

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
<b>Below are comments directed to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC), received prior to the 21 March 2017 comment submittal date.</b>							
1	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	4	1-9.3 (pg. 4) In addition to prohibiting restrictions on solar collectors, the Subdivision Ordinance [§ 14-14-4-7(B)] requires a note to be placed on plats regarding future restrictions; this existing section 7(B), as well as the caveat of section 7(C) needs be retained in the IDO.	This can be an administrative requirement. The IDO is intended to include provisions that need review by the land use authority of the City -- the City Council -- to change. Requirements for notes on plats seem to fall into the category of requirements that the Planning Department has the administrative authority to require.	
2	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	183	4-3.2.B (pg. 183) The Complete Streets Ordinance [§ 6-5-6] links to standards from several national design guides and reports. This ordinance was targeted for City sponsored street projects, but development review on the private side of the right of way is an opportunity for regulating transit facilities/ stop amenities which currently are incentivized in the Zoning Code [§ 14-16-3-1E(6)(a)] but not required. One more item from the Complete Streets definition needs to be added by re-writing the sentence towards the end of 2.B.1: "...to allow <del>comfortable and</del> convenient street crossings, <u>comfortable and accessible public transportation stops</u> , and pedestrian access...."		On page 183, Section 4-3.2.B.1, edit the text to read as follows: "... safe access by users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders to allow comfortable, convenient, and universally accessible street crossings, transit stops, and pedestrian access..."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
3	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	183	4-3.2.B.2 (pg. 183) Item 2B.2 appears to be the first mention of the DPM in the IDO. Currently the DPM has the force of ordinance by virtue of § 14-14-1-10 RULEMAKING. (A) (1) The Mayor is responsible for the promulgation of rules necessary to fulfill the intent of this article. Authorized rules shall be published in the <i>Development Process Manual</i> and <b><u>shall have the same effect as the provisions within this article</u></b> . This is repeated in § 14-14-4-14 (“...such technical standards and criteria for infrastructure improvements <b><u>shall have such force and effect as if they were fully set forth herein.</u></b> ” ) This type of language will be needed (Administration and Enforcement?) for the DPM to maintain this regulatory vs. ‘guideline’ status.		Add a new subsection to 1-7.1 with the following language: "The Mayor is responsible for the promulgation of rules necessary to fulfill the intent of this Ordinance. Authorized rules shall be published in the Development Process Manual and shall have the same effect as the provisions within this Ordinance."
4	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	185	4-3.3.A.4 (pg. 185) The City definition of “cul-de-sac” notes that it normally has a vehicular turnaround, which is a huge difference in standards from a stub street. The DPM has detailed and distinct criteria for each which need to be reflected here by removing the words “[ <del>stub streets or</del> ” from 4.a and remove the words “[ <del>or cul-de-sacs</del> ” from 4.b.		The project team will work through this with the DPM Ch. 23 subcommittee and forward recommendations.
5	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	186	4-3.3.A.5.b (pg. 186) Street lights are appropriately approved by the City Engineer, however Footnote 642 is incorrect.		On page 186, Footnote 642, replace "Development Review Board" with "City Engineer. "

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
6	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	188	4-3.3.D (pg. 188) Footnote 648 is incorrect: the reference should be to 14-14-4-5(A)(7)(c).		On page 188, Footnote 648, revise to reflect the correct reference: 14-14-4-5(A)(7)(c).
7	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	189	4-3.4.B.3.c (pg. 189) This particular exception is not appropriate and needs to be deleted: the entire valley is subject to odd sized tracts, not just for Los Duranes. The Sidewalk Ordinance provides for variances [§ 6-5-5-16], and this section simply needs to make that reference.		The project team will work through this with the DPM Ch. 23 subcommittee and forward recommendations.
8	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	192	4-4.1 (pg. 192) Key standards from the existing Purpose and Intent of the Subdivision Ordinance need to be retained by inserting the following new/ underlined language at the end of 1.A: <u>and such further plans, policies, and ordinance adopted by the City Council</u> ; and inserting the following new/ underlined language at the end of 1.F: <u>while providing economy for governmental purposes and efficiency in governmental operations</u>		On page 192, Section 4-4.1.A, add "and other plans, policies, and ordinances adopted by the City Council".  On page 192, Section 4-4.1.F, add "while while providing economy for governmental purposes and efficiency in governmental operations."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
9	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	195	4-4.6.D (Footnote 682 pg. 195) The City does not allow “remainder parcels” now [§ 14-14-9-2] but in terms of parcels that are not “lots” they are labeled as “tracts” for open space, drainage, etc. and they are always noted on the plat for the use and for maintenance responsibilities (e.g. ‘Landscape Tract A, to be maintained by the Homeowners Association’). Instead of Section D., the following new/ underlined language should be added as a new Item C.5: <u>Tracts for open space, drainage, landscaping or other communal purposes shall have their use, beneficiaries, and maintenance responsibilities clearly noted on the subdivision plat.</u>		On page 195, add a new Section 4-4.6C.5 to read: " <u>Tracts for open space, drainage, landscaping or other communal purposes shall have their use, beneficiaries, and maintenance responsibilities clearly noted on the subdivision plat.</u> " Section 4-4.6D should be retained to be clear that in the future, the City will continue to prohibit remainder parcels.
10	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	197	4-4.11.A (pg. 197-198) Dedication of open space should be re-instated from the February 2016 Draft; however detached open space is not always dedicated to the City, but can be by deed restrictions, easements, etc. The previous (02/16) language could be expanded by adding an option for deed restrictions: “...may be met by dedicating or deed restricting detached open space on lots separate from the use ...”	The language from the previous draft was erroneously carried over from the Parks Dedication Ordinance, when the City could require open space or park land. Section 4-4.11 is describing dedications that the City can require, which is no longer the case for parks or open space.	On page 198, Section 4-4.11.B, edit sentence to read: "an appropriate tract shall be shows as reserved, deed restricted, or dedicated for public use on the plat."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
11	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	199	4-4.12 (pg. 199) Easements are 'granted,' only right of way is 'dedicated' – insert the words “ <del>or granted</del> ” after all references to “dedicated.” Additionally, the ABCWUA (12.B.3) is requiring separate easements from City drainage facilities wherever private streets or other easements are platted		On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B, revise as follows: "Easements or rights-of-way dedicated for public infrastructure shall be granted or dedicated, respectively, ..." On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B.1, revise as follows: "All easements or rights-of way granted or designated, respectively, ..." On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B.3, revise as follows: "Easements with <del>rights-of-way</del> "
12	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	199	4-4.12.C Utility easements are quite common along all lot lines; at the end of this section, delete the words “[ <del>rear and side</del> ]” and the phrase “[ <del>except those bordering dedicated streets and alleys</del> ].”		On page 199, revise 4-4.12C to read: "Utility easements may be required along any lot line."
13	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	199	4-4.13 (pg. 199) Impact Fees are paid at the time of Building Permit, not subdivision; this section needs to be deleted.	This section does not specify when the impact fees must be paid, that is an administrative procedure. It is important to retain this section to make clear that impact fees are required with development of land. Staff is reviewing this comment for subsequent recommendations to determine a more appropriate location in the IDO to move this section.	On page 199, Section 4-4.13, revise to read: "Development shall be required..."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
14	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	200	4-4.15.B (pg. 200) The notice of waiver from § 14-14-6-2(B) as well as the qualification from 2(C) need to be retained by inserting the following new/ underlined language at the end of 15.B: <u>Such further review and approval must be more comprehensive than issuance of a building permit, and a notice of any waivers shall be placed on the final plat and on a separately recorded.</u>	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations. Generally, this appears to be a procedural requirement, and is addressed in Section 5-5.2H.2.a on page 352.	
15	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	299	Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) Footnote 1119 - Subdivision of Land – Major Application Type should read: Preliminary Plat (Including Variance and/ or <u>Subdivision</u> Improvement Agreement <u>Extension</u> ), plus it is at this level the <u>Neighborhood</u> notification is required.		On page 299, revise the application type under "Subdivision fo Land - Major" to read: "Preliminary Plat (Including Variance and/or <u>Subdivision</u> Improvement Agreement/ <u>Extension</u> )"
16	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	299	Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) The functions of the Pre-Application meeting in the Subdivision Ordinance is now done through the One Stop Shop Front Counter with other general issues addressed at the Sketch Plat review, so <del>Pre-Application</del> Mtgs does not need to be checked in the table.	The sketch plat as it is known today serves the purpose of the Pre-Application Meeting, so it is intended to be checked in the table.	
17	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	299	Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) Footnote 1121 - For Final Plat, this is the technical completion of the entitlement granted with Preliminary Plat; Published and Web Posting Notice are all that is needed.		On page 299, change Table 5-1-1 to show that only Published and Web Posting Notice are required at Final Plat.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
18	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	299	Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) Vacation Application Type needs to include all Easements – delete the word (Public).		On page 299, edit Table 5-1-1 to delete the word "Public" before "Easements."
19	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	299	Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) Sidewalk Variances are administered through the Sidewalk Ordinance [6-5-5] but they are included in subdivision review – the <del>Posted Sign</del> requirement should be deleted, but the request will still be noted (and should be included) under Mailed Notice.		On page 299, edit Table 5-1-1 to delete "Posted Sign" requirement for Sidewalk Variance.
20	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	318	5-4.13.E (pg 318) As a technical review board composed of City staff, the DRB is often contacted or contacts directly with applicants regarding technical design issues – these usually involve minimum standards and may not rise to the level of discussing the ‘merits’ of an issue, but there may need to be additional or exception language added here.		Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.
21	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	319	5-4.13.G.5 (pg 319) The DRB needs to be included for decisions following a public hearing.		On page 319, Section 5-4.13G.5, add DRB to the list of review bodies that provide a written decision with findings after the hearing.
22	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	319	5-4.13.H (pg 319) The DRB meets weekly and is not staffed to do mailed notices within three days.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
23	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	328	Table 5-4-2 (pg 328) ( <del>Development Agreements</del> ) are not subject to a public Hearing decision so this should be deleted from the Table.		On page 328, Table 5-4-2, move the "Development Agreement" application type to the Administrative Decisions section.
24	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	328	Table 5-4-2 (pg 328) Similar to Vacation of Right-of-Way, the Vacation of Easements are only valid for <u>1 year, if not platted</u> – also, insert the following new/ underlined language: Vacation of Public <u>or Private</u> Easements		On page 328, Table 5-4-2, revise the period of validity for Vacation of Easements to read: "1 year, if not platted" and revise the type of approval to read: "Vacation of Easements"
25	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	351	5-5.2.H.1.a. (pg 351) Footnote 1320 Items 1.a.ii., 1.a.iii. and 1.a.iv. do not represent the current Subdivision Ordinance definition or interpretation of DPM – the concept of ‘significant’ infrastructure to determine a Minor Subdivision is whether it’s affecting other properties and is expensive (generally, something over \$50,000); an 8 lot subdivision can build its own (‘expensive’) public or private street and still be considered Minor if the street only serves that property, but if a small subdivision requires extension of off-site infrastructure then a value determination is needed. These items (1.a.ii., 1.a.iii. and 1.a.iv.) need to be deleted.	The IDO intends to make modifications to the current application, review, and approval process, including this one, to align the City's process with Best Practices. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
26	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	352	5-5.2.H.2.a.i. (pg 352) Footnote 1323 This item does not carry forward the intent of § 14-14-4-1(B), but instead has conflated it with the variances related to lot sizes which are the jurisdiction of the ZHE. The Subdivision Ordinance is specific to <u>subdivision design standards</u> , which includes dimensions for easements, rights of way and alignments along with quantities/dimensions of infrastructure. A new Item 2.a.ii should be inserted after Item 2.a.i to read as follows: <u>A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.</u>		On page 353, Section 5-5.2H.3.c, add the following review and decision criterion: " <u>A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.</u> "
27	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		Additionally, a bulk land transfer is for waiver of 'significant' infrastructure and is not applicable to Minor Subdivisions; draft items 2.a.ii. and 2.a.iii can be deleted.	The IDO intends to make modifications to the current application, review, and approval process, including this one, to align the City's process with Best Practices. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
28	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		<p>5-5.2.H.2.c. (pg 352) It is not unusual for a Minor Subdivision to have infrastructure, it's just not considered 'significant;' however it still requires construction or financial guarantee to obtain a final plat. Similar to the procedures for Major Subdivision noted on pages 354-355, new Items H.2.c and H.2.d. should be inserted after Item H.2.b. to read the same as I.2.d and I.2.e (with the inclusion of the phrase <u>if required</u> after the first references to 'improvements') then re-order accordingly.</p>	<p>Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
29	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		<p>5-5.2.H.3.c. (pg 353) Footnote 1326 As previously noted, a bulk land waiver of 'significant' infrastructure is not applicable to Minor Subdivisions; Item 3.c should read as follows: If an adjustment from the applicable subdivision standards in this IDO or the Development Process Manual has been requested, <u>the Development Review Board shall not approve variances unless it shall make findings, based upon the evidence presented to it at a public meeting, that:</u> <u>(i.) The variance will not be injurious to the public safety, health or welfare, or to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community; and</u> <u>(ii.) The variance will not conflict significantly with the goals and provisions of any city, county, or AMAFCA adopted plan or policy, this IDO, or any other city code or ordinance; and</u> <u>(iii.) The variance will not permit, encourage or make possible undesired development in the 100-year Floodplain; and</u> <u>(iv.) The variance will not hinder future planning, public right-of-way acquisition, or the financing or building of public infrastructure improvements.</u></p>		<p>See also line 26. Page 353, Section 5-5.2.H.3.c. (pg 353) revise to read: "If an adjustment from the applicable subdivision standards in this IDO or the Development Process Manual has been requested, <u>the Development Review Board shall not approve variances unless it shall make findings, based upon the evidence presented to it at a public meeting, that:</u> <u>(i.) The variance will not be injurious to the public safety, health or welfare, or to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community; and</u> <u>(ii.) The variance will not conflict significantly with the goals and provisions of any city, county, or AMAFCA adopted plan or policy, this IDO, or any other city code or ordinance; and</u> <u>(iii.) The variance will not permit, encourage or make possible undesired development in the 100-year Floodplain; and</u> <u>(iv.) The variance will not hinder future planning, public right-of-way acquisition, or the financing or building of public infrastructure improvements."</u></p>

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
30	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		5-5.2.1.2.a.i. (pg 353) Footnote 1329 To address variances to <u>subdivision design standards</u> , as noted for Minor Subdivisions a new Item 2.a.ii should be inserted after Item 2.a.i to read as follows, and re-order accordingly: <u>A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.</u>		On page 353, Section 5-5.21.3.c, add the following review and decision criterion: " <u>A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.</u> "
31	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	353	Additionally, on page 353 in the first box on the right, Subdivision of Land – Major should be revised to match revision for Table 5-1-1, to read: Preliminary Plat (Including Variance and/ or <u>Subdivision Improvement Agreement Extension</u> ).		On page 353, in the procedure illustration, revise the title to read: "Preliminary Plat (Including Variance and/or <u>Subdivision Improvement Agreement/Extension</u> ."
32	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	354	5-5.2.1.2.b. (pg 354) Footnote 1330 As noted with Table 5-1-1, The functions of a Pre-Application meeting and other general issues are addressed at the Sketch Plat review; Item 2.b should simply be titled Sketch Plat and begin with Item 2.b.i.	See Line 16.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
33	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	354	5-5.2.1.2.c.ii. (pg 354) The second half of this sentence is redundant of preceding procedure Item 2.a.i. and could be deleted (after the semicolon).	This section refers to the approval procedure for Preliminary Plat, which is different for the procedure for Variances and Waivers. Staff thinks it is more clear to have the text in both locations. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
34	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	355	5-5.2.1.2.e.iii. (pg 355) Currently the Subdivision Ordinance allows an extension of up to 24 months not 12 (however the DRB often does shorter extensions).	The IDO intends to make modifications to the current application, review, and approval process, including this one, to align the City's process with Best Practices. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
35	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	355	5-5.2.1.2.e.iv. (pg 355) This section is an anachronism and can be deleted.		On page 355, remove Section 5-5.2.1.2.e.iv.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
36	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	357	<p>5-5.2.1.3.c. (pg 357)</p> <p>As noted with Minor Subdivisions, Item 3.c should read as follows: If an adjustment from the applicable subdivision standards in this IDO or the Development Process Manual has been requested, <u>the Development Review Board shall not approve variances unless it shall make findings, based upon the evidence presented to it at a public meeting, that:</u></p> <p><u>(i.) The variance will not be injurious to the public safety, health or welfare, or to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii.) The variance will not conflict significantly with the goals and provisions of any city, county, or AMAFCA adopted plan or policy, this IDO, or any other city code or ordinance; and</u></p> <p><u>(iii.) The variance will not permit, encourage or make possible undesired development in the 100-year Floodplain; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv.) The variance will not hinder future planning, public right-of-way acquisition, or the financing or building of public infrastructure improvements.</u></p>		<p>See also line 30 and 37.</p> <p>On page 357, Section 5-5.2.1.3.c., replace the text with the following: "If an adjustment from the applicable subdivision standards in this IDO or the Development Process Manual has been requested, <u>the Development Review Board shall not approve variances unless it shall make findings, based upon the evidence presented to it at a public meeting, that:</u></p> <p><u>(i.) The variance will not be injurious to the public safety, health or welfare, or to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii.) The variance will not conflict significantly with the goals and provisions of any city, county, or AMAFCA adopted plan or policy, this IDO, or any other city code or ordinance; and</u></p> <p><u>(iii.) The variance will not permit, encourage or make possible undesired development in the 100-year Floodplain; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv.) The variance will not hinder future planning, public right-of-way acquisition, or the financing or building of public infrastructure improvements."</u></p>

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
37	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	357	And, to address waiver of subdivision standards (reference 4-4.15.B, pg. 200): <u>(v.) Where a waiver is based upon a bulk land transfer, development shall require subsequent further review for subdivision or site plan approval; such further review and approval must be more comprehensive than issuance of a building permit, and a notice of any waivers shall be placed on the final plat and on a separately recorded.</u>		On page 356, Section Section 5-5.2.I.3.c., add the following text: <u>"(v.) Where a waiver is based upon a bulk land transfer, development shall require subsequent further review for subdivision or site plan approval; such further review and approval must be more comprehensive than issuance of a building permit, and a notice of any waivers shall be placed on the final plat and on a separately recorded."</u>
38	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17	357	5-5.2.J.1. (pg 357) As previously noted for Table 5-1-1, Vacation Application Type needs to include Private Easements – delete the word <del>Public</del> (twice) in the header and insert the words <u>"as well as to private ways and easements shown on recorded plats"</u> at the end of this section.		On page 357, Section 5-5.2J, revise the title and the produce illustration to read: "Vacation of Easement and Right-of-Way" On page 357, Section 5-5.2J.1, add to the end of the applicability sentence: <u>"as well as private ways and easements shown on recorded plats."</u>
39	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		5-5.2.J.2.a. (pg 357) Published and Posted Sign needs to be retained for vacation of all public easements, however this section would apply to Private Easements – delete the word <del>(public)</del> and insert the word <u>"private"</u> in its place, then add the words <u>"and the Planning Director is satisfied that all the benefitted and burdened parties are clearly and completely defined and all agree to the vacation"</u> at the end of this section.		On page 357, Section 5-5.2J.2.a, revise to read: <u>"Notwithstanding the provisions of Table 5-1-1, Published and Posted Sign notice are not required when the application is for vacation of a private easement that does not involve a public right-of-way and the Planning Director is satisfied that all the benefitted and burdened parties are clearly and completely defined and all agree to the vacation."</u>

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
40	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		Also on page 357 the first box on the right should be revised to match revision for Table 5-1-1, to read: Vacation of Public R-O-W or Public <u>or Private</u> Easement.		See Line 38.
41	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		6-1 (pg 398 - Footnote 1498) Easements are not allowed by the City does within public right of way; additionally, there are other uses besides infrastructure improvements which could require an easement, such as open space, or a view or use easement	Staff is considering the comment to remove reference to public right of way for subsequent recommendations. More research is needed to determine if there are easements in the public right of way, such as for PNM electrical facilities and/or Wireless Telecommunication Facilities, among others.	On page 398, in the definition for Easement, add the following to the end: " <u>Easements may also be granted for open space, view protection, or specific uses.</u> "
42	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		(pg 405/407 - Footnote 1544) Lot definitions 2. and 3. should include the references to the appropriate ordinances from the existing Zoning Code definitions	More information is needed about what should change.	
43	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		(pg 423 - Footnote 1626) Street, Stub definition is incorrect – see DPM Chapter 23.5.D.5	The IDO intends to make some modifications to the current terminology, including this one, to align with Best Practices. These changes are consistent with changes proposed in the DPM. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
44	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	1/10/17		(pg 426) Water Resources Engineer is no longer a position with the City of Albuquerque		On page 395, revise the DRB membership to refer to an "ABCWUA representative." On page 426, delete the definition for 'Water Resources Engineer.'

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
45	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17	199	A.3: Easements or rights-of-way that will be jointly occupied by public water and sewer lines and/or public drainage facilities shall be a minimum of 30 feet in width.	This comment provides the text found in Section 4-4.12B.3, and is the basis for additional comments below. Several other sections in the IDO discuss utility easements or rights-of-way requirements. Page 173, Section 4-1.7 discusses Utility Clearance requirements, and defers to the requirements of the DPM. This comment will be forwarded to the DPM team. Page 195, Section 4-4.7 discusses water and sanitary sewer systems, and defers to ABCWUA policy on water and sanitary sewer line extensions. Page 199, Section 4-4.12 discusses location and dimensions of utility easements and rights-of-way.	
46	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17		My comments are as follows:	See Lines 47-50.	
47	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17	199	1. All Water Authority easements shall be exclusive from all other underground utilities.		On page 199, Section 4-4.12B.3, revise the text to read "All ABCWUA easements shall be exclusive from all other underground utilities. ABCWUA easements shall not include storm drain facilities."
48	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17	199	2. Water Authority easements shall not include storm drain facilities.	See Line 45 and 47.	See Line 47.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
49	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17	199	3. Per the DPM Chapter 25: A permanent easement must be granted for the exclusive use of water and sanitary sewer, unless shared use with other utilities is coordinated and approved in advance by the DRC Utility Development representative. A minimum width easement of 20' is required for a single utility and 25' for water and sewer both within the same easement. Appropriate forms of easement language may be obtained from the Planning Department/ Utility Development.	This comment provides the text contained in the Current DPM.	See Line 47.
50	Cadena, Kristopher	ABCWUA	1/11/17	199	4. 25' has always been the requirement if both water and sewer were in the same easement. Was the 30' width indicated by a Water Authority representative? Footnote states changed from 25' per ABCWUA but I cannot think of anyone else who may have made that comment.	This comment pertains to the DPM, and will be forwarded on to the DPM team. This comment reflects the content in 4-4.12B.2 & 3, which were drawn from the current DPM. Section B.2 will remain, but Section B.3 will be revised as shown on Line 47.	See Line 47.
51	Haynes, Margaret	NMDOT	1/12/17		NMDOT has no comments.	Noted.	
52	Gallegos, Herman	Solid Waste	1/13/17		No Comment	Noted.	
53	Chinchilla, Antonio	Fire Marshall	1/17/17		Reviewed with no comments.	Noted.	
54	Mazur, Lynne	AMAFCA	1/17/17		No adverse comment. AMAFCA staff provided input during the review process.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
55	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	362	Section 5-5.3.A (page 362) deals with adoption of other City plans, including master plans in general. I recommend adding a new #2 under "Applicability" to explicitly EXCLUDE the BioPark Master Plan and explain that amendment procedures for that document are as set out in the BioPark Master Plan. (DF: The amendment procedures are not spelled out in the master plan...yet. They are, however, spelled out in the BioPark resolution R-16-68. We can use the same language.)	Section 5-5.3A addresses adoption and amendment of Facility Plans, Resource Management Plans, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Plans, and does not apply to Master Plans.  The amendment of Master Plans is described on page 330, Section 5-4.24. Section 5-4.24A.2 provides an exclusion for Master Plans, as requested in this comment. The IDO also indicates they may be amended by the procedures specified in the relevant Plan, which would include direction provided in the adopting resolution.	
56	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17		Our discussions with you indicate that the existing process is through your own advisory committee and therefore entirely outside the scope of the IDO in terms of zoning. (DF: OK)	Agree, this is how the IDO is structured. See also page 338, Section 5-5.1F.1.k, Site Plan - Administrative, which provides for an administrative review and approval process for all City BioPark facilities.	
57	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	52	2-5.6 Non-residential Park and Open Space Zone (NR-PO) – describes zone and sets out BioPark as NR-PO-D and as regulated by your Master Plan – page 52 (DF: Uses and standards and development in the BioPark master plan and approved by the Cultural Services Department are allowed.) (Note little m and little p)	Noted.  More information is needed about the reference to "little m and little p," which are not found on page 52.	
58	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	107	Table 3-2-1 Permitted Use Table – BioPark – Permissive in Subzone D, xref to Use Specific Standard 3-3.3.C – page 107 (DF: No Change)	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
59	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	103	3-1.7 Permitted Uses in the NR-PO Zone District – mentions BioPark as regulated by Master Plan – page 103 (DF: Would prefer the use of the word Master Plan as master plan in all instances of the IDO.) (Also: The BioPark is regulated by a Master Plan, which specifies permitted uses and development associated within the ABQ BioPark Zoo, Aquarium, Botanic Gardens, and Tingley Beach facilities.)	More information is needed about what should change. The text from page 103 is provided in the last sentence of this comment and uses the term "Master Plan."	
60	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	126	3-3.3.C.4 Civic and Institutional Uses – Parks and Open Space – In Subzone D (Bio Park) – page 126 (DF: Uses and standards and development in the BioPark master plan and approved by the Cultural Services Department are allowed.) (Note little m and little p)	Noted. This comment provides the text from page 126.	
61	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	338	5-5.1.F.1.k Administrative Decisions – Site Plan – Administrative – BioPark facilities – page 338 (DF: Only change here is little m and little p if we can)	This comment refers to a previous draft, which was revised to respond to this comment. The EPC draft does not contain a "little m and little p" in this section, which ends at letter 'k.'	
62	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	389	6-1 Definitions “BioPark” – page 389 (DF: ABQ BioPark: City-owned facility managed by the Cultural Services Department and regulated and developed by the BioPark master plan, including the ABQ BioPark Zoo, Botanic Garden, Aquarium, and Tingley Beach. Zoned Non-Residential Parks and Open Space Subzone D (NR-PO-D) in the IDO.	This comment provides the text for the BioPark definition.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
63	Renz, Erica	Cultural Services	1/17/17	429	6-1 Definitions "Zoo" – page 429 (DF: Don't think you have to have accreditation to call yourself a zoo. May need to remove this.)	This definition was drawn from the current Code of Ordinances, which may need to be amended in a separate action.	On page 429, in the definition for Zoo, revise the text to indicate that it " <u>may</u> be accredited by the American Zoological Association..."
64	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		The members of the LUCC have reviewed the new Integrated Development Ordinance as it regards the Old Town Historic Overlay Zone and the surrounding 300' buffer zone. Having reviewed the content and intent of the original H-1 zoning overlay as well as the 300' buffer zone, it is the view of this Commission that the following changes should be incorporated into the proposed IDO.		Agreed. The boundary of the Old Town Historic Overlay Zone will be changed to reflect the LUCC's recommendations to incorporate appropriate parts of the buffer area.
65	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		1. The 300' Old Town Buffer zone should be removed from the area north of Old Town along Mountain Road. This area has been completely built out according to the Buffer Zone guidelines.		See Line 64.
66	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		2. The area to the west of Old Town along Rio Grande Blvd. should be removed from the buffer zone. Much of this area has been built out according to the BZ guidelines and what remains is not contributing to Old Town.		See Line 64.
67	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		3. The properties along the south side of Central Avenue are not in keeping with Historic Old Town and to have them meet guidelines does not make for reasonable development. This area is better addressed through City standards.		See Line 64.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
68	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		4. The municipal parking lot as well as the property on the northeast corner of Central and San Felipe, currently located within the 300' buffer zone, should be incorporated into the Old Town HPO-5 in order to ensure compatible development of the sites in the future. The record shows that the original intention of the buffer zone was considered a temporary solution until such time as this area was incorporated into the Historic Old Town Zone.		See Line 64.
69	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		5. The primarily residential block bound by Lomas Ave., San Pasquale, Old Town Rd and 19th St. is currently incorporated in its entirety in the 300' buffer zone. This block is currently zoned R-2 and would be completely without development or demolition safe guards were it to be removed from the buffer zone without alternative protection. As such, it is the recommendation of the LUCC to fully incorporate this block into the Old Town HPO-5 zone in the new IDO.		See Line 64.
70	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		6. The inclusion of these areas (listed in points 4 & 5 above) would best be served with full incorporation into HPO-5 and the dissolution of the 300' Old Town Buffer Zone.		See Line 64.
71	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		7. Incorporation of these areas into HPO-5 will not create any additional controls on these areas as they have been reviewed according to the H-1 guidelines up until now.		See Line 64.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
72	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		The members of the LUCC have reviewed the new Integrated Development Ordinance as it regards the East Downtown Area Urban Conservation Overlay Zone as well as the Huning Highland Historic Overlay Zone. Having reviewed the content and intent of the original Huning Highland zoning overlay as well as the Edo UCOZ, it is the view of this Commission that the following concerns should be considered by the proposed IDO.	See Lines 73-85.	
73	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		1. The southwest block bound by Union St./John St., Gold Ave., S. Broadway and Central Ave. Was originally a part of Huning Highland Historic Overlay zone and subsequently part of the East Downtown UCOZ.	Noted.	
74	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		2. This block includes one significant historic building, two contributing buildings and one building of note, located on three of the four corners of the block.	Noted.	
75	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		3. These properties are all considered to be part of the newly designated HPO-1.	Noted.	
76	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		4. Removal of the block from the CPO in the new IDO would allow for the development of potentially unsuitable development in the areas adjacent to historic buildings in areas currently used as parking lots.	Noted.	See Line 82.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
77	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		5. The Central Avenue corridor as demarcated by the East Downtown CPO-1 runs through the middle of the Huning Highland Historic District and in so doing represents a unique condition concerning the nature of development in the area.	Noted.	
78	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		6. The Edo UCOZ was originally removed from the Huning Highland Historic Overlay Zone, in part because it was of a different historic nature than that of the residential neighborhood.	Noted.	
79	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		7. The East Downtown HPO-1 and the East Downtown CPO-1 address the uniqueness of this area as different from Huning Highland HPO-4.	Noted.	
80	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		Considering the current conditions as listed above, it is the recommendation of the LUCC that the IDO be changed as follows:	See lines 81 - 85.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
81	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		1. Combine the East Downtown CPO and the East Downtown HPO to create one unified HPO. This would protect historic buildings, promote compatible development and protect the unique streetscape of the area.	The current EDo Regulatory Plan provides different development standards and requirements for designated historic buildings than non-contributing structures or vacant land. Staff has reflected this different set of rules through a complementary set of regulations provided as a Character Protection Overlay zone and a Historic Protection Overlay zone. Staff believes that this is the most effective way to apply the different, but complementary regulations. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to combine into one HPO, which would change the review process that is carried forward from the EDo Regulatory Plan.	
82	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		2. Reinstate the southwest block of Central and Broadway (Item 1 above) into the East Downtown overlay.		Agreed. The EDo CPO will be revised to reinstate this block.
83	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		3. Include those buildings marked as Buildings of Note in the 2005 EDo UCOZ document in the protected buildings of HPO-1, especially if the HPO and CPO are not merged.		Agreed. The building footprints from the EDo Regulatory Plan will be added to the relevant parcels in the IDO. The text will also be revised to specifically apply the historic building standards to only the noted buildings, and not new development that may occur on the same parcel.
84	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		4. Utilize guidelines as set forth in the CPO-1 for East Downtown for non-contributing buildings in a unified HPO-1.	Agreed. These have been incorporated into the EDo CPO. Staff needs more information about what specifically needs to change.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
85	Naji, Leslie	LUCC	1/17/17		The joining of the CPO with HPO-1 is viewed by the LUCC as a necessary means for protecting the unique character of the Central corridor through Huning Highland and allowing for LUCC review of development in the area. By creating this new Historic Protection Overlay, the commercial and industrial nature of properties in this area are provide more suitable guidelines than the original Huning Highland Overlay zone was able to.	Staff believes that the complementary tools of the CPO and HPO provide this protection. The IDO has been carefully crafted to bring in the protections from the EDo Regulatory Plan into the two types of Overlay Zone, based on the presence or absence of a Building of Note on each parcel within the boundaries [except for the one block noted above that was excluded.] Staff worked with the EDo Board to develop and refine the proposed text. Staff needs more information about what specifically needs to change.	See Line 82, which addresses the block that was excluded from the HPO in the EPC draft of the IDO.
86	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	52	Pg. 52 C.3.- District Standards - Require SPBP review for Private Parks. Refer to requirements sent previously from Christina Sandoval.	More information is needed about what should change. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
87	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	101	Pg. 101 D. Deviations - Please clarify who reviews and what public hearing would it be at? EPC or DRB?	This text indicates that deviations in the View Protection Overlay areas are not allowed, so there would not be a reference to any review body in this location.	
88	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	121	Pg. 121 C. 4.- Dwelling, Cluster Development. Please add maintenance responsibility. If for the benefit of the residents, should it be maintained by the HOA?		On page 121, Section 3-3.2C.5, add the following text: "Maintenance for Common Open Space areas is the responsibility of the property owner. See Section 4-12.2.J (Maintenance Standards).

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
89	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	125	Pg. 125 3. F Dog Parks - Please refer to information provided by Christina Sandoval earlier referencing the HEART Ordinance and the (Parks) Dog Park Ordinance.	More information is needed about what should change. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
90	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	162	Pg. 162 D Fair, Festival or Theatrical Performance - Please add "excluding Balloon Fiesta Park".	This comment could be applied to many of the uses regulated in the zoning code, such as Open Air Market and Outdoor Dining Area, among others. Because of the flexibility needed for events and operations at the Balloon Fiesta Park, instead of being regulated by the use specific standards for each use, the use specific standard 'Balloon Fiesta Park Events and Activities' was created. This standard refers to the Ballon Fiesta Master Development Plan for uses and conditions on operations. See page 137, Section 3-3.4Y.	
91	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	176	Pg. 176 C.4. – Arroyo Corridor Right-of-Way and Trails - Please strike "Access for the public may be provided at the applicant's option or as required to comply with other provisions of this IDO..." Also please add that access for the paved trails is required every ½ mile.	The City is not able to require public access to be provided, which is why the text is written to require access for the residents of the subdivision. The referenced text allows that the access could be for the general public if the owner wishes or if it is required by another governing document, such as the DPM or a Facility Plan.	On page 176, Section 4-2.5C.4, revise text to read "one-half mile for paved trails."
92	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	231	Pg. 231-256 - Landscaping... Did this section come out of the new Landscape Ordinance ?	Yes, see footnote 838 on page 231.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
93	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	238	Pg. 238 references the Regulation Authorized to the Parks and Recreation Department Director to develop and implement the Street Tree regulations of 6-6-2 in the City Code. Other questions have to do with the terminology when describing types of trees and shrubs. These should be consistent with industry standards and in many places, describes deciduous trees and evergreen trees as interchangeable in their proposed use and their description of size by caliper or height.	This comment refers to Section 4-6.3Q, Regulation Authorized. More information is needed about what needs to change.	
94	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	255	Pg. 255 8. -. Bicycle access – Access points shall be platted as easements. How is liability to be addressed?.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
95	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	263	Pg. 263 -4-8.5. Screening and Buffering – Should buffering be moved to be in chapter on Landscaping, General?	This section provides additional screening and buffering required where low density homes in residential districts about mixed use or non-residential zone districts.	On page 241, Section 4-6.5.A.3, add reference to Section 4-8.5 (Neighborhood Edges) requirements.
96	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	300	Pg. 300 – Table 5-1-1: Summary of Development Review Procedures, Note (1) Strike “May”.	This list identifies the possible city staff that may be involved in review of a particular application type. Removing the word "May" would imply that all the listed staff and city divisions would be involved in review of all the application types, which is inconsistent with current practice and what is proposed in the IDO.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
97	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	301	Page 301 5-2.4 Development Review Board – As previously stated, the Parks and Recreation Department would like to remain on the DRB.	Noted. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to change this standard. Since the Park Dedication Ordinance was replaced by the Impact Fee Ordinance, there is less that parks needs to review as part of most DRB submittals. Parks will continue to be notified and be a review agency for all development projects and have signature authroity for all projects that include or adjacent to a park, major public open space, or trail.	
98	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	356	Pg. 356 – 2.G.iii Dedications – When parks are dedicated to the City, a Special Warranty Deed and any other requirements of the Real Property Division for the land transfer are required.	This level of detail is more appropriately addressed in the DPM or as an administrative requirement concurrent with the park dedication. This comment will be forwarded to the DPM team.	
99	Dumont, Carol	Parks & Rec	1/17/17	412	Pg. 412 Definitions - Open Space, Major Public – Please re-word first sentence to read... “Publicly-owned spaces managed by the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department. ...”		On page 412, revise the definition for Open Space, Major Public to read: “Publicly-owned spaces managed by <u>the Open Space Division</u> of the City Parks and Recreation Department. ...”
100	Patz, Logan	Planning - Transpor- tation Develop- ment	1/17/17		Transportation development is supportive of this application. We have been working with the staff planners to ensure elements in the IDO, referring to traffic and transportation, provide the safest and most equitable transportation system for City of Albuquerque.	Noted. Staff appreciates the ongoing input from other agencies.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
101	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	115	In Table 3-2-1 at the top of page 115 in the first line, it is recommended that "Solar or geothermal energy generation" is clarified that this category refers to private solar generation and not to utility-scale solar generation. Private solar generation is an accessory use; utility-scale generation is primary use and is permissive.	Utility-scale energy generation is addressed by the use "Utility, Electric," which covers electric generation and transmission, as regulated in the Facility Plan. See also page 141, Section 3-3.5G.	
102	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	141	In Section 16-16-3-3.5, F. Solar or Geothermal Energy Generation or Device on page 141, is recommended that items 2, 3 and 4 which apply to primary use of the property be removed and placed under Section 16-16-3-3.5, G. Utility, Electric, also on page 141.		On page 141, Section 3-3.5F, remove text related to primary use of the site, and add this text to Section 3-3.5G.
103	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	146	In Section 14-16-3-3-5, I. Co-locations and Public Utility Co-location, item iv, on page 146, it is recommended that the term "electric transmission line structure" is replaced with "public utility structure" to be consistent with the definition provided on page 416.		On page 146, Section 3-3.5.I.I.iv, replace the phrase "electric transmission line structure" with " <u>public utility structure.</u> "

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
104	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	250	<p>In Section 14-16-4-6-9, B. Maximum Height on page 250 and 251, it is recommended that the following statement regarding wall height in item 3 on page 251 is repeated at the end of item 1 on page 251. In the current IDO draft, it may be interpreted that taller walls for security reasons may only apply to the NR-LM and NR-GM zones; however, it is necessary to allow taller walls for security reasons in all zones in order to accommodate PNM's substation wall height as directed in the Rank II Facility Plan: Electric System Transmission and Generation (2010 – 2020) where all electric substation walls are allowed to be 12 feet in height (see Standard #15 in the Facility Plan on page 6). The 12' wall height is required at electric substations and switching stations for safety and security purposes. The recommended revision includes inserting the following language at the end of the B. Maximum Height 1. at the top of page 251:</p>	Noted.	See Line 105.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
105	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17		<p>“1. In any zone district except the NR-LM and NR-GM zone districts, a wall located between the front or side façade of a primary building and a public street, park, Major Open Space, trail or arroyo may not be more <u>than</u> 36 inches tall. Walls in other locations on the lot may not be more than eight feet tall and may be opaque. <u>The Director, or their designee, may approve a taller wall if necessary for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site.</u>”</p>		<p>On page 250, Section 4-6.9B.1, revise the text to read "... Major Open Space, trail or arroyo may not be more <u>than</u> 36 inches tall. Walls in other locations on the lot may not be more than eight feet tall and may be opaque. <u>The Director, or their designee, may approve a taller wall if necessary for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site.</u>”</p>
106	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	314	<p>In Section 14-16-5-4.9 A. Referrals to Commenting Agencies on page 314, there is a concern that during the staff review of an application, if the review does not include those commenting agency subject matter experts currently reviewing applications, impacts will potentially be missed. In order to provide an efficient method for issues to be resolved early on in the review process, it is recommended that commenting agency review of the applicant’s submittal materials be added as a review step on the Pre-Application form which would formalize the process as part of the EPC review.</p>	<p>The standards provided on page 314, Section 5-4.9 provide for agency review during the review and approval time period. Requiring agency review prior to application submittal would add additional time to the development process that is currently accommodated <i>during</i> the application review period. The timeframe for providing comments, within 15 calendar days of the referral, is intended to identify potential issues early in the review process.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
107	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	351	In Section 14-16-5-5.2, H. Subdivision of Land-Minor, 1. Applicability, item a. iv. on page 351, it is recommended that the terms "pipes, wires" be deleted, as they are unnecessary and since the terms are not used anywhere else in the IDO. The sentence is clearer without the terms. Recommended revision: "iv. Does not require installation of any significant infrastructure, other than <del>pipes, wires, and other</del> connections between permitted structures on the lot and existing infrastructure <del>pipes, wires,</del> and other systems located on or in an adjacent street or parcel of land; and"		On page 351, Section 14-16-5-5.2H.1.a.iv, revise the text to read: "Does not require installation of any significant infrastructure, other than <del>pipes, wires, and other service</del> connections between permitted structures on the lot and existing infrastructure <del>pipes, wires,</del> and other systems located on or in an adjacent street or parcel of land; and"
108	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	404	In the Definitions section on page 404, the definition of the term "Infrastructure" includes the reference to "lines". It is recommended that the term "lines" is deleted or further clarified to identify which lines are being referenced.		On page 404, Infrastructure definition, revise the word "lines" to read " <u>electric facilities.</u> "
109	Culpepper, Elizabeth	PNM	1/17/17	119	PNM staging areas should be added to Table 3-2-1 on page 119 as a temporary use that is permissive in all zones.		On page 118, revise the use "Construction trailer or office" to include " <u>Construction staging area, trailer or office.</u> "
110	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		Questions on content: Just wondering if this could be clarified in the new IDO (if possible):	See lines 111 - 113.	See lines 111 - 119.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
111	Sommerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		<p>1. When calculating parking for restaurants, we combine indoor and outdoor seating - one space per four indoor/outdoor seats. However, I have received questions from developers stating that the code is unclear and we should only count indoor seats.</p> <p>i. The current code states "Restaurant, bar: one space for each four seats for establishments without a full service liquor license; otherwise one space per three persons of permitted fire occupancy load."</p> <p>ii. On p207 the parking table states: "1 space/ 4 seats with full service liquor license; otherwise 1 space per 3 persons of permitted fire occupancy";</p> <p>iii. On p160 under P. "Outdoor Dining Area" # 5. states "No additional parking is required."</p> <p>The current code and the new IDO are contradicting (above). Do we intend to count outdoor dining seats for parking?</p>	<p>Most cities do not require additional seating for those areas, for two reasons. First, the outdoor patrons are often not additional patrons – they are diners who choose to eat outside rather than inside on a given day. Second, many cities have a policy of encouraging outdoor dining areas to promote active streetfronts, and an additional on-site parking requirement could make it difficult/impossible to have such areas along streets where they are wanted.</p> <p>Guidance from decision-makers is requested to provide direction on this matter.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
112	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17	234	2. p234 (first line) C.7. states: "The use of gravel or crusher fines as ground cover is limited to a maximum of 50 percent of any outdoor space." Not sure what this means exactly... gravel is often used as mulch so it would be under plants – and could be more than 50 percent - is this ok?	This provision was taken from Sector Development Plan areas such as Uptown and East Gateway, which have even stronger limitations on the use of rock mulch. These limitations were adopted to encourage more living material as ground cover and to limit materials that contribute to the urban heat island effect. The regulations encourage organic mulch in the tree and plant wells, which help nourish the soil and moderate temperatures under the plants.	
113	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17	38	3. P38 f. Height Stepdowns. Can this description be separated into two sentences? Perhaps: "After [effective date of this IDO] new primary and accessory buildings constructed in the MX-FB-DT district with a height greater than thirty feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from any adjacent lot containing a single-family detached or two-family detached dwelling occupied by a Household Living use. The perceived building height shall be reduced by "stepping down" any portion of the building within 100 feet of the front, side, and rear lot line adjacent to the lot containing the single-family detached or two-family detached dwelling."		On page 38, Section 2-4.5C.2.f, revise the text to read: "After [effective date of this IDO] new primary and accessory buildings constructed in the MX-FB-DT district with a height greater than thirty feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from any adjacent lot containing a single-family detached or two-family detached dwelling occupied by a Household Living use. The perceived building height shall be reduced by "stepping down" any portion of the building within 100 feet of the front, side, and rear lot line adjacent to the lot containing the single-family detached or two-family detached dwelling."
114	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		General formatting comments/questions:	See lines 115 - 119.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
115	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		1. Avenue, Boulevard, Street, Lane etc. are spelled-out are abbreviated in some instances. Suggest searching and replacing all abbreviated street designations in document with long spelling (maps excluded).		Throughout the IDO, replace all referencenes to the street types with the abbreviated form of each.
116	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		2. In some instances "Central" is used without "Avenue". Suggest adding Avenue to Central in all cases.		Throughtout the IDO, replace all text that refers to Central Avenue as "Central" with "Central <u>Ave.</u> "
117	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		3. Throughout document there are double spaces between sentences and within sentences – probably due to editing. Suggest automatically search two spaces and replace with one space.		Throughtout the IDO, replace all sentence spacing with one space between sentences.
118	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17	34	4. P34 vii.b. What are "replacement continuations"? – sorry, I have not heard this before. Perhaps it should say "The replacements shall continue"		On page 34, Section 2-4.5C.2.c.vii.b, revise to read: "The <u>pedestrian connections</u> shall <u>be extensions of and</u> continue the existing street <u>grid</u> "
119	Somerfeldt, Cheryl	Planning - Current	1/19/17		List of 36 typos.		Throughout the IDO, fix clerical mistakes.
120	Dicome, Kym	Planning - Current	1/19/17		Good catch about the outdoor seating parking. After review with Code Enforcement in around August, we decided that the parking should remain 1 @ 4 seats as well as having the restaurant at the same ratio. The same would apply to taproom. Somehow this did not get passed on. I will rereview my notes with the latest version to see if there are any other changes.	See Line 111.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
121	Maddieson, Ian	GARTC	2/2/17		<p>At its January 2017 meeting GARTC took note of the intention to remove representation of the city's Parks and Recreation Department from the Development Review Board. We wish to express our firm conviction that this is an unwise move that will in the long term weaken one of the major factors that make Albuquerque a good place to live — its system of parks and open spaces and network of urban trails. Albuquerque compares very favorably with other cities in the provision of parks and recreational facilities. For example, the Trust for Public Land* calculates that over 80% of Albuquerque residents live within a 10-minute walking distance to a park. This system contributes to the fact that Albuquerque consistently scores well above national averages for the percentage of the population that is physically active** and of healthy weight***. In addition, there are economic benefits: proximity to parks and trails adds to the value of real estate, and outstanding facilities attract visitors and spur spending in the local community as well.</p>	<p>Noted. The value of parks and trails is discussed in the Comprehensive Plan and the Bikeways &amp; Trails Plan. There are related policies that acknowledge the importance of these facilities for quality of life and health in our community.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
122	Maddieson, Ian	GARTC	2/2/17		The Parks and Recreation Department owns or maintains large areas of land within the city. This means that new development is highly likely to impact one or more of their facilities. Ill-thought out plans carry the risk of impeding access to or destroying a view from a park or trail, or of foreclosing the opportunity to add an amenity for the community.	Agree. The new section about Site Design and Sensitive Lands, Section 4-2, provides standards for avoidance of sensitive areas, in particular, Section 4-2.8 about Properties Abutting Major Public Open Space (MPOS). In this section, single-loaded streets are required for all new subdivisions adjacent to MPOS lands. There are new standards related to pedestrian connectivity in subdivision design in Section 4-3, including requirements for pedestrian connections to adjacent parks, trails, MPOS and other civic uses (4-3.4C.1.a). New Edge Buffer Landscaping is required on property that abuts Areas of Consistency (all parks are designated as Areas of Consistency). All of these new standards were created to protect access to, views of, and enjoyment of parks, public lands, and other sensitive lands.	
123	Maddieson, Ian	GARTC	2/2/17		It is also common practice these days to require larger-scale developments to set aside space for parkland and trails. Clearly such facilities should be integrated with the city's overall plans for parks and trails, and created in such a way as to avoid burdening Parks and Recreation with unwanted responsibilities for maintenance and security.	This will continue to occur in the Planned Community zone. Since replacement of the Park Dedication Ordinance with Impact Fees, it is no longer possible for the City to require dedication of park land. It continues to be encouraged, particularly through the policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the new NR-PO-C zone, which was created for private parks.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
124	Maddieson, Ian	GARTC	2/2/17		We see maintaining a voice on the DRB for the Parks and Recreation Department as the only reasonable way to ensure that the city's future development maintains a focus on providing the recreational and aesthetic benefits that our parks and trails have provided in the past.	See Line 97.	
125	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		ABO RIDE staff has been involved in the effort to update the ABC Comprehensive Plan and draft the Integrated Development Ordinance. We are grateful for the productive coordination the project team has extended us throughout the ABC-Z process, and we are very pleased with the way that transit has been integrated into both documents as a key consideration for land use, transportation, and mobility.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
126	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		We wholeheartedly support the Integrated Development Ordinance but feel compelled to request the Commission's consideration of two changes to the document as currently drafted. Both concern our park-and-ride facilities. Specifically, we request:	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point. See Lines 127-135.	
127	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		A change to the definition of "Transit Facility" to include specific reference to park-and-ride uses; and,		See Line 134.
128	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		A change to the proposed NR-SU zone to make park-and-ride lots an "Accessory" use.		See Line 135.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
129	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Park-and-Ride lots already exist at our major transit centers. Changing the definition of "Transit Facility" to include park-and-ride uses would allow our operations to continue in their existing locations.	Noted.	
130	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Central and Unser Transit Center (CUTC): The CUTC is zoned SU-2 for IP Uses and is proposed to be converted to the NR-BP zone. The approved site plan allows for a temporary park-and-ride. In the IDO, per Table 3-2-1, "Temporary park-and-ride" is disallowed entirely, and park-and-ride lots are allowed only as a conditional use. However, a "Transit Facility" would be a Permissive Use.	Noted.	
131	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Northwest Transit Center (NWTC): The NWTC is governed by an SU-1 Town Center Plan and is also proposed to be re-zoned NR-BP. Again "park-and-ride" would be allowed as a conditional use only, but a "Transit Facility" would be Permissive.	Noted.	
132	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Uptown Transit Center: Now zoned SU-3 MU-Uptown, the UTC would now be zoned MX-H under the IDO. "Park-and-Ride" would no longer be a permitted use, but "Transit Facility" is allowed.	Noted.	
133	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		A fourth park-and-ride location, the Montano Transit Center, is proposed to be converted from M-1 to MX-M, where "Transit Facility" would be a permissive use.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
134	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Each of the proposed conversion zones allows "Transit Facility" as a Permissive Use. In order to clarify that park-and-ride is a permissive use at a transit center we request the definition of "Transit Facility" (page 424, EPC Draft) be changed as follows: "Transit Facility: Bus or rail stops, terminals, shelters, transfer points, depots, park-and-ride lots, and related facilities that are located on publicly or privately owned property."		On page 424, in Section 6-1, revise the definition for "Transit Facility" to read as follows: "Bus or rail stops, terminals, shelters, transfer points, depots, park-and-ride lots, and related facilities that are located on publicly or privately owned property."
135	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Park-and-Ride Lots as an Accessory Use in NR-SU A fifth park-and-ride location, called Spanish Bit, is co-located with the James Dwyer Memorial Police Substation, which like all other fire and police stations is to be zoned NR-SU or "Sensitive Use". No mention is made in the descriptor for this sub-station that the park-and-ride facility exists, and likewise, the IDO does not give any status to a park-and-ride in an NR-SU zone. We request the designation of "park-and-ride" as an accessory or "A" use under NR-SU on page 114. This small change would allow this use to continue on the site.		On page 114, Table 3-2-1, add an "A" for "Park and ride lots" in the NR-SU column.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
136	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		[The following is a separate letter sent about the proposed zoning conversion for the Daytona facility.] ABQ RIDE is generally in support of the Integrated Development Ordinance, and we do want to thank the ABC-Z project team for the effort given to integrating transit into both the Comprehensive Plan and IDO in support of the relationship between transportation and land use. However, we would request the Commission's consideration of a different zoning conversion for ABQ RIDE's operations facility on Daytona Road NW.	The project team is grateful for the collaboration with ABQ RIDE throughout the Comp Plan update and IDO drafting.	
137	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Today, our Daytona Maintenance Facility is zoned .SU-1 for Transit Facility and Day-care. In the IDO, it is presently proposed to be converted to NR-BP – Non-Residential Business Park. We assert that such a conversion does not capture the breadth of uses permitted today and suggest that our current zoning would more appropriately be converted to NR-LM, which is the first zone that permissively allows heavy vehicle repair.	Noted.	
138	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Our Daytona Facility combines a broad spectrum of uses that center equally on the maintenance of transit vehicles and on providing a base of operations for supervisors and Motor Coach Operators or MCOs.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
139	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		Daytona is the maintenance and storage facility for 85 40- and 60-foot foot buses and about 75 Sun-Van vehicles, as well as for the myriad smaller vehicles like tow trucks, system maintenance trucks, and supervisor vehicles necessary to the operation of the transit system. They are all stored outside. Daytona also has 22 vehicle maintenance bays in which all of these vehicles are maintained, along with the concomitant parts rooms, battery rooms, tool storage, and so forth.	Noted.	
140	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		We also have administrative space for our financial division, and break rooms, locker rooms, exercise equipment, and a media/training room for our MCOs. We also have approval on the site plan for a day-care facility.	Noted.	
141	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		We perform every sort of fueling - diesel, gasoline, compressed natural gas. And we will soon be adding the electrical equipment necessary to "fuel" the new 60-foot all-electric buses that will serve the ART project. We also wash buses, both mechanically and by hand, on the site.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
142	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		The attached analysis shows the effect the conversion to NR-BP would have on the permissive nature of the complex stack of land uses at Daytona. As you can see the primary use of the site - vehicle maintenance - becomes a conditional use, and the storage of those same vehicles becomes an accessory use. The site would also fall under a metric standard for pervious area, which cannot presently, if ever, be met as virtually the entire surface of the property is used for the storage and circulation of transit vehicles. Our stormwater is collected and cleaned through oil/water separators and discharged into the pond visible in the lower right corner of the aerial.	Noted.	
143	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		We had initially thought that conversion to NR-SU, as is proposed for the shuttle-bus maintenance facility at the Sunport, would be most appropriate. We have attached an aerial photograph of each set side by side, and notwithstanding the difference in scale of the operations, the similarities between the two sites are evident. The ABC-Z project team has convinced us the cases are not parallel, given that all operations at the airport should be governed by a single zone and site plan.	NR-SU includes airport facilities as a use that requires EPC approval. The facility and operations at Daytona could be administered through a base zone.	See Line 144.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
144	Rizzeri, Bruce / Kline, Lawrence	ABQ RIDE	3/16/17		In order to maintain the principle of least change under which the IDO conversions are to take place, we therefore request that our Daytona Facility be converted from "SU-1 for Transit Facility and Day-Care" to "NR-LM", which is the first zone where our most critical operation, heavy vehicle maintenance, is allowed permissively. Conversion to NR-LM is appropriate to the continued operation of this large, valuable, and unusual piece of critical City infrastructure.		In the next version of the Conversion Map, convert the "SU-1 for Transit Facility and Day-care" to NR-LM to match the heavy vehicle maintenance use currently allowed as a permissive use under the SU-1 zone.
145	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	3/17/17		Request Description: The City of Albuquerque is requesting adoption of an Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) to replace the Zoning Code, Subdivision Regulations, and Planning Ordinances. The IDO proposes 3 zoning categories: Residential, Mixed-use, and Non-residential. These each have five to six zones that range from low intensity to high intensity and maintain entitlements in matching existing zones.	This description of the IDO is accurate.	
146	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		1. Comment in relation to Chapter 14-16-2 Zone Districts The District requests additional time to study the relation between infill development and schools. Restrictive land use for school siting in non-residential zone districts decreases the opportunity for infill development for schools.	Schools were generally removed from the more intense Non-residential zones due to the potential incompatibility of schools and industrial activity in close proximity. APS is generally not bound by City zoning standards, so it is unclear how the IDO would reduce opportunities for APS schools.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
147	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		2. Comment in relation to Chapter 14-16-4 Development Standards The District requests additional intergovernmental coordination to address development standards impacting future school construction.	APS is generally not bound by City zoning standards. The project team is willing to meet to discuss development standards with all stakeholders.	
148	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		3. Comment in reference to Chapter 14-16- 4 - 1.3 Residential Zone Districts and 1. 4 Mixed-Use Districts The increase for the maximum densities and no maximum density requirements in Residential and Mixed-Use zoning categories (R-MH, MX-M, MX-H) may impact the APS District's ability to provide adequate facilities in established areas of the City. Application of this Zoning may result in a new residential development adjacent to an existing school having its students made to attend a school 2 miles away.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
149	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		<p>In the interim, should current school facilities become adversely impacted, the District will explore various alternatives to accommodate residential students. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools due from growth triggered by increased densities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundary Adjustments / Busing</li> <li>- Grade reconfiguration</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Improve facility efficiency (short term solution) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Schedule Changes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Double sessions</li> <li>ii. Multi-track year-round</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. Other <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Float teachers (flex schedule)</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Provide new capacity (long term solution) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construct new schools or additions</li> <li>- Add portables</li> <li>- Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms</li> <li>- Lease facilities</li> <li>- Use other public facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Combination of above strategies</li> </ol>	Noted.	
150	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
151	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		<p>4. Comment in reference to Chapter 14-16-2, section E Development and Form Standards</p> <p>To comprehensively plan for adequate public school facilities in planned communities, the APS District requests an added section to Chapter 14-16-2, section E Development and Form Standards to address adequate public school facilities within a Planned Community Zone, similar to what is required by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Authority. The Capital Master Plan department proposes the following language to be added to Chapter 14-16-2, Section E:</p> <p>- "An application for a Planned Community shall not be processed unless accompanied by written documentation from the Albuquerque Public Schools Capital Master Plan that adequate public school facilities will be available to serve the development, based on known educational facilities owned or controlled by Albuquerque Public Schools."</p>	<p>This request is a significant change to the existing relationship between APS and the City in terms of coordination on major development approvals. Direction will be needed from decision-makers to add the requested language to the IDO.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
152	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		<p>A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools due from growth triggered by future planned communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Boundary Adjustments / Busing</li> <li>b. Grade reconfiguration</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Improve facility efficiency (short term solution) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Schedule Changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Double sessions</li> <li>ii. Multi-track year-round</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Float teachers (flex schedule)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. Provide new capacity (long term solution) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construct new schools or additions</li> <li>2. Add portables</li> <li>3. Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms</li> <li>4. Lease facilities</li> <li>5. Use other public facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>iv. Combination of above strategies</li> </ul>	Noted.	
153	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
154	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		5. Comment in reference to Chapter 14-16-5-5, Section F-1 The APS District relies on the formalized notification process to stay informed on residential development throughout the City. The proposed increase of Administrative Approval by the Zoning Enforcement Officer for residential, multifamily residential, and mixed-use development site plans as stated in Chapter 14-16-5-5, Section F-1 is a point of concern due to the decreased notification requirement. Application of this policy would adversely impact the ability of APS to continue providing adequate educational facilities in a timely fashion.	Almost 50% of the development that came through the City's review and approval process between 2008 and 2014 went straight to building permit with no notification required. Approximately 16% of projects during that same timeframe came through the EPC. The IDO is not expected to change these ratios. Notification will still take place for DRB and EPC reviews. The City could work out a reporting system to alert APS to residential building permits on a regular basis to assist in school planning. This could be handled administratively and does not need to be in the IDO.	
155	Halpin, Elizabeth	APS	1/17/17 (minor revisions 3/17/17)		The District requests clarification and inclusion on Electric Mail Notices as called out in Table 5-1-1: Summary of Development Review Procedures.	APS will continue to be on the agency distribution list for EPC and DRB cases. See also Line 154.	
156	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Integrated Development Ordinance – EPC Draft dated 12/2016. I submitted the comments by the deadline to staff planners Carol Toffaleti and Carrie Barkhurst but they requested I send them also to you.	We appreciate the collaboration with MRGCD and thank you for submitting comments.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
157	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		I met with the North and South Valley Acequia Associations to review the language in IDO Chapter 14-16-4, Chapter 4-2.6 Acequia Development Standards, and they supported the language with the following exception: We had the following revision to Section B. as we felt it is potentially unenforceable. Additionally, we felt there could likely be confusion between community ditches, which are managed by the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD) or acequia associations but are also privately owned, and other small feeder ditches on private property. In other words, since community ditches are technically privately owned, someone could make the legal argument that these standards are optional or only "encouraged." We also collectively agreed that standards for ditches that aren't managed by the MRGCD or Acequia Associations (where we have ownership, prescriptive or other easements) would be difficult to enforce.	Noted.	
158	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		So we propose the following edited language for Section B. "These standards apply to all MRGCD owned or maintained irrigation facilities and community acequia associations. Private landowners are also encouraged to follow these standards for privately-owned ditches, in order to best preserve the system."	The language about encouraging private landowners to follow the standards does not seem appropriate in the City's Zoning Ordinance, which does not include policy or recommendations but only requirements. This language might be appropriate to add on a City website or MRGCD website for private landowners.	On page 178, Section 4-2.6.B., revise the text to read: "These standards apply to all MRGCD owned or maintained irrigation facilities and community acequia associations."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
159	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		In Chapter 4-2.6 Section C. there is an exception from the Los Duranes Sector Plan, which proposes "15 foot setbacks from the centerline of any ditch, lateral or drain designated on the Los Duranes Community Acequia System Map." I went to the field with our Irrigation Systems Operator (i.e. ditchrider) for the Duranes area as well as his supervisor. We took sample measurements on various ditches in the Duranes neighborhood to see if the 15 foot setback would be adequate to meet the MRGCD's needs for irrigation water management and maintenance. We found in many cases that this setback still allows structures to be located quite close to the already very constricted maintenance access.	Noted.	
160	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		Most importantly, the standards exclude walls and fences, allowing landowners to potentially locate a fence or wall anywhere on the ditch or drain. In fact there are several ditches in Duranes that have fences located right at the top bank of the interior slope and fences across ditches that prevent our staff from accessing to manage water or maintain that ditch, including in emergencies. Our Board member, Adrian Oglesby, requested a meeting with the Duranes Neighborhood Association on a few occasions to discuss these standards but received no response.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
161	Najmi, Yasmeen	MRGCD	3/21/17		Our concerns with the Duranes Sector Plan standards are 1) the 15-foot setback is inadequate for some ditches and/or locations in Duranes and 2) the setbacks don't include walls or fences, which are the primary barriers to the MRGCD's access. With the current standards, it's very likely that more ditches will become inaccessible for proper maintenance and water management, including emergency access for ditch breaks, flooding etc.	Noted. The project team appreciates that the MRGCD has reached out to the Los Duranes Neighborhood Association and hopes that coordination can take place while the IDO is in the review/approval process. At this time, the City is generally carrying over the provisions from the adopted Sector Development Plans. Staff will recommend any changes worked out with the Neighborhood Association to decision-makers. In the meantime, direction would be needed from decision-makers to adjust these adopted standards in the IDO.	
<b>Below are written agency comments received after the 21 March 2017 comment deadline and before the 4 April 2017 comment deadline - the EPC 48-Hour Rule deadline.</b>							
162	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		As a key utility stakeholder, PNM appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the City of Albuquerque Draft Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO).	Noted.	
163	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		PNM has participated in many IDO workshops and meetings since its inception and has provided input and comments throughout the process. PNM would like to recognize the hard work of City of Albuquerque's Planning Department staff on this significant task. City staff members have been responsive in listening to PNM's comments and most concerns have been adequately	Noted. Staff appreciates the ongoing input from other agencies.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
164	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		The following important electric utility infrastructure components that are related to the final 2017 Comprehensive Plan and thus relate to the IDO include:	See Lines 165-168.	
165	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		Recognizing electric utility facilities as essential public infrastructure in the City and County;	Noted.	
166	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		Protecting and safeguarding critical energy utility facilities;	Noted.	
167	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		Addressing the importance of how infill and redevelopment in Centers and Corridors will need to be efficiently served in the future by expanded electric utility infrastructure; and finally,	Noted.	
168	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		Acknowledging the link between robust electric utility infrastructure and the ability to serve growth and economic development.	Noted.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
169	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		<p>While the IDO Zoning Conversion Map was being developed, PNM requested equivalent zoning on two electric facility parcels; however, the existing IP zoning or equivalent for these two parcels was not carried forward into the current draft map. The two referenced electric facility parcels are Reeves Generating Station and Sandia Switching Station, both currently zoned "Industrial Park: IP" (Enclosure). The City's proposed zoning for both is "Non-Residential Business Park: NR-BP." The current IP zoning allows for industrial uses in an industrial environment which is defined as follows: "This zone provides suitable sites for a wide range of industrial and commercial uses, provided such uses are conducted in a compatible and harmonious manner within industrial environments achieved through a Development Plan." Permissive uses include..."(19) Public utility use or structure and fire stations, provided their location is in accord with an adopted facility plan and a site development plan for building permit purposes has been approved by the Planning Commission."</p>	<p>The proposed straight conversion of zones between the current zoning code and the IDO is for all lands designated as IP or that reference IP in a site development plan or Sector Development Plan to be converted to NR-BP. This zone most closely matches the current permissive uses in the IDO system of zones.</p> <p>The City recognizes the importance of maintaining current entitlements used for energy generation. This comment was addressed in the EPC Draft by making the use "Utility, electric" a permissive use in all zones, as regulated by the Facility Plan for Electric System Transmission and Generation. Staff believes that this global change will allow all PNM facilities to continue to operate and expand as Permissive Uses in all zones, as controlled by the Facility Plan.</p> <p>ABC-Z project is not intending to match existing land uses to IDO zones but rather a straight conversion from one set of permissive uses per existing zoning to the closest matching IDO zone. This property can be considered in a future action to make discretionary zone changes.</p>	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
170	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		The definition of the zoning district “Non-Residential–Business Park: NR-BP” is as follows: “The purpose of the NR-BP district is to accommodate a wide range of non-residential uses in close proximity while buffering potential impacts of each use from surrounding uses and adjacent areas. A wide variety of commercial, research, light assembly, development, office, distribution, showroom, processing, and institutional uses are permitted...”	See Line 169.	
171	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		PNM is requesting the EPC to designate Reeves Generating Station parcel and Sandia Switching Station parcel with the “Non-Residential General Manufacturing: NR-GM” zoning. The definition of the NR-GM zoning district is as follows: “The purpose of the NR-GM zone district is to accommodate a wide variety of industrial, manufacturing, and heavy commercial uses, particularly those with noise, glare, or heavy traffic impacts, in areas separated from residential neighborhoods and lighter impact businesses and mixed-use areas.”	See Line 169.	
172	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/4/17		In closing, PNM is requesting zoning from the new zoning districts for these two electric facility parcels from NR-BP to NR-GM.	See Line 169.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
173	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		<p>1-9.3 (pg. 4) In addition to prohibiting restrictions on solar collectors, the Subdivision Ordinance [§14-14-4-7(B)] requires a note to be placed on plats regarding future restrictions; this existing section 7(B), as well as the caveat of section 7(C) needs be retained in the IDO. Staff response was to not make this change because: "The IDO is intended to include provisions that need review by...- the City Council – to change." However, the referenced provisions were specific in the adoption of the "Solar Collector" ordinance adopted by the Council, with the intent to make the 'Solar Note' an ordinance requirement <i>not</i> an administrative action.</p>	<p>See line 1. Staff believes that the IDO does not need to duplicate the content from another ordinance. A cross reference to the requirements of the Solar Collector Ordinance can be added. One of the goals of the IDO is to remove duplication of standards and requirements from the City Code. This is to prevent future inconsistencies if one part of the Code is amended without changing the portions that repeat the same or similar content. The DRB should cite the Solar Collector Ordinance when requiring notes to be placed on plats regarding future restrictions.</p>	<p>Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.</p>

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
174	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		<p>4-4.12 (pg. 199) Easements are 'granted,' only right of way is 'dedicated' – insert the words "or granted" after all references to "dedicated." Staff response appears to have reversed the use of the term 'dedicated.' By using the form of the proposed change, 4-4.12.B should be revised as follows: "Easements or rights-of-way <u>designated</u> for public infrastructure shall be granted or dedicated, respectively,..." while 4-4.12.B.1. should be revised as follows: "All easements or rights-of-way granted or <u>dedicated</u> , respectively,..." and 4-4.12.B.3 is appropriate as written in the EPC Draft – December 2016.</p>		<p>On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B, revise as follows: "Easements or rights-of-way designated for public infrastructure shall be granted or dedicated, respectively, ..." On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B.1, revise as follows: "All easements or rights-of way granted or dedicated, respectively, ..." On page 199, Section 4-4.12.B.3, no changes needed from the EPC Draft.</p>
175	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		<p>Table 5-1-1 (pg 299) Footnote 1119 - Subdivision of Land – Major Application Type should read: "Preliminary Plat (Including Variance and/or <u>Subdivision</u> Improvement Agreement <u>Extension</u> ), plus it is at this level the Neighborhood notification is required. Staff response addressed the first part of this comment, but did not include</p>	Table 5-1-1, Summary of Development Review Procedures already require all types of notice, which would address the comment about Neighborhood Notification in the IDO operations.	On page 299, revise footnote 1119 for "Subdivision of Land - Major" to read: "Currently, Preliminary Plat approvals (Including Variance and/or Subdivision Improvement Agreement/Extension), require neighborhood notification."

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
176	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		<p>5-5.2.H.2.a.i. (pg 352) Footnote 1323 This item does not carry forward the intent of § 14-14-4-1(B), but instead has conflated it with the variances related to lot sizes which are the jurisdiction of the ZHE. The Subdivision Ordinance is specific to <u>subdivision design standards</u>, which includes dimensions for easements, rights of way and alignments along with quantities/dimensions of infrastructure. A new Item 2.a.ii should be inserted after Item 2.a.i to read as follows: "A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards." Staff response addressed the new language, but has retained criteria from the existing Bulk Land Variance; previous discussions had indicated that a Bulk Land Waiver should not be a 'variance,' therefore Items 2.a.ii, 2.a.iii and 3.c.should be deleted from the EPC Draft – December 2016.</p>		<p>On pge 352, revise footnote 1323 as follows: "... The Subdivision Ordinance is specific to subdivision design standards, which include dimensions..." On page 352, delete Sections 2.a.ii, 2.a.iii and 3.c to remove a Bulk Land Waiver from the variance section. On page 352, a new Item 2.a.ii should be inserted after Item 2.a.i to read as follows: "A request must demonstrate that varying from the normal requirements will encourage flexibility, economy, effective use of open space, or ingenuity in design of a subdivision, in accordance with accepted principles of site planning, or that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulty may result from strict compliance with the minimum standards."</p>

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
177	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		6-1 (pg 398 - Footnote 1498) Easements are not allowed by the City within public right-of-way. Staff response was for more research, specifically regarding utilities in City right of Way; currently these situations are handled through Franchise Agreements.	More information is needed about what specifically should be revised in the IDO to respond to this comment.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
178	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		(pg 405/407 - Footnote 1544) Lot definitions 2. and 3. should include the references to the appropriate ordinances from the existing Zoning Code definitions. Staff response was for more information; the reference was to what a legal "Lot" is when created by plat or metes and bounds prior to adoption of specific City or County ordinances.		On pages 406 and 407, revise the definitions for Lot, subsections 2 and 3, to more closely reflect the definitions from the appropriate ordinances from the existing Zoning Code Definitions.
179	Cloud, Jack	DRB Chair	4/4/17		(pg 423 - Footnote 1626) Street, Stub definition is incorrect – see DPM Chapter 23.5.D.5. Staff response was for modification to the current terminology; however the footnote incorrectly identifies this modified definition as "existing."		On page 423, revise Footnote 1626 to read: "This is a new definition for stub streets, which is different from how they are currently defined by the City of Albuquerque. The definition is consistent with the regulations and intent to regulate streets that temporarily dead-end, until abutting development occurs to continue the road through. Footnote revised since EPC draft."
<b>Below are comments taken from verbal testimony from Agency representatives at the 6 April 2017 Hearing.</b>							
180	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17		Commend the team on an impressive job.	Noted. Staff appreciates engagement from the public and other agencies in this process.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
181	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17		Two PNM facilities (Reeves and Sandia) are zoned IP and being converted to NR-BP. Requesting change to NR-GM as most appropriate conversion for the existing zone.	See Line 169.	
182	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	115	Table 3-2-1: Accessory use for solar/geothermal should be clarified as referring to private energy generation, not utility-scale generation. If it is a primary use, it should go under Electric Utility and be a primary use.	Agree. The IDO should be revised to make clear that utility-scale solar/geothermal generation is to be considered under the Utility, Electric use. This could be handled through the definitions or the Use-Specific Standards	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
183	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	141	In the Use Specific Standard for Solar or Geothermal Energy Generation or Device, recommend that lines 2-4, which apply to primary use of the property, be removed and placed under 3-3.5.G Utility, Electric (also on page 141).	It was staff's understanding that PNM did not want these restrictions to apply to the use "Utility, electric." These standards could be added to Utility, electric if there is no conflict with the standards in the Facility Plan for Electric Transmission and Generation. They need to be retained in this section to cover other private solar or geothermal business operations that are not covered by the Facility Plan.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
184	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	146	Section 3-3.6.I.2.I.iv - the term "electric transmission line structure" should be replaced with the term "public utility structure" to be consistent with the definition on page 416.		See Line 103.

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
185	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	250	Electric Facility Plan requires 12' walls. In the Fences and Walls section, there is a provision that higher walls than normally allowed can be approved by the Planning Director in NR-LM and NR-GM. This should apply in other zones as well.		Staff is working on a Condition related to revising the wall section 4-6.9, including moving the provision that the PD can approve higher walls to the wall permit section, so it will apply to all walls in all districts.
186	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	351	Delete the term "pipes and wires" - not used elsewhere in IDO and not defined.		See Line 107.
187	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	404	In the definition for "Infrastructure," clarify what "lines" are being referenced.		See line 108.
188	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/17	119,	Description of Temporary Use for staging areas should be clarified to remove the reference for an allowed amount of time - may last longer than 45 days.	Temporary staging areas for construction has been combined with the use "Construction Trailer or Office" and those Use-Specific Standards will apply. There are time limits identified, but each is tied to receiving a certificate of occupancy or project dormancy for over 6 months.	See line 109.
189	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		Thank staff - great job reaching out to our department and addressing most of our comments.	Noted. Staff appreciates engagement from the public and other departments in this process.	
190	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		Support the following changes in the IDO:	See Lines 191-196.	
191	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		Separate category "NR-PO" for public parks, MPOS, private parks, and Bio Park. Allows us to protect park property, improves transparency.	Noted.	
192	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		We want to be good neighbors. Projects that will have lighting over 35 ft., amplified sound, etc. will continue to go through EPC by our discretion.	Noted. See Section XX, which allows any project to go through EPC at the discretion of the owner.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
193	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		"Private Parks" zone was created at our request, which allows us to have requirements for private parks to ensure that they are either fenced off and/or are built to City standards. This helps Parks & Rec if we have to take over the property in the future and protects the City from liability.	Noted. Staff appreciates engagement from the public and other departments in this process.	
194	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		Open Space - appreciate expanded buffers and viewsheds for MPOS, as well as inclusion of other requested changes, including single-loaded streets abutting MPOS	Noted.	
195	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		We follow Rank II Plans (e.g. Bikeways & Trails and Arroyos) in addition to zoning. Those plans are staying in place with the IDO.	Noted.	
196	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Rec	4/6/17		Staff has been sharing DPM revisions that impact our department with the City Parks & Recreation department so that we can review them and ensure compatibility.	Noted.	
<b>Below are comments taken from verbal testimony from Agency representatives at the 10 April 2017 Hearing.</b>							
197	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/10/17		I have submitted a letter with my comments from the April 6 hearing, and I have two more to add. [See attachments to Supplemental Staff Report for supporting documents for public testimony.]	Noted. See Lines 180-188 for April 6 comments. See Lines 198-99 for new comments.	

Agency Comments - EPC IDO Submittal Draft  
Hearing #3 April 24, 2017

No.	Name	Agency/ Org	Date	Pg #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change	Change
198	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/10/17	199	On page 199, 4-4.12, Easements or Rights-of-Way, in section A. and in section D., suggest changing the term "infrastructure" to "facilities" as follows: A. The Development Review Board may require rights-of-way or easements for public <i>infrastructure</i> or private <i>infrastructure facilities</i> . D. Easements may be jointly used for private <i>infrastructure facilities</i> with approval from the Development Review Board as specified in the Development Process Manual and in Section 5-5.2H (Subdivision of Land - Minor) or Section 14-16-5-5.2.1 (Subdivision of Land- Major)	Clarion is reviewing the proposed language.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
199	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/10/17	415	On page 415, in the definition of Private Way, it is recommended to change the term "infrastructure" to "facilities" or "use" as follows: Private Way A lot or easement that is not public right-of-way and that contains a street or alley providing access between public right-of-way and one or more lots. The term may include easements for public and private <i>infrastructure facilities</i> when such are established through a suitable legal document, along with the access rights.	Clarion is reviewing the proposed language.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
<b>Below are written comments received after the 4 April 2017 @ 1 p.m. EPC 48-Hour Rule comment deadline and before the 12 April 2017 @ 5 p.m. deadline for comments to be addressed in the Supplemental Staff Report for the 24 April 2017 hearing.</b>							







