

Multi-Use Facility Committee Meeting

DRAFT Minutes

February 15, 2024 9:30 AM

Corrales Village Council Chambers and on Zoom

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 9:31 am

2. Roll Call

Present for today's meeting were committee members Ed Boles, Barbara Boyd, Sherry Jones, Patricia DeVivi, Rick Snow, John Perea, Cynthia Nava, and Ken Martinez. Johnny Martinez attended via Zoom. Ken Martinez was acting chair. Also present were Assistant Village Clerk Skye DeVivi. There were many community members in the audience and several on Zoom.

3. Approval of Agenda

Sherry Jones raised the question of public comment at the end of this meeting. Ken Martinez noted that public comment was to focus on what was discussed at this meeting and not offering any new feedback.

Sherry Jones moved to suspend public comment at this meeting and to reopen public comment on February 29 to allow the committee to do their work. Rick Snow seconded.

A motion to approve the agenda with the amendment was made by Sherry Jones, seconded by Barbara Boyd. Johnny Martinez and Ken Martinez opposed, all other committee members approved, motion passed.

4. Approval of minutes from 2/1/23

Sherry Jones asked for an addition to the minutes to include this addition: "Ms. Romero clarified that only a preliminary recommendation can be released to the public prior to the committee delivering the report to the Mayor and Village Council on March 7, 2024."

Rick Snow moved to approve the minutes with the amendment from February 1 and Ed Boles seconded. Motion was carried by a voice vote.

5. Read Multi-Use Facility Resolution

Ken Martinez read the germane portions of the resolution from Village Council and the Mayor.

6. Review committee data collection process

Ken Martinez shared there were seven open meetings with Zoom capability, two open forums where approximately 240 people attended in total and 49 people provided input at those meetings. The survey regarding this project was prepared in English and Spanish capturing qualitative and quantitative data. And written comments were gathered from emails and early feedback provided in the Administrative offices.

All of this data was categorized into Concerns or Needs with a total of 39 categories created. These categories were then grouped with like items creating five groups.

7. Development of recommendations by committee facilitated by Arnold Farley and assisted by Sandy Farley

Ken Martinez set up the facilitated session by stating we are using the data give to us by the community. The Committee has not expressed their opinions. This is the time where the Committee is to provide input using a process guided by the facilitator.

Arnold Farley shared he spoke at the Open Forum and is in favor of the facility. And noted he would keep his personal opinion out of this session.

Notes from Facilitated Segment of Multi-Use Facility Committee Meeting

May 15, 2024

Facilitators: Arnold Farley, assisted by Sandy Farley

Arnold explained the rational of the group process, to move closer to agreements on findings from all community input. Sticky dots were used for committee members to vote on general and specific feedback data aggregated from all sources; each dot represented their vote to express

their opinion combined with community input from emails, oral testimony, public forums, and survey (quantitative and qualitative data).

- 1) Aggregated input from the community coming from public forums, survey (both quantitative and qualitative data), oral testimony, emails, written submissions) was consolidated into 39 issues, one of which was not directly related and the other two were only distantly related to the Multi-Use Facility (MUF). These 36 issues were then categorized into five groups.
- 2) Committee members were asked to identify the grouping (A-E) that they felt was most important, as a way to begin focusing on the next step of voting for individual issues.
- 3) Each committee member was then asked to consider the community input and given 8 dots to vote on individual items (but could put up to 3 votes on any one item)

Groupings identified by committee as important (Each grouping was made into a large poster and placed on wall):

Group A – 4 – Favor multi-use facility/community center

Group B – 2 – Current design proposal will not be beneficial to the Village

Group D – 1 – Need to maintain cultural, agricultural, and farming integrity, fear of destroying rural nature

Group E – 1 – Determine expense of building and operating/develop a business plan

No one chose Group C – Current design proposal will be beneficial to the Village

Individual votes for the specific issues (number on left refers to its rank order among all individual items mentioned in aggregated public feedback)

Group A

11 Favor of multi-use facility/community center **11**

1 Need meeting rooms in Village **5**

4 Need class rooms for teaching/learning **2**

3 Cutting edge technology in meeting and auditorium area **2**

- 6 Consider outdoor plaza space **3**
- 38 LEED-Rated/Sustainable **1**

Group B

- 2 Current design proposal will not be beneficial to the Village **5**
- 5 Maintain architectural integrity of Village/state **1**
- 13 Need flexibility in design **3**
- 14 Include history/heritage/culture/honor descendant families **2**
- 18 Include needs of youth in design **3**
- 30 Accommodate dances and social events **2**

Group C

- 8 Favor of art display space **3**
- 27 Favor of large auditorium **2**

Group D

- 9 Need to maintain cultural, agricultural, and farming integrity; fear of destroying rural nature **5**
- 10 Too much traffic and not enough parking **2**
- 25 Maintain and protect existing equestrian infrastructure **1**
- 28 Consider an alternative site **2**
- 33 Include needs of growers/farmers **1**

Group E

- 16 Determine expense of building and operating/dev biz plan **6**
- 19 Local facility not regional **1**
- 20 Inclusivity = come together as a community **2**
- 23 Need licensed architect from outset – **5**
- 26 No facility **1**

31 Anchor tenant status determination 1

Committee Comments:

Johnny (via Zoom): Need to be sure that the committee members' votes represent the feedback from the community and not their personal viewpoints.

Ed: Don't forget feedback from people whose issues are not represented in large numbers in the data, yet their concerns may be more critical and significant than other issues.

Sherry: Committee worked very hard to be inclusive.

Rick: Corrales has a great need for a facility (as represented by the need for meeting and classrooms).

Ken: Slow down the process to do it right so that we can say we came together as a community in a transparent process to serve the inclusive, broad, and diverse needs of the Village.

Barb: Thank you for those that have attended and spoken at the meetings, answered the survey, and provided written comments, because I appreciate that you care.

John: The high volume of responses from the Comprehensive Plan Survey in favor of a multi-use center indicated support for it.

TALKING POINTS

- 1) Ed suggested changing the name from Multi-Use Facility to "CORRALES COMMUNITY CENTER" (consensus)
- 2) Consensus about need for a "community center"
- 3) Based on community input, the items to include in the architectural design:
 - flexible design to accommodate space for meetings
 - flexible design to accommodate for classroom space (include space for student classes and preparation for presentations)
 - maintain architectural integrity of Village, utilizing southwestern architecture
 - showcase history, heritage, arts, culture, agriculture, and rural nature of Corrales, while honoring Village founders and descendant families
 - utilize "cutting edge" technology that is easily updated, provide adaptive audio and visual aids for the elderly
 - flexible space for art shows, dances, performing arts; social events
 - equestrian space for indoor classes and outdoor demonstrations;
 - dedicated historical space
 - Include needs of growers/farmers/use of catering kitchen

- LEED rated for sustainability and eco-friendliness
- outdoor plaza space

4) Develop Business Plan:

- Funding
- Operating costs
- Management of facility
- Feasibility studies (traffic, infrastructure, environmental – noise, lighting)
- Hire architectural firm
- Size of facility (to meet community needs)

- 5) With the recent acquisition of land in the Village, explore all options for location of the community center (Jones, Gonzales, Anderson?) to maximize traffic flow, entry/exit of parking, footprint of facility, ability to face property on Corrales Road, proximity to other Village property such as the proposed welcome center, La Entrada Park, and restaurants (Gonzales property), for design of outdoor components, etc.

Facilitation ended and meeting proceedings was returned to Acting Chair, Ken Martinez by Arnold at approximately 11:55 AM.

8. Adjournment – We thanked the facilitators and thanked Ken for chairing the meeting. Ed Boles moved to adjourn at 12:02 and Rick Snow seconded. It was unanimously approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Barbara Boyd