

Lehner, Catalina L.

From: martina <martina776@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 8:26 AM
To: Lehner, Catalina L.
Subject: Fw: EPC hearing Jan 10
Attachments: SA CC EPC Hearing follow-up.doc

Hope this worked... Last paragraph should end with "saddened heart". Please let me know if it worked. My computer is on a terrible strike (just calling me incapable). mm

From: martina
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 7:38 AM
To: CLehner@cabq.gov
Subject: EPC hearing Jan 10

Catalina,

I have rewritten the last paragraph four times- and better each time, but each time I lost the latest version. It will not save properly nor attach properly. Please do NOT send this previous version from 7:28 AM. Please wait for a later version.

Martina

=====
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

Input to EPC since the Hearing of Dec. 13, 2018. From: Martina Mesmer , January 7, 2019

I request that the Commission re-open the floor at the Jan. 10, 2019 hearing to allow us to ask questions and /or give rebuttal to any new drawings or information brought to light by the Applicants or their City representatives, in the hearing of Dec. 13, 2018. I have important questions regarding what I see on the drawings since Dec. 21. Please allow my above request. MM

The following is lengthy, but this has gone on for years and is a poor excuse for spending this much money for a NEW building understood to be a NEW building by only a few people of the public sector.

1. For years the theme has been: improve and expand the existing center rather than building a new one. My earliest notes in my paperwork are from 2009. Why has the 2nd classroom in the separate toddler/child care wing NOT been used (occupancy of this wing was in 2002)? Also, ALL the space in the other two wings for Before and After school kids has not been used up to capacity. Kids are being kept safe by keeping adults out while the kids are there. Why not keep the before and after school kids safe by leaving them where they are. Face the reality of NO OVERLOAD @ the existing center. The center is NOT exceeding the Fire Marshall's occupation load numbers, as claimed by Councilor Harris and Family and Community Services. Let adults enter by a different entrance to an add-on expansion section to the existing center, at a much more reasonable cost than \$5.5M. Is it because other uses for the NEW center are planned despite what Family and Community Services say when they assure us that no government services will be put into the NEW center so close to our homes.? Councilor Harris said on TV a day ago that the NEW center will be used for lower income children and refugees with after school programs. See: <https://www.kob.com/albuquerque-news/proposed-community-center-faces-opposition-in-se-albuquerque/5200716/?cat=504> We already have after school programs in the existing center, without "busting at the seams". Why can't those programs stay there while an add-on can offer teen, adult, and senior programs. See also attached e-mail regarding the above, on page 4.

Let's get real about the actual use of the existing Center. Go visit the building. See for yourselves, the condition, numbers of kids there are. Men are not allowed into the building during before and after school times (which will also be true most likely, when the NEW building is built), and since the toddler program is all day, they are not allowed past the door of the toddler program, - now locked and with a bell- which was put in since we started asking questions. You will also notice that there are no Fire-Marshall notices up anywhere (contrary to law requirements). So much to hide; so much we know despite attempts of cover-up. **Misleading information has been given since the beginning.**

2. The change in square footage of the existing center from report to report is challenging. My approximate measurements were 6,858 square feet, with measurements in person along the back side, each part of the front two wings, the entry "hall" with an arc at the front and sided by two prefab structures- one to the north and one to the west- with some block structures: restrooms, utility closet, and storage, tying them all together. The prefab structures were all the same width and the length was longer in the child care area. The only walls measured with the help of Google maps were those locked within the fencing of the child development area that has the toddler play area in it. With existing square footage of close to 7,000 sq. ft., much more use should be made of this existing center. The center is NOT exceeding the Fire Marshall's occupation load numbers as claimed by Councilor Harris and Family and Community Services; far from it. We have close to 7,000 sq. ft. in the existing center which is hardly used (also realize that of the "enrolled" number of kids , it is said that typically at best only 80% of such a number would actually be at the center at one time). How can we justify the expenditure of \$5.5M for 15,000 sq. ft. when we already have almost 7,000 sq. ft. poorly used.

3. By January 17, 2017, the first actual hearing that the public became aware of regarding this NEW/2nd CC in the park because signs were put up in the park, even some of the Neighborhood Association Officers had no clue that it was going to be an additional NEW building. So when Councilor Harris said over and over again, that he "got/received" plenty of public input (the only such input was at Association meetings and often only represented by his Assistant). He did not "get" input; he "GAVE" input, but those in attendance were obviously not well informed by the manner in which he expressed his ideas. Even as a member, I stopped going to Association meeting under the previous president's "reign", and when I did go again after the signs in the park went up, Many of us asked Councilor Harris poignant questions regarding the project. He was definitely agitated and thereafter was always quick to find an excuse to leave the meetings for "other appointments" or some such. No one was properly advised of anything- not by Councilor Harris, nor by the previous President of the Neighborhood Association, especially about the building having become so large and a separate, NEW, 2nd building altogether, and then only 90' from private residences.

Misleading information has been given since the beginning.

I circulated a petition on Survey Monkey to my neighborhood of 36 single family residences out of 300 total (I do not know if this includes the 4-Hills Mobile Home Park) in the Singing Arrow Neighborhood,. Results were 73% AGAINST a NEW center. I introduced the project with information such as "90' distance from residential property"; "\$5.5M cost"; "15,000 sq. ft." and allowed comments at the end. When I approached the then president of the SA Neighborhood Association, he would not pass it on to the membership because in his opinion, the "needs" study obviously gave the reasons why a new center would be needed, and therefore no survey was needed. This same previous president has started a new Coalition since having been voted out of office, and is openly backed and financially supported with City funds by Councilor Harris. Councilor Harris no longer wishes to be associated with this project as a representative of it, but the Coalition has taken over his slant and is pushing for government services in the would be NEW center. They claim they meet with Councilor Harris often and know what they are talking about.

4. The "Needs" study commissioned by Councilor Harris to justify a NEW center, in the introduction, pre-empted a NEW center being needed without anyone ever having asked the public (perhaps someone from the city?) if that was wise or needed. Generalities trying to point out need were equivalent to " A new community center will provide new/more activities for the community". With Manzano Mesa Multi Generational Center only 1.6 miles away, that certainly ignored taking inventory (in an honest way) of what we already have available. Of course, that center was also "overrun and exploding at the seams". Yes, perhaps in the evening some rooms and at after work hours the Gym are/is well used, but whenever I asked for a space for a meeting or a class, there were always choices of spaces with even up to four different rooms/spaces to choose from for different uses. The study also mentioned that "the (existing center's) roof leaks sometimes". Later in that same study, there was mention that the building should be torn down. If that is logical, then we will have to tear down the MMMG Center, as well as my house for that matter, since the roofs "leak sometimes". See: <https://www.cabq.gov/council/documents/saccneedsassessment-2.pdf>
It is strange that kids who do not go to the existing Center at 5th grade, know about leaking roofs and mold in the existing Center, which I have not heard of since I have dropped into the center over many years. I feel for these kids who were told that there would be consequences for lying under oath, should they ever discover at a later timer that the adults gave them mis-information. Those cute kids brought up a good point, though. Let's improve and expand the existing center rather than building a new one, as in the arguments #1.

Misleading information had been given since the beginning.

Just before the first public (Zoning) hearing, Jan. 17, 2017, the information being passed around had been that the building would be torn down. Then once the application for Zoning had been made, the word was

that the existing center would remain and would be taken over by the toddlers (Child Development) and or Headstart. So now the existing building's use is being expanded for toddlers and younger than before and after school kids, while there is mold in the building. Is there still mold since Dec. 13? Is the paint on the front structures (of the existing center) going to get done with good workmanship and good quality materials/paint any time soon (this could include basic/ proper scraping of loose paint, priming before painting, and using elastomeric paint, which has held up for years on one of my own rental properties)? We were told by one person in the city, that the "city always hires the cheapest bidders". Will any money be spent on the existing building before a 2nd/NEW building would get started? Will this mini ART project fall into the same disrepair? By the way, the condition of the existing building inside, seems absolutely acceptable for toddlers. Where is the truth in all these presentations?

Misleading information had been given since the beginning.

At the end, the study happens to address two other sights - vacant lots- that could perhaps work, but because the parking lot at Wenonah was already developed, it would cost much less to buy from the owners of the commercial center across the street, than starting a parking lot from scratch. Also, since the City owned the park, the land would be free for an extra plus. Did no one see the flaws in these arguments? Of course the parking area would need to be adapted to specific needs for a community center. Fire hydrant, Fire engine turn-around, etc. etc. Now the lot needs to be totally torn up to re-do EVERYTHING that is there: pavement, curbs, planters, planting, water lines etc. etc. This increases the cost of this lot far above any cost it would have taken to build a parking lot on existing dirt. The taking of green space just to save the City money for a building lot, out of a not-so-large park (when you are honest about the sizes of its parts, especially the little portion of green space), completely ignored the essence of this park and its total offerings, including the archeological site that would now be cut off visually and physically from the "entry" parking lot. Do remember that the part that the building would take over was developed only ten years ago @ \$400K per acre. Another waste in this mini ART project. Manzano Mesa MGC is only 1.6 miles away.

5. The size of the park keeps getting larger. Details in my previous comments. All the green color shown purposely on one of the site plans on Dec.13, obviously tried to make the loss of green space by an approximately 15,000 sq. ft. building look like a minimal mass. A clever trick. 'Before 1/17/17, a notice went out that described the hearing about improving "the Center". We asked for it to be corrected to "NEW". After Jan. 17, 2017, and multiple Appeals that followed, many residents and especially politicians, still had no clue that this Center was a 2nd/NEW Center. Some of the e-mails we get from those who only recently have become active in getting information regarding this issue, still do not understand that this large and costly building would be a NEW/2nd Center.- and will argue our points. This serious misrepresentation in presentations has gone on for many years, especially since Councilor Harris set out to make this a NEW building. I personally had never heard anything other than "improvement" and "expansion.

Misleading information has been given since the beginning.

6. We were told that the area would increase in population and therefore Manzano Mesa MGC could no longer expand. There is no direction in which the area around the park could possibly expand, especially when those who live on Juan Tabo south of the Arroyo, whom I talked to about this, said they prefer MMMGC and would continue to go there in preference. A more direct route they said, just like the route from the 4-Hillos Mobile Home Park farther north on Juan Tabo @ Southern en route to MMMGC.

Misleading information has been given since the beginning.

I apologize for the many repetitions, but this tough battle against deceit has been a disappointing struggle. We have not been heard by those who wish to force this project forward. I want to scream out about this terribly un-thought-through mini Art catastrophe. I am being as honest as I can be; I am trying to find out as much truth as I can to pass it on, though that is another struggle, since often the information from officials is also purposely deceptive. We need more honor in this town.

Conclusion:

Just because \$5.5M was gathered for a building, based on false facts, is it right to vote on such an expenditure because the ZHE was limited to not question those false pretexts, and then the EPC is limited in scope so as not be able to consider those facts, when the public is still uninformed and many many locals do not want this new/2nd building in this park? Please find a way to help us save the City from another loss of finances from a misguided project that started with misguided judgment by the same man who also started his political career wanting a 1 mile long 4-lane highway in the flood plane of a beautiful Tijeras Canyon. And now the originator of this terrible idea takes no responsibility for this project as Councilor nor will he have any communication with those who wish to discuss this with him as our representative. Then the various city departments have taken over since the money has been allotted- based on false pretenses- and must hire various presenters who will follow up as is needed for the city to keep face. This fraud and senselessness must stop.

Do what is right. Stop this building on this site. The east side park should not be a pallet for a building to be used by multi use govt. "stop and shop" nor any other building. The developers of the east end of the park did the thoughtful thing: add to a small park at the west end and create a landscape, green and lush to give relief from the summer heat. The pallet is a softened base for people to want to touch the earth, smell the moisture, sit down and get closer. Parks in this climate are major parts of what the soul needs. Leave us this bit of bliss and do not allow a hard structure within it. It is the wrong choice. Clump the structure with the existing or otherwise put the Center with other hard structures in another appropriate area. Do not give into the distance that they have gone within this poor plan. The Money can still be re-appropriated. This location within the analysis of site design at a larger scale is WRONG! Please do not allow another ART at mini scale. The northwest corner of the park has minimal views, whereas the east end has views that can never be replaced.

With saddened heart I am,
Martina Mesmer

Additional, Supportive Information re: Use of existing center

From: Wanda Umber

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 9:33 AM

Subject: Re: KOB coverage

PS: Technically, we already have services for refugees at the current Center. From the SACC webpage. I assume computer, ESL, and GED classes are to help the "refugees." I don't believe any of these things has ever been offered, but I could be wrong.

Adult, Family & Open Recreation

Anyone who wishes to participate in open recreation at the community center must be registered at the center. Please see supervisor or staff to fill out a registration form. This includes but is not limited to usage of basketball courts, computer lab and game room. Registration is ongoing.

- **Open Recreation:**
 - Monday, Tuesday, Thursday - 9 a.m. - 2 p.m.
 - Wednesday and Friday, 9 a.m. - noon (18 and older)
- **GED Classes:** Call center for more information
- **Computer Classes:** Call center for more information
- **ESL Classes:** Call center for more information