers for the 2005 cycle will began again and say what do I expect to accomplish in the 2005 cycle. And at that point when we come back to you in 2005 people would have had experience with what construction costs are or the cost to purchase equipment whatever it may be (INAUDIBLE) very broad to hypothetically and that will then include the inflation of the other three ...that we understood it. But it is not a straight line, I guess what I want to emphasize is that it is not necessarily a straight-line calculation.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Well I mean the City has certain operating costs for replacing vehicles with the Police Department, Solid Waste and I think everyone needs to recognize that those costs are going to be more in the future then they are today.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: And I just think that this CIP budge should provide for that. I am not going to beat on that very much but I want to move onto one other question. Okay for instance in— lets shift to page twenty-one and we are going to look at the year 2003 and we are going to look at AGIS. I think AGIS provides a very important function to the city they do great work.

MS. TAYLOR: We agree.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: But to sit here and to project \$400,000.00 in the year 2003 to develop, maintain and provide access to computerized maps associated geographic record information for the use of all City departments. Purchase hardware, software, and technical consulting assistance. This will include the purchase of ARC-SDE Oracle and Remote Sensing Aerial Photography. However, realizing well and good that all of that becomes obsolete so fast without having another item some place down the road in the next ten years I also think is unrealistic. Now that is just a fly in the ointment because \$400,000.00 on a \$1,300,000.00 is not a big deal but I am just pointing out that is something I would think and I did not talk to AGIS and nobody even made me make that observation. I am just sitting here as an individual looking this over and making that observation. I guess my last—go ahead.

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, on that particular copy Richard Sertich is here from the Planning Department perhaps I should (INAUDIBLE) the planning process I should say that each department prepared its own request. The Capital Implementation Program is the facilitator and the administrator of this process but on the particular question of AGIS I do know that Richard Sertich is here.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: We will come back to that. I just have one other question. The bulk of it really and here comes from Public Works; I mean that is the bulk of the money being spent. It looks like to me I live in the northeast heights and it looks like to me that a lot of the money is—I pay taxes and not a lot of the money is being spent in that area. And granted that this is on a need basis where the money is needed. But I just think that the way this is spread out over here is not proportional to the population or to where people live. I think that there is some disproportion spending geographically—I am sounding like a politician—on the budget. I think it is being spent more on the Westside then on the Eastside and that is my point.

### **NOTE: THE MICROPHONE IS TURNED OFF WHEN MS. TAYLOR SPEAKS**

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman I would respectfully suggest that there are a number of generic projects including throughout this in Parks and in Public Works and that is you can (INAUDIBLE) name projects in main locations. But for example in the streets category (INAUDIBLE) \$5.9 million dollars for street rehabilitation is not defined as to the various (INAUDIBLE) projects that we have done. (INAUDIBLE) so in fact over the next years keep it closer to \$32 million dollars—I just took the last part of Pat's speech. But closer to \$32 million dollars will be spent throughout the city. It is difficult to take this program and isolate for them. Granted you can point to Unser (INAUDIBLE) in the streets program (INAUDIBLE) a lot of money.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Commissioner McMahan.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: Lets let them off the hook okay. I think that my understanding of the program is having been involved at a certainly lower level in getting into this is that this is really a wish list for everybody over a long period of time. And the wish list usually is made up of people say I would like to do this and then somebody else puts some dollar figures with it and then the CIP staff has the horrendous task of going through and saying okay here what it is going to cost and then they go back to departments and say prioritize these things. Now there are some slips in there that is not the way it totally the way it works so I do not view this as saying well if they spend ten million dollars this year the ten million dollars this year is going to cost so much more next year accounting for inflation. I think that is the way the program is set up and Mr. Montoya, Ms. Taylor please jump in and correct me if I am misstating this but that is the way I have always understood this works. So as time goes on some projects I think AGIS for example AGIS may need \$400,000.00 this year to do what they have to do, they may need a million and a half this year to do what they want to do and they may need two million dollars next year to do what they want to do. But it probably is not going to happen and those wishes may not be reflected in this book because those kinds of things have

## EPC Public Hearing

---

been ...at based on what the CIP staff knows revenues available or projects revenues available. So I really cannot get to upset about not seeing the projections carried out what I would call strictly statistically into the future, I do not think it works that way. But I would like to see though in relation to one of your comments is a spread sheet of how much money in each department is spent by Council District. I do not see that this year and I think I have seen it in years past and I am certain that some place on someone's desk it exists okay. Now why we do not have it I do not know and I am not saying that I will fall down on the ground and kick and scream if I do not get it but I would certainly like to see it and I am certain some of the other Commissioners would also. If it is there that is wonderful.

MS. TAYLOR: It occurred to me that you might ask Mr. Chairman, Commissioner McMahan it occurred to me that you might ask that question and I brought that chart along.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: That will be great please pass it out.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: That is wonderful.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Commissioner Schwartz.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ms. Taylor let me ask you a easier question. Generally can you—yes I think so—I am pretty sure—can you just explain to me how our bonding capacity is determined and where the funds come that we repay the bonds.

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Schwartz I do not know if that is easy or not. The Treasury Department gives us—calculates that and it is always something of a (INAUDIBLE).

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Is it essentially gross receipts based?

MS. TAYLOR: It is property taxes.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Property taxes so it is essentially the property tax base and a function of market interest rates as to how much our payment capacity and then how much we can borrow is our payment capacity leverage not by whatever the interest rate is. Okay so to the extent that we can increase our property tax base we can increase our borrowing capacity?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any other questions of Ms. Taylor?

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: Yes I have a couple more. I am curious as to about the city's responsibility is for a health, welfare, and safety of the citizens of the city right? Is that what the charter says we are suppose to take care of? Silence I guess says yes. And I look at page four of the policies and criteria at the funding allocation chart and I see that public safety has 12.12 million in it. And I see that Parks and Rec has 16 million in it and I really get I guess concerned about that discrepancy simply because I feel that public safety is probably more important then Parks and Rec. I think it is a known fact that I am not a golfer. I think the golf courses should probably be put to some other beneficial use like grazing cows but that is a different issue. But I am curious as to how the process worked to provide more of this scarce resource to Parks and Recreation then to public safety. And it may be that this is Parks and Recs year I do not know or Parks and Rec's decade.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner McMahan the criteria resolution that was passed by Council established the relationship between the funding allocation categories (INAUDIBLE) making records (INAUDIBLE)...It may also be reasonable consider that some departments are more capital intensive. I do not know the breakdown in the Capital Program necessarily is the breakdown in the intensive city's overall priorities. That there is more money in this program then there was in 2001 program and significantly more money for public safety.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: But when go to community meetings and I hear a police captain talk about his officers and his substation having to drive cars with over a hundred thousand miles on them while the golf course gets new golf carts. I get I guess a little annoyed about that. I am concerned about maintaining the streets, maintaining safety, maintaining the water quality, those kinds of things and I just really cannot get on board with supporting that kind of difference and again some of the other things—I want to see my community center rebuilt right now, it is in the process I know that. But why did it have to take so long? Why do other community centers have wait to get renovated when again we do some of these other kinds things that according to my seem of priorities are not that necessary. And that is the problem I have. I do not disagree with the Capital Improvement Program; I think it is great that we can do it. I love the fact that the park that I jog in is watered, the grass is trimmed, the tennis courts are kept nice, neat and tidy. But another park also close to my house suffers from a little bit of disrepair and I understand that is a definition but it still bothers me that those two parks that I have pretty frequent access to are maintained differently. I would like to seem some more money put into the parks to take care of that. But if someone says okay you make a choice between the cops and the parks I am going to choose the cops simply because I think that is more important to a lot of people in the city. Overall I love the program, I wish we had more money for it, I wish we can—I wish AGIS could get five million dollars and I wish the cops could get thirty million dollars and I guess I wish parks can get well seventeen million dollars instead of sixteen.

One other question and I will quit. Can you tell how much it cost to run a street sweeper per hour from Public Works? Is there someone here from Public Works to answer that question?

MR. CHAVEZ: I am Ray Chavez; I am the Street Maintenance Manager for the city. A sweeper costs about they run at least one hundred thousand dollars, a little over one hundred thousand dollars. If you look at an hourly cost I think operator in there we are talking about probably fifty dollars by the time you maintenance the equipment, pay the employee salary and benefits. Approximately fifty dollars.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: Ray I wish I had known you had the answer to that because I have been asking a lot of people that question and nobody well I do not know and nobody ever said ask Ray Chavez so I appreciate that, thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman that is enough for now.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Thank you very much Commissioner McMahan. Commissioner Owens.

COMMISSIONER OWENS: Just a comment, correct me if I am wrong Ms. Taylor but this is such a small piece of the budgetary picture this is just GO Bonds right? So this does not tell us what the delta is between financing for Parks and Rec and Public Safety. So Parks and Rec might be getting a little more...

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: ...(INAUDIBLE) overall...

COMMISSIONER OWENS: ...overall.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: That is true; I know that, I am well aware of that, thank you.

# EPC Public Hearing

---

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any one signed up to speak in behalf of public...

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: ...did they finish their presentation?

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: I am sorry are we done? Staff, Mr. Montoya did you have some other remarks you want to make?

MR. MONTOYA: Mr. Chairman no closing comments.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Mr. Montoya I find myself in one of these particular situations. The last time we did this and I made a comment about golf and Commissioner Gara was on the Commission and Commissioner Gara made it very clear to me that the fees at the golf courses cover the expenses and in fact the last time I looked at the coffer that was the case. That the expense of running the golfing operations was covered by the fees and I am not a golfer but I thought I would point that out. It is not the golf courses.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Okay anyone signed up to speak?

MS. CANDELARIA: Janet Saiers.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Ms. Saiers do you agree to tell the truth?

MS. SAIERS: No I am (INAUDIBLE).

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: I need an affirmative statement. Do you agree to tell the truth? And your name and address for record please.

MS. SAIERS: I am Janet Saiers, I live at 1622 Propps Northeast, this is in District Nine and I spent almost thirty years working with the Parks and Recreation Department, that is where my heart and my passion is. I worked on first CIP 1975 and over the course of time worked on about fourteen of them. It is an imperfect system with not enough money to do what we need to do and I personally would love to see a lot more money go into Parks and Recreation. And I have a feeling by the time this goes to the City Council process that certainly a lot of the million dollars that each one of them have are going to go into projects. Some of the things that I am just a little concerned about here when you go under planning and design which is simply a condition of our department and there is money to do parks on the Westside there are two other major community parks that I am sure the people in those areas are going to come out for. Manzano Mesa which is near Eubank and Central that has a huge Willow Wood Subdivision with about a thousand houses over there and those folks I have been at meetings where they wanted a children's playground so there is no money in here to do a simple children's playground at Manzano Mesa Community Park. North Domingo Baca Park which is over by La Cueva High School there is zilch for that and that is the park that the city has already spent millions of dollars to acquire the property and to do roads and storm drainage but there is no money left and hopefully the Councilors (INAUDIBLE). When you get also to renovation the only renovation is to look at irrigation systems because of water conservation. There are still about forty playgrounds out there that date back to the '70's that look crummy. And when I was at Parks and Rec one of the things that people called in all the time why does my neighborhood park have these metal things from the '60's and early '70's and other renovation projects come in with a nice brightly colored module plastic and it simply of the numbers. When you have a lot of parks that were all built in the '60's and '70's and try and go back and start renovating them you can only do so many with so many resources but I have a feeling that is going to also come up with what happen to playground renovations.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

There is nothing in here for trail renovations. There is money that is in the ten-year transportation tax and transportation ... and trail tax that is ongoing. There is money to develop trails and bridges but that does not cover trail renovation. So I am concerned that there is nothing in here for trail renovations because some of the trails that we built in the late '70's early '80's those things are going to be pushing twenty-five years old very soon and the...asphalt broken down and there is a variety of needs. I love the fact that there are skate parks in there. Not every kid plays soccer or little league baseball and a lot of teenagers—skate parks are there equivalent of playgrounds in parks. So I am happy to see that.

There is no money to renovate pools. We have some pools out there same thing they were built in the '70's like our last small outdoor pool was 1981. Most of our pools were from the '60's and '70's and there is no money to renovate any swimming pools. Although it is great that finally at last hallelujah there is enough money in here to finish the West Mesa Aquatic Center. That is a ten-year project that has just been dribble drabble and so there is money in here to do the Olympic pool. But I would hope that at some point in time that there would be leadership, the same kind of leadership that says we need a special tax to go in and do some rehab on our streets and build trails and enhance buses and go in and get some ...to do what needs to happen in the park system. Tens of thousands of people every week are using parks for everything from pulling up and eating their sandwich while they are at lunch to soccer games, little league games, softball games, family picnics, church picnics, weddings, I mean every possible human experience takes place in the Albuquerque park system. And people value parks and I think we need to really do a sixteenth of a cent or an eighth of a cent just like they do for the quarter cent tax for transportation to make the parks better.

So there is not much that can be done given with a cap \$130 million, \$16 million ...for parks but there are so many more needs then what this can really do. And Commissioner McMahan I know that at some point in time you are going to want to play golf you better be nice. To echo what Commissioner Schwartz said yes golf is an enterprise. That got switched over about ten fifteen years ago. The people that play golf are who pay the water bill, the electricity bill; they are the ones who are funding the renovation of the clubhouse at Los Altos. It is not the general taxpayer it is through GO Bonds. So thank you very much for letting me talk about my favorite topic Parks and Recreation.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any questions of Ms. Saiers?

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JEISONOWSKI: Commissioner McMahan.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: I am not old enough to play golf, I am sorry...

MS. SAIERS: ...you are not old enough...

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: I am not old enough to play golf okay. Let me count, I am glad you are here and I hope that the other departments that are here take it to heart that A department got some citizen out all be it a retired employee but they got some citizen out to really speak up and jump up and down on their behalf. I am really disappointed that there are not more citizens here speaking here speaking for against this. This is an important project within the city and we need to get more people out. If people go through this line by line like most of us have they find things that they have questions about. They find things that they would like to ask how the process works. They would like to ask how come this is happening there and not here. But it takes people to get in there to stir things up. We need more people like Janet to come out and jack us up to get something done.

MS. SAIERS: I just came on my own. I did not come because anybody asked me.

## EPC Public Hearing

---

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: I know you have a sincere interest and that is great. That is right. I applaud you being here.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else signed up to speak? Is there anybody else who would like to speak?

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: Mr. Chairman I would encourage any of the city people who are here to jump and say we like this and we want more. We understand that. If we could help we would, if we can help we will. I guess I would say you have the right as a citizen to go bang on your Councilor and say I want part of that million dollar set aside for my favorite project. That is what I did last year and it worked. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Commissioner Schwartz.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Who addresses the Urban Enhancement Trust Fund?

MR. MONTOYA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Schwartz...

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Okay when I went to look at this section of the report and the first thing that I went to look at was just out of curiosity who is on the committee and I see that we have like four vacancies on our eleven member committee. Where those vacant when these request were processed?

MR. MONTOYA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner we actually had nine individuals who served on the committee at the time that the projects where reviewed. We had two vacancies, one at (INAUDIBLE) and from District 7. As of that date all of the positions have been filled, the Mayor just appointed two additional individuals. But nine positions where filled during the time.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Okay because the next thing to follow in the Chairman's lead here I started looking and I noticed that the person that is listed here for District 5 apparently as near as I can tell was actually appointed before redistricting and is actually not from the current District 5 and then it says District 1 is vacant and so I am looking at there is no representation west of the river and when I looked in detail at where the awards are going and I understand that we cannot control where the artistic activities take place but to me it gives the appearance of being short changed when there is no representatives west of the river and out of forty-nine projects I can only identify two of them that had as a primary address any place west of the river. And I think that this program—I mean I understand some of these activities are going to be centralized and New Mexico Symphony and some of the others but I think it is important that we do outreach or get proactive to inculcate cultural activities throughout the city. And if we do not have people from those areas to kind of speak up for their own areas I do not know how that is going to happen. I mean over ten percent of this goes to UNM, UNM sponsored or controlled activities in this Urban Enhancement Trust Fund.

MR. MONTOYA: Do you want me to respond to that?

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Sure any comment you want to make.

MR. MONTOYA: Basically just an overview when you were on the Commission two years ago actually all of the UETF has changed from 51% capital 49% ...

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: ...right...

# EPC Public Hearing

---

MR. MONTROYA: ...and then through legislation the Council—and so the program is now 100% cultural projects.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: I think that is an improvement because some of those—and then we had signs in there.

MR. MONTROYA: Basically what happened is there was a public meeting that was conducted or was outreached to many of the organizations in the form of two or three advertisements and listed proposals. Actually the committee and ...broke up into three subcommittees and each of those three subcommittees basically reviewed a set of applications. I believe we had somewhere in the neighborhood of one hundred and twenty-three applications to fund seventy-six applications to fund forty-three projects so there was some ...funded (INAUDIBLE). But again to answer your primary concern the positions have been filled (IANUDIBLE) but these selections where made by the previous UETF Committee.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: And this can only—it really does not operate continuously right?

MR. MONTROYA: I am sorry?

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: It does not operate continuously or it seems to me that there is just this window...

MR. MONTROYA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner they meet on a monthly basis and on an ongoing basis basically what they do is they have a liaison from the committee to each of the groups that receive funds from the UETF. They report back on a quarterly basis as to the progress. All of the members attend as many of the functions as they possibly can in order to collect that information and bring it back to the committee. And then on an ongoing basis because we have a contingency fund where we can fund special projects if in fact a group or an individual comes in and makes a presentation. But they do meet on a monthly basis.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: Thank you Mr. Montoya.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any further questions? Any further questions of staff? Commissioner Briscoe.

COMMISSIONER BRISCOE: One very large section of our packet has to do with enterprise fund summary. The only question I know how to ask is what question should we be asking on this. Tell me what this is. What do we need to know here? What should we be responding to?

MR. MONTROYA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Briscoe we provide for you as we are mandated under resolution a summary of the enterprise fund. The enterprise fund is treated a little bit differently then the GO program as we actually present because the enterprise fund does not go (INAUDIBLE). They actually do a budge on a yearly basis, it is presented—as a matter of fact they are in that process just now. They present their enterprise fund package simultaneously to the GO program during the years that (INAUDIBLE). But basically UETF and enterprise funds are asked to be reported in the Decade Plan but technically you will go through a different cycle (INAUDIBLE).

COMMISSIONER BRISCOE: Okay.

MS. TAYLOR: I am just going to add a word to that. I think the intent of the CIP Ordinance is that this is the one time every two years here all the aspects of the capital program are in one place.

# EPC Public Hearing

---

COMMISSIONER BRISCOE: I see.

MS. TAYLOR: (INAUDIBLE) the entire.

COMMISSIONER BRISCOE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any other questions? Any other questions of staff? I will close the floor. Discussion? I would like to say I think we need to recommend approval of this but what I would want to do is to add a finding just to point out to the Mayor, which is who we are really addressing this to. Point out to the Mayor that the Public Works projects—add a finding that says, “The Public Works projects and dollars as identified in the two year plan are not evenly or equitably dispersed throughout the geographical areas or Council Districts of the city.” Because I think it is really—I live in District 8 and there is \$150,000.00 being spent where I live and I want them to know that I take offense to that and I think the rest of the people in District 8 do to.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: But somebody might point out Mr. Chairman that you got your share two or three years ago and it is somebody else’s turn. And I have no idea that in fact has happened but that is a possibility because to make that issue conjoin or to make it valid I really think you have to go back and look at the breakdown over the past number of years to see how each district or each part of the city...

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: But I think the finding though as I worded it is a valid finding. I am not saying anything other than what is obviously stated in this summary information that was handed out here. Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I cannot agree that that’s something that we ought to add as a finding because it was nowhere in here the intent to do that. I mean the intent the priorities where established based on a variety of things. Critical deficiencies and rehabilitation needs. It was never intended to be evenly distributed across the Council District. Each Councilor gets a million dollars to do with whatever they like but that was not the point and so I cannot really be inclined to put a finding in that says that they did not do what they did not intend to do.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Any other discussion?

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: I am prepared to make a motion Mr. Chairman; I am prepared to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: Commissioner McMahan.

COMMISSIONER McMAHAN: In the matter of 02EPC 01768, the Mayors proposed Decade Plan I recommend it be approved based on the preceding three findings.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN JESIONOWSKI: We have a motion by Commissioner McMahan and a second by Commissioner Johnson, any further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying “Aye”. Opposed? Passes unanimously.

# EPC Public Hearing

---

## **FINAL ACTION TAKEN**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Environmental Planning Commission voted to forward approval to the Mayor and recommended to the City Council of Project 1002358 /02EPC-01768, Mayor's Proposed Decade Plan based on the following Findings:

## **FINDINGS:**

1. This "Special Project Review" case is a request for review and comment by the public and for recommendations from the Environmental Planning Commission on the Mayor's Proposed Capital Program.
2. This program conforms to the requirements of F/S R-02-30; Enactment 34-2002 establishing policies and criteria for the selection of capital projects for the 2003 General Obligation Bond Program / 2003-2012 Decade Plan, and the 2004-2013 Enterprise Fund Decade Plan.
3. The Urban Enhancement Trust Fund program conforms to the requirements of O-10, Enactment 12-2000 establishing policies and procedures for the administration of the Trust Fund and selection of projects.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER McMAHAN

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY