

IV. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & INPUT

Public involvement consisted of two rounds and was modeled on public input from the 1993 effort. Round 1 used unpaid focus groups in Summer 2001 from seven sub-areas of the County where public meetings occurred for the original master plan in 1993. Round 2 meetings occurred in the Fall of 2002 at the same locations as Round 1 meetings.

Dr. Craig Kelsey, UNM Professor of Recreation and Education, led the 1993 effort and was asked to assist with the 2002 efforts. Continuity in process and the ability to measure results across time were additional benefits to using this particular evaluation method again.



P.O.S.T. Public Meeting

Citizens were invited to both rounds by direct letter to participate through contacting registered neighborhood associations, organizations with BCPR field use agreements, active community center participants, County web page notice, newspaper articles, and flyers sent home with summer program participants. The purposes of the focus groups were to elicit qualitative discussion about providing facilities relative to issues and concerns of BCPR, compare results longitudinally from 1993 – 2001 and between different sub-areas of Bernalillo County, and identify general relative preferences by the public.

A set of 15 issues were presented to participants for prioritization in Round 1. These issues, along with other influences explained in Chapter V, were used to develop a draft work program that was presented to the public in Round 2. Public comment and subsequent review by an agency and technical team form the basis for proposed projects in Chapter V.

A. Round 1 Summary - Public Focus Groups

1. Introduction to Round 1

As part of the BCPR's effort to prepare the P.O.S.T. Master Plan, the public was invited to participate through a two-round program of focus groups, issue prioritization and public comment. Round 1 of the public participation process consisted of seven (7) meetings held throughout the unincorporated County. Citizens present at those focus groups discussed, debated and then prioritized pre-determined key issues that are relevant to the future of the County serving the P.O.S.T. interests of the citizens.

a) Pre-determined Key Issues

The professional staff of the Parks and Recreation Department reviewed pre-existing documents, discussed current unsolicited public comments and assessed relevant professional literature to determine those key issues that are important to the County and the citizens. Well-informed citizens gave perspective on these key issues. The key issues fell into three broad categories: issue prioritization, issue valuing, and open issue generation and comment. The issue prioritization component consisted of the twelve (12) items listed on the following page:

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES FOR PRIORITIZATION	
♦	The County should continue to add to the local trail network to link areas for bicycles, pedestrians, equestrians and other users.
♦	The County needs to put more resources toward maintaining existing parks and recreation facilities.
♦	The County should acquire land for and develop more neighborhood parks within walking distances of neighborhoods.
♦	The County should concentrate future funding on improving existing park features such as playgrounds, shade structures, picnic tables, etc.
♦	The County needs to develop more multipurpose fields for soccer, football and baseball/softball for organized youth and/or adult leagues.
♦	The County should develop in future parks, or when renovating existing parks, "hardscape" surface areas dedicated to activities like hockey, rollerblades, scooters and skateboards.
♦	The County should continue to ask users of organized adult and youth sport leagues to pay fees that help defray the costs of maintenance and administration.
♦	The County should develop more programs and/or facilities for senior citizens (senior centers).
♦	The County should provide recreation programs and/or facilities for individuals with physical and mental disabilities.
♦	To conserve and protect resources, the County should acquire Open Space and limit public access and use so that the historical and archeological sites remain unharmed.
♦	The County should continue to develop and maintain landscaped medians.
♦	It is important for the County to provide facilities for organized adult leagues that are sized and designed for adults only, and not for youth use.

The issue-valuing component consisted of the five (5) issues as follows:

ISSUE VALUING	
1	Neighborhood park design features
2	Funding of operation and maintenance
3	Development prioritization
4	Indoor swimming pools
5	Open Space uses

The third component consisted of encouraging citizens to identify and elaborate on open-ended issues that were important to them as citizens and as residents of their respective area of the County. These issues may or may not have been covered in the pre-determined focus group issues.

b) Focus Groups

In Round 1 seven (7) focus groups were held throughout the unincorporated County. The intent was to identify and invite those citizens that were well informed and committed so that rich conversation would occur. Each of the seven focus groups varied in attendance, but all were hallmarked by thoughtful citizen involvement.

The following were the dates, places and times of the seven (7) focus groups:

DATE	LOCATION (Park Service Area)	TIME
June 5, 2001	Vista Grande Community Center (East Mountain)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 7, 2001	Los Padillas Community Center (South)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 13, 2001	Paradise Hills Community Center (Northwest)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 14, 2001	Raymond G. Sanchez Community Center (Northwest)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 21, 2001	West Side Community Center (South)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 25, 2001	William Sibrava Substation (Northeast)	7:00 - 9:00 pm
June 27, 2001	Los Vecinos Community Center (East Mountain)	7:00 - 9:00 pm

2. Round 1 Findings

The results of Round 1 yielded important County-wide as well as geographic-specific information. The citizens were asked to review, discuss, debate and eventually prioritize the twelve (12) previously identified pre-determined issues into order from the most important to the least important as the issue impacted that specific geographic area. However, by summing (from a 1–12 point scale) the results from the seven (7) focus groups, a County-wide prioritization emerges:

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – COUNTY-WIDE		
Priority	Issue	Rating
1	Local trail network	2.42
2	Resources for maintenance	3.85
3	Neighborhood parks	4.00
4	Improve existing park features	4.85
5	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5.14
6	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5.14
7	Continue user fees for sport leagues	6.00
8	Programs for Senior Citizens	7.28
9	Programs for those with disabilities	8.14
10	Limit access to Open Space areas	9.28
11	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	9.28
12	Provide adult only sport fields	11.14

Citizens were also asked to discuss and respond to five (5) additional issues to determine what value, if any, these items had to them as individuals and as representatives of their respective geographic area. These items were:

ISSUE VALUES	
♦	Neighborhood parks should be developed to provide for multipurpose sport playing fields for youth and adult league practice and play.
♦	Recognizing operations and maintenance needs of all parks and recreation facilities, the County should fund this by what method?
♦	What are the three most important development priorities (Mesa Del Sol or specialized facilities or traditional neighborhood parks)?
♦	How important is it to have an indoor pool in your area?
♦	Of five options, what is the best use of County-purchased Open Space?

This process involved individual response after group discussion and yielded helpful trend patterns. By following the “trend pattern”, a County-wide statement emerges:

ISSUE VALUE	COUNTY-WIDE PATTERN
Sports fields developed within neighborhood parks	YES
Funding options most preferred to support County parks and recreation	County’s general fund
The most important future development from a list of three:	Typical, traditional neighborhood parks
Importance of an indoor swimming pool in your area	Very to somewhat important
Most preferred use of County Open Space	Internal multi-use trails

3. Geographic Specific Findings

Geographic-specific responses that reflect the discussion and priority ranking of those residents speaking on behalf of that geographic area of the County were obtained. When more than one issue generated significant discussion and no clear preference emerged, those issues were given the same priority value. The following are the focus group issue rankings by geographic area:

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – VISTA GRANDE AREA		
Area Priority	Issue	County-Wide Priority
1	Local trail network	1
2	Neighborhood parks	3
3	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
4	Programs for senior citizens	8
5	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
6	Develop more multipurpose sports fields	5
7	Limit access to Open Space	10
8	Improve existing park features	4
9	Resources for maintenance	2
10	Programs for those with disabilities	9
11	Provide sports fields for adults only	12
12	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11

Citizens participating in this focus group indicated that programs for senior citizens and programs for those with disabilities should be emphasized, but not as stand-alone facilities. To the extent that programs are developed, they should be integrated into existing facilities. Also discussed was the general value of County-owned Open Space, but limiting access was not viewed as meeting resident needs.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – LOS VECINOS AREA		
Area Priority	Issue	County-Wide Priority
1	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5
2	Resources for maintenance	2
3	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
4	Improve existing park features	4
5	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
6	Local trail network	1
7	Neighborhood parks	3
8	Programs for senior citizens	8
8	Programs for those with disabilities	9
10	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11
11	Limit access to Open Space	10
12	Provide sport fields for adults only	12

Programs for seniors and the disabled were thought more worthwhile than facilities for these citizens, though seniors in the East Mountains are “hearty” and less likely to need or want such services. Open Space is an important County effort but not if access is limited. Trail demand is lower because of National Forest. Playing fields concentrated in one or two areas is desirable. Maintenance money should be requested as part of capital expenditures. Like the South Valley, land development patterns make typical neighborhood park development not as important, especially in terms of walking distance.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – NORTH ALBUQUERQUE ACRES/SANDIA HEIGHTS AREA		
Area Priority	Issue	County- Wide Priority
1	Neighborhood parks	3
2	Local trail network	1
3	Improve existing park features	4
4	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
5	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11
6	Resources for maintenance	2
7	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
8	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5
9	Limit access to Open Space	10
10	Programs for senior citizens	8
10	Programs for those with disabilities	9
12	Provide sport fields for adults only	12

These residents supported the concept of landscaped medians only if xeriscape design principles and associated plant materials are utilized. The trail network is a high priority, but difficult because of area platting, land development patterns, and perceived issue of parking at trail heads and undesirable activities.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – PARADISE HILLS AREA		
Area Priority	Issue	County- Wide Priority
1	Neighborhood parks	3
2	Local trail network	1
2	Develop more multipurpose sports fields	5
4	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
5	Resources for maintenance	2
6	Improve existing park features	4
6	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
8	Programs for senior citizens	8
8	Programs for those with disabilities	9
10	Provide sport fields for adults only	12
11	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11
12	Limit access to Open Space	10

Citizens emphasized that access and use of sports fields should be for multipurpose and multiage use. Development of Ventana Ranch subdivision has overwhelmed Paradise Hills recreational facilities. Maintenance is viewed as high quality. Trail links are important. User fees are reasonable to request.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – ALAMEDA AREA		
Area Priority	Issue	County-Wide Priority
1	Resources for maintenance	2
1	Improve existing park features	4
3	Local trail network	1
3	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11
5	Neighborhood parks	3
6	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5
6	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
8	Programs for senior citizens	8
8	Programs for those with disabilities	9
10	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
11	Provide sport fields for adults only	12
12	Limit access to Open Space	10

The concept of maintaining and improving park and recreation resources is seen as key by North Valley participants and the area of trails and medians is seen as inclusive of this concept. Programs for seniors and the disabled are highlighted over the provision of facilities. Within the concept of Open Space, the limiting of access is not valued while the concept of Open Space is important. These participants believe that land should not be called Open Space if it is not accessible. Linking what exists is important.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – WEST SIDE AREA (NEAR SOUTH VALLEY)		
Area Priority	Issue	County- Wide Priority
1	Resources for maintenance	2
2	Local trail network	1
2	Neighborhood parks	3
2	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
5	Limit access to Open Space	10
6	Programs for senior citizens	8
6	Programs for those with disabilities	9
8	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5
9	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
10	Improve existing park features	4
11	Provide sport fields for adults only	12
12	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	11

This group of citizens suggested that “hardscape” areas, where appropriate, should be part of new neighborhood parks especially since few sidewalks exist. Additionally, the residents did not support separate facilities for seniors and the disabled but recommended program integration into existing County sites. Programming is the key for integration. Maintenance of facilities was viewed as deficient – beautification is needed and a trip to the park should be viewed as a “treat” because of larger yards at most South Valley homes.

FOCUS GROUP ISSUES – LOS PADILLAS AREA (FAR SOUTH VALLEY)		
Area Priority	Issue	County- Wide Priority
1	Local trail network	1
2	Improving existing park features	4
3	Resources for maintenance	2
4	Limit access to Open Space	10
5	Develop more multipurpose sport fields	5
5	Develop “hardscape” surface areas	5
7	Programs for senior citizens	8
7	Programs for those with disabilities	9
9	Continue user fees for sport leagues	7
10	Neighborhood parks	3
11	Provide sport fields for adults only	11
12	Develop and maintain landscaped medians	12

This group of citizens felt that within the context of improving existing park features, trails should be included as a given. Trails mostly consist of maintenance roads of MRGCD facilities. Regarding services for seniors and the disabled, programming was encouraged, but not separate facilities. Maintenance of existing facilities was viewed as important. Typical neighborhood park development is a lower priority because of rural and irregular land development patterns of the South Valley.

4. Longitudinal Findings

In 1995, the County Parks and Recreation Department prepared the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for 1995-2001. During that process, similar focus groups were conducted in similar geographic locations. A different set of issues was developed for those meetings but several issues were held over to this public input process to assess what longitudinal implications, if any, exist. The issues that were essentially similar to both public input groups were:

1995		2001
RANKING	ISSUE	RANKING
1	The County needs to develop more multipurpose fields for soccer, baseball/softball, football, etc.	5
2	The County needs to develop more trails for walking, biking, horses, etc.	1
8	The County needs to develop programs/facilities for senior citizens	8
11	The County needs to develop programs for those with physical and mental disabilities	9
14	The County needs to improve maintenance at existing facilities	2
16	The County needs to develop more neighborhood parks within walking distance for neighborhood use	3

Though a different set of issues existed at the 1995 focus groups than at the 2001 focus groups, (this could have impacted the issue ratings), some comparisons can still be made. The issue of trails was and is still a critical felt need. The issue of multipurpose fields is still a higher priority though the felt need is reduced some. The issues of programs for seniors and those with disabilities have remained about the same, as a middle to low priority over time. The two most significant shifts are a significant increase in the importance of:

- ♦ neighborhood parks, and
- ♦ maintenance of existing facilities

Issues in which a similar concept was addressed but with significant wording differences were:

1995		2001	
RANKING	ISSUE	ISSUE	RANKING
17	The County needs to develop more passive recreation areas for outdoor game tables, walking trails, shelter, etc.	The County should concentrate future funding on improving existing park features such as playground, shade structure, picnic tables, etc.	4
3	The County needs to acquire land for Open Space	To conserve and protect resources, the County should acquire Open Space and limit public access and use.	10

There was a significant shift in priority over time on these two issues. The wording in the park feature issue is different but the need to provide park features has increased as a priority. The wording of the Open Space issue is very different and shifted the issue from acquiring Open Space to limiting access. Anecdotal

comments in the 2001 focus groups support the Open Space concept, however, limiting access is not felt as in the best interest of the citizens.

It appears that from 1995 to 2001, that citizens have felt that trails and the use of Open Space is important. Additionally, the need for multipurpose fields has remained important and that increased efforts on maintenance of existing facilities and adding parks and park features is a new felt need.

B. Round 2 Summary - Public Meetings


1. Introduction to Round 2

The citizen-generated information from Round 1 was combined with other input sources to create a proposed work program that served as the basis for the Round 2 public participation process. Besides the Round 1 comments, the BCPR also conducted Community Center Assessments. The professional staff associated with the Centers offered viewpoints that they had gathered from citizens who utilize the Centers. This information was specific to each center and concerned citizens views regarding both facilities and programs. BCPR planners also analyzed available resources and constraints to isolate, per service area, what resources (such as land, potential funding sources, etc.) and what constraints (such as water concerns, flat budgets, maintenance work overloads, etc.) impact each of the service areas. This study provided a control element so that suggestions for the future would be kept in proper planning context. Additionally, the professional staff collected their observations concerning needed projects. These observations were based on the staff members review of existing documents, professional literature and day to day operations perspectives.

2. Proposed Work Program

The data from all of these sources were collected and developed into a proposed work program. Figure IV-1 shows the input process used to create the proposed work program.

Figure IV–1 Development of Master Plan Work Program



Round 2 began with a series of seven (7) public input sessions, which were held at the same locations as Round 1 meetings. The Round 2 meetings were designed to solicit the public's discussion and views on the proposed work program. Citizens were invited to participate by letter and phone invitation, newspaper releases, neighborhood association solicitation and known user group contacts. Each of the seven public input sessions varied in attendance but the sessions yielded thoughtful and meaningful information.

The following were the dates, places and times of the seven (7) public input sessions:

DATE	LOCATION (Park Service Area)	TIME
October 30, 2002	William Sibrava Substation (Northeast)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 4, 2002	Paradise Hills Community Center (Northwest)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 7, 2002	Raymond G. Sanchez Community Center (Northwest)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 12, 2002	Los Vecinos Community Center (East Mountain)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 19, 2002	Los Padillas Community Center (South)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 20, 2002	West Side Community Center (South)	6:30pm - 8:30pm
November 21, 2002	Vista Grande Community Center (East Mountain)	6:30pm - 8:30pm

3. Round 2 Findings

The results of the Round 2 public participation process clarified and validated those elements of the proposed work program that residents of the service area felt were important. The proposed work program was unique to that service area and the citizens provided thoughtful and specific input.

The following pages contain those elements of the proposed work program that the residents of each service area felt were important for that area. Additional comments are provided where citizens had specific suggestions.

EAST MOUNTAIN SERVICE AREA	
♦	Develop a swimming pool facility in the East Mountain area. Consider a site by the Los Vecinos Center or work with the Carnuel Land Grant for a possible site or a joint use agreement with APS Charter school or a site by the Vista Grande Center
♦	Acquire land adjacent to the Los Vecinos Community Center. Consider expansion needs such as a fitness center, space for teens, space for seniors, parking spaces. Also improve playground equipment, picnic area and ADA accessibility. Improve the field and replace perimeter fencing. Provide a separate place for BMX riders and activities as well as consider a rock climbing wall for the Center
♦	Develop additional phases at the Vista Grande Community Center to include expansion of the on-site trail network, hardscape features for skating. Develop a gym and a small outdoor amphitheater and work with APS to create a possible joint use agreement for these areas. Install exercise equipment at stations along trail network system
♦	Work with neighborhood associations, special interest groups and user groups on developing open space plans for East Mountains properties. Special attention should be made to involve the Carnuel Land Grant
♦	Initiate the East Mountain Trail Plan. Develop trail connections between Vista Grande Community Center and San Antonito Elementary School. Explore the feasibility of extending the San Antonito/Vista Grande trail connection further north and south on NM 14.
♦	Sell undeveloped land and use money for other capital improvements in the East Mountains.

NORTHEAST SERVICE AREA	
♦	Develop the Oakland & Browning property as a tennis court and playground area: - Consider a two court block with basketball uses and a perimeter walking path - Do not provide night lighting but play area and playground equipment is important
♦	Develop Sandia Heights property as a neighborhood park - Consider turf area that might accommodate sports practice space and a perimeter exercise station - Provide appropriate parking space that doesn't impact residents
♦	Complete Phase 2 of the Big Sky Hang Glider Park - Consider picnic table and shade structure that does not interfere with landing area - Consider a trail connection to Ben Greiner Soccer field
♦	Complete Phase 2 of the Vista Sandia Equestrian Park with benches, overlooks and neighborhood trail connections
♦	Initiate site improvements at Altamont Little League: - Consider additional parking spaces and additional access points - Consider adjacent land acquisition for possible site expansion
♦	Develop trails within road right-of-way per North Albuquerque Acres Transportation Plan
♦	Link Double Eagle Elementary School, Oakland & Browning, Ben Greiner Soccer Field and Altamont Little League with a trail system

NORTHWEST SERVICE AREA	
♦	Consider the following improvements to the Paradise Hills Community Center: expand gym to accommodate fitness room, replace gym floor, develop tennis courts on west side of center, park features between center and annex, improved pedestrian safety between center and park, additional land acquisition between center and Little League area
♦	Consider the following improvements to Paradise Hills Park: complete the skateboard project with ADA sidewalk connections from Chapparal Circle to park, increase parking spaces with ADA standards, added bleachers for spectators, modify parking area on Paradise Blvd to increase safety and develop a perimeter walking trail
♦	Consider the following improvements to the Paradise Hills Little League area: connect concession stand to water and sewer lines, experiment with artificial turf infields, increase parking spaces and seek APS joint use agreement for additional field development
♦	Consider the following improvements to Raymond G. Sanchez Community Center: complete the dual facing stage but control noise and traffic influences, install shade structure to cover outdoor basketball court, increase parking by BMX track
♦	Consider acquiring land adjacent to Raymond G. Sanchez Community Center: develop a modular skate park, restrooms for BMX and baseball area users
♦	Consider connecting to the City's North I-25 Reclamation/Reuse System non-portable water line that will be developed along Alameda Blvd with sub-outs at the 4th Street intersection and connecting Alameda Soccer Field irrigation systems
♦	Consider the identification and acquisition of a site for the Alameda Little League working in conjunction with the City of Albuquerque, experiment with turf grass infields
♦	Identify and pursue land for acquisition in the area of 2nd Street and Osuna NW for a neighborhood park
♦	Develop a facility improvement plan for the Bachechi Open Space property in conjunction with the City of Albuquerque Open Space: Alameda Project
♦	Acquire trail easement between Riverside Drain and Main Canal.
♦	Explore the feasibility of extending Alameda Blvd Trail east to Balloon Fiesta Park, develop trail along Paradise Blvd as part of road widening

SOUTH SERVICE AREA	
♦	Consider the following improvements to the Los Padillas Community Center and future swimming pool: secure additional funding to complete the pool and related amenities, secure funding to complete the future phases of the Los Padillas Approved Site Plan
♦	Consider the following to improve the Mesa del Sol recreation area: set aside funds in the 2004 GO Bond for reuse water infrastructure from the City's Southside Water Reclamation Plant, continue seeking legislative and GO bond funds to finish developing Phase 1 multipurpose playing fields and landscaping, promote the Regional Recreation Complex for soccer and non-soccer uses, particularly where the parking lot and playing fields can be used for revenue generating activities, secure funding for Phase 2 design of the Regional Recreation Complex, including additional parking for the Journal Pavilion Amphitheater
♦	Consider the following to improve the Mountain View Community Center: secure additional funding for the following improvements - Parking on Williams Street, perimeter walking path and fencing around basketball court
♦	Develop a perimeter trail around the Raymac Neighborhood Park
♦	Secure funding for the following improvements at the Rio Bravo Regional Park: secure funding for site improvements that may include some or all of the following: - Renovate tennis courts, improve parking lot and make it ADA accessible, develop thematic (literacy) on-site trail system, install new playground equipment and provide new park furnishings
♦	Secure funding and joint agreements with AMAFCA to develop baseball fields at the Borrega Dam for a proposed Adult Level Hardball Field
♦	Consider the following improvements to the Westside Community Center: secure funding for some or all of the following improvements: - Fitness station on track, meeting conference room, outdoor field lighting, improved playground equipment at small playground, add 1600 square foot meeting/conference room, add small skateboard park, convert rear parking lot area to a new basketball gym complete with 4 full courts and convert existing gym to a boxing/wrestling facility
♦	Secure additional funding to renovate the plumbing and filtration systems of the Rio Grande H. S. Pool and Fitness Center

SOUTH SERVICE AREA (continued)	
◆	Secure additional funding to design and develop an additional playing field at Tom Tenorio Park. Also add lights for the sand volleyball courts and consider an indoor training center and sports administration building
◆	Secure funding to design and develop the 8 acre property at the Larrazolo site to create a family multi-service center and neighborhood park
◆	Implement the approved and phased site plan for the Atrisco Little League, Park (U) and Open Space (Sunset Rd.)
◆	Secure funding to design and develop a park at both the Judge Henry Coors property and the Ambassador Edward L. Romero property. Consider extending municipal water from the Valley Gardens subdivision west to the Judge Henry Coors property and use future city reuse water line on Second Street from Southside Water Reclamation Plant as an irrigation source for the Rio Bravo property
◆	Implement improvements per the approved site plans for a perimeter trail and wetlands on the Pajarito and Durand Open Space properties and rehabilitate the Hubbell House, create an agricultural demonstration farm, perimeter trail and a public meeting space at the Hubbell House Open Space
◆	Consider creating a South Diversion Channel Trail Phase II extension on the north side of Rio Bravo to the railroad spur. Additionally, consider a Tijeras Arroyo Phase II trail extension on the South Diversion Channel to the future University Boulevard

Citizen involvement has been both extensive and vital. Much thoughtful direction has been rendered through the public input of the citizens of each of the service areas.

C. Technical Review

After public input on the proposed work program, BCPR submitted it for technical review and comment to various local and state government agencies and departments (the list of review agencies is in Appendix F). These agencies and departments were asked to review the proposed work program as it affects, or is affected by, projects and plans they are leading. Agency and department comments received in writing can be obtained by contacting BCPR. Changes to the BCPR P.O.S.T. work program were made based on this review and are reflected in the P.O.S.T. Goals, Objectives & Project Priorities presented in Chapter V.

This page intentionally blank.