

From: [Debbie - South Los Altos](#)
To: [Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J.](#)
Cc: [Quevedo, Vicente M.](#); [Planning Department](#)
Subject: EPC March 21, 2024 meeting - 48 hour comments - CORRECTION
Date: Monday, March 18, 2024 8:17:51 PM

[EXTERNAL] Forward to phishing@cabq.gov and delete if an email causes any concern.

Mikaela,

I apologize but just now saw that I had a bad typo in the same spot that I did before. Please replace my prior 48 hour comments with this one.

Thank you, and again, I apologize. This is what happens when I only have my phone available and not a computer. I am on a computer now.

Debbie Conger

Environmental Planning Commission
Attn: Jonathan R. Hollinger, Chair

Re: Agenda item 3. Project # PR-2024-009940
SI-2024-00286 - Community Planning Area Assessment Report – East Gateway ABQ CPA

EPC Chair Hollinger and all EPC Members:

This report is not ready to send to Council, for three reasons: (1) There was not enough public outreach, and (2) there was not a phase that addressed weaknesses and threats, and (3) the report appears to be written for show and not to convey enough specific facts.

Not enough Public Outreach: There was not enough public outreach, especially to working homeowners without children who go to school in the CPA and who do not frequent community centers, laundromats, bus stops, but instead spend much of their time at home or at work. I repeatedly requested during the process that the City reach out to more people via radio, TV, the Albuquerque Journal, and door-to-door. The answer I got was that they did not have enough staff or money to do those things. Reaching neighborhood associations, which are known to have low percentages of residents as members, is not sufficient. My neighborhood association, for instance, for the last 10 years has had approximately 20 members. That is of approximately 1700 residences. In addition, neighborhood associations do not have the resources to reach out to all residents on behalf of the City.

Take a look at the Public Engagement Appendices that start on page 145. (Although page 10 of this report states “See Appendix 7.2 for a full overview of the public engagement that contributed to the development of this report. “, it is actually Appendix 8.1.) You will see that the number of responses received for different things is very low. For instance, on page 147: “The Long Range team asked interested participants several questions related to their housing, a survey was also available online. In total, 17 people responded to these questions.” 17 responses is not sufficient. Or this on page 10: “Our team analyzed 500 comments that we heard through tabling events and more than 200 online survey responses.” These are not a sufficient number of responses from a pool of 30,700 residents. Not impressive. However, I bet if they had a phase that was entitled “Weaknesses and Threats”, and that was advertised, and several sessions were held, there would have been more responses.

Page 145 states: “In addition to the website and activity-specific advertising, the Planning Department mailing list promoted different engagement and review opportunities. Over 9,000 people

received announcements at the beginning and final phase of the assessment, and more than 550 people who signed up for area-specific updates, which were sent throughout the process.” Were these sent by USPS mail or email? What did the announcements say? Why isn’t an example included in the report? Who were they sent to and why not to all in the area? What about the rest of the 30,700 people who live in East Gateway?

No Phase addressing Weaknesses & Threats: None of the phases addressed weaknesses and threats. There were four phases outlined in the report:

8.1.2 PHASE I: ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

8.1.3 PHASE II: SPECIAL TOPICS

8.1.4 PHASE IV: FOCUS GROUPS [this is likely a typo on page 148 and is probably meant to say phase III]

8.1.5 PHASE IV: ACTION AND POLICY SURVEYS

During the Phase I kick-off meeting, many of us said that we wanted to be able to talk about problems, not just assets and opportunities. But we were told that would happen later. It didn’t. You are probably familiar with a SWOT analysis. As you know, the name is an acronym for the four components the technique examines.

Strengths: characteristics of the business or project that give it an advantage over others

Weaknesses: characteristics that place the business or project at a disadvantage relative to other

Opportunities: elements in the environment that the business or project could exploit to its advantage

Threats: elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the business or project

This CPA process did not have a phase that focused on weaknesses & threats.. This is a major shortcoming of this process and report, especially in an area that has so many problems. Except for a Planner who is no longer with the City, it was clear that the Planners did not want to hear about the problems we are concerned with. Not listening to our concerns seems to have been built into the process. This is a major flaw.

Most homeowners in the area recognize there are problems with lack of code enforcement and dilapidated housing, yet there is only one small paragraph addressing this:

"4.8.3 CODE ENFORCEMENT AND HOUSING

Homeowners, renters, and people who live in manufactured homes throughout East Gateway expressed concerns about poor property maintenance. Some issues are related to landlords’ inability or unwillingness to rehabilitate their residential buildings. Other concerns related to homeowners’ maintenance of property.”

And there is only one item in the Action Plan even somewhat related to this, which does not address the issues with code enforcement throughout the area, especially related to homeowners’ maintenance of properties.

"Add a "Renter/Landlord Code Violation" option on 311 online and app reporting so that it is easier for people to share housing issues with Code Enforcement."

Report style: The report appears to be written for show, without enough emphasis on specifics and obscuring facts.

For instance, on page 148: “8.1.3.5 Walk in South Los Altos Community members and Planning staff explored connections between Daniel Webster Park, Hawthorne Elementary, the Los Altos Golf Course, and Los Altos Park. Discussion centered on the APS and CABQ Parks joint use agreement and comfort levels on the walk between Hawthorn Elementary and Los Altos Park.” What this does not say is that the only participants were two Community members (I was one of them), two Planning staff, and that no one from either the Golf Course nor CABQ Parks showed up as planned. It also does not say that the other community member, now in his 70s, grew up in South Los Altos and told how he and his neighbors used to be able to walk across the freeway overpass and easily

access Los Altos Pool. It does not say that we stopped our walk after we walked down the ramp on the other side of the freeway because we saw that to get to Los Altos Pool and Park we would need to walk across a debris filled dirt lot to Lomas and then walk down Lomas. It does not say that we found was that there is no comfort level walking between Hawthorne Elementary and Los Altos Park.

And how about the “Stationary Sources of Air Pollution” map on page 144? It looks interesting, but I could find no further explanation of it in the report. Did I miss it? It’s true that as a person with a full-time job I have limited time so it is possible that in my review of this 150 page report I missed it. But I could not find anything more about pollution using the search tool on my computer. Or is there no explanation in the report? Something as important as air pollution should have further explanation.

In conclusion, I ask that this not be sent to Council. Further public outreach needs to be done, a focus on weaknesses and threats needs to be made, and the report needs to be more concise and precise.

My mom used to say: “do it right or not at all”. This wasn’t done right. Threats and weaknesses should have been a phase, and the City should have found a way to reach working homeowners who are not members of neighborhood associations and do not go to community centers, bus stops, laundromats, and parks.

I have the ability to do a more thorough review of this report. However, as a person who works full-time I only have so much time. I have lived in this area most of my 40+ years in Albuquerque. And I would prefer to stay in this area. However, now I am faced with the choice of retiring in a few years or working longer so that I can afford to move out of this area into a better one. Wouldn’t it be better for all of us in Albuquerque if things were done to improve this area rather than watch it degrade even more than it has?

Respectfully,
Debbie Conger
South Los Altos resident