INTER-OFFICE MEMO

**§ 14-16-3-23 ZONING OF HOT AIR BALLOONS.**

DATE: September 17, 2021

TO: Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair

Maggie Gould, Planning Manager

FROM: Catalina Lehner, AICP- Senior Planner

RE: Project #2021-005684/SI-2021-000975

Mesa del Sol Level B Plan Amendments

On August 19, 2021, the EPC voted to approve various amendments to the Mesa del Sol Level B Community Master Plan to facilitate future expansion of the existing ABQ Studios site. On August 30th, 2021, Staff met with the agent to discuss the conditions.

Staff reviewed an updated version (v.2) of the amendments, which consists of Table 1 (green header)- Amendments to the Level B Plan and Table 2 (blue header)- Amendments to the Level B Technical Appendices.

Staff finds that the following EPC conditions are not met in the revised submittal, as explained below:

***EPC Conditions***

1. Condition 6A- the reference in the text box should be to p. 42 of the Level B Plan, not to p. 32.
2. Condition 6B- the maps continue to look different. The grid of orange roadways needs to be shown on the map on the right.
3. Condition 7A- the language was not updated. The maps show no change to Crick Crossing that I can see. Eastman Crossing should continue to be labeled because it is not entirely gone.
4. Condition 7C- the existing exhibit (box in the middle) remains blank.
5. Condition 8B- the narrative explanation was added to the cross-section itself rather than the technical appendices, which is acceptable but it should be in both places.
6. Condition 9- (please see below). Also, I suggest re-phrasing the statement: “The purpose of this TIS was not to conduct an update to the Mesa del Sol Level B Master Plan TIS”. Regardless, this TIS does affect and update a significant portion of the Level B Plan area and therefore affects the larger Level B Plan area.
7. Condition 10B- the landscaping buffer on the right-hand side of the cross-section is still shown as 8 feet (not 10 feet).

***Other – TIS Language Summary (Condition 9)***

I reviewed key portions of the TIS and could not find adequate support for the conclusion that the amendments would result in less traffic (AM Peak -739 trips and PM Peak -202 trips) and congestion than the land uses originally listed in the Level B Plan.

\*How do the original land use totals compare to the updated land use totals?

\*How was the decrease of 575,000 sf of development calculated?

Though I defer to Transportation Engineering Staff for traffic specifics, answers to these overarching land use issues were not well explained and they are the basis for the study.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (505) 924-3935 or e-mail me at clehner@cabq.gov. Thank you.