

SANTA FE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING
June 17, 2025

Camilla Bustamante, Chair - District 3
Lisa Cacari Stone, Vice Chair - District 2
Justin Greene - District 1
Hank Hughes - District 5
Adam Johnson - District 4

SEC CLERK RECORDED 07/31/2025

SANTA FE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL BUDGET SESSION

June 17, 2025

1. A. This special meeting of the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners Board was called to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. by Chair Camilla Bustamante in the County Commission Chambers, 102 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. Roll Call

Roll was called by Celeste Garcia of the County Clerk's Office and indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:

Commissioner Camilla Bustamante, Chair
Commissioner Lisa Cacari Stone, Vice Chair
Commissioner Justin Greene [1:35 arrival]
Commissioner Hank Hughes
Commissioner Adam Johnson

Members Excused:

2. **Prehearing Conference**

A. **Prehearing Conference Concerning Appeals of Planning Commission's Final Order, dated March 20, 2025, in Case No. 24-5200, Rancho Viejo Limited Partnership, Rancho Viejo Solar, LLC, AES Clean Energy Development, LLC, Applicants, Application for Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Appeal Case Nos. 24-5201, 24-5202, 24-5203 and 24-5204.**

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: The first thing that I would like to do is see who from the interested parties/organizations are here and if we can just with a show of hands. I'm going to call out the interested party/organizations you can let us know if you're here on the behalf of that particular organization. New Mexico for Responsible Renewable Energy; okay, we have one person in the house. Ashley Schannauer, okay. The Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County, the San Marcos Association, 350 Santa Fe Inc., Santa Fe Green Chamber of Commerce, Sierra Club Rio Grande Chapter, The Global Warming Express, is there anyone from the Global Warming Express. Okay, thank you all for your presence.

SEC CLERK RECORDED 07/31/2025

- **Request from Camilla Brom**

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, next on our agenda, we have a request from Ms. Camilla Brom regarding being recognized as an interested party; is Camilla Brom here. Thank you. Ms. Brom, if you could please come forward you will have five minutes to provide your case as to why what you would bring to that conversation would be unique from anything that is already identified in those interested parties that I disclosed earlier. Okay, so we're looking specifically for the unique quality of your presentation asking the Commission to consider that this is in the interest of making sure that we have those interested parties and their concerns reflected so if the concerns are already reflected elsewhere then we would not add another interested party if those interests are being served. Does that make sense?

CAMILLA BROM: It does. It does and I mean I'd like to make some additional comments in my five minutes because I didn't prepare just for that one –

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: That is the only thing that we're hearing today. We can't hear anything with regard to the conditions of the project. Anything that is within the scope of the project we cannot hear that.

MS. BROM: Oh, I understand that.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: And I'm glad that you brought that up just to remind everyone we are not hearing details of the case that doesn't happen until the day of public -- so today all we are hearing is the merits of your request to be an interested party that does not reflect the interests of any other group. And you have five minutes. You will be given a one minute flag up.

MS. BROM: Okay. So my name is Camilla Brom and I'm requesting status as an interested party for the upcoming BCC hearing. I was not a party with standing at the Planning Commission hearing. I didn't request that because I had a family emergency and I had to go out of state. So during the time frame I was not able to even submit a request.

Over the past several years I've been involved in the Rancho Viejo project. In my opposition to it I formed a grassroots campaign several years ago. I live in Rancho San Marcos and I've been involved in bringing public awareness for the past several years on this. And I'm also -- I'm kind of skipping what I wrote since I only have five minutes -- but let's see, forgive me, for delaying here for a second.

So I'm requesting status both on my individual capacity as an aggrieved adjacent property owner who will be directly and materially impacted by the proposed project and my capacity as the founder and sole administrator of a local grassroots campaign. With respect to qualifications for legal standing in my individual capacity this includes proximity to the project. My property is adjacent to parcels that will be developed for this facility. Also the water well vulnerability. I rely on groundwater from a well situated approximately a half a mile southwest of the proposed facility and given the groundwater in this area flows generally west to southwest my well lies directly down gradient from the project site placing it squarely in the path of any potential groundwater contamination originating from the facility. Given the facility's scale and use of lithium ion batteries I have specific concerns about potential impacts to this groundwater quality including runoff, spills, stormwater contamination, etc.

I'm also concerned about environmental and public health concerns based on my proximity in the surrounding area. And legal basis for my standing/for my request and as I understand I should meet the qualifications is because of New Mexico land use law they define it standing is generally granted to individuals who can demonstrate they are directly and substantially affected by a land use development decision and my groundwater water reliance, direct environmental and safety concerns in close proximity to this infrastructure should clearly satisfy this threshold.

If granted status as an interested party with standing I will be providing information and evidence that has not been raised by other parties who've been granted standing in the hearing so far. My intent is not to repeat the same information that has or will be discussed but rather to present additional information that is critical to this hearing. As a result of extensive research regarding the Rancho Viejo solar project and its associated risks I plan to present in-depth information on issues such as groundwater, wildlife and public safety. These have all been mentioned by other parties but there's not been an in-depth discussion on all of this. And this is important to me being that I would be directly impacted and I absolutely believe I can bring additional information to this upcoming hearing that I'd like you all to be to listen to.

These insights I have are pertinent to your decision that you'll be making and distinct from the other parties. I believe the information I provide is going to be vital in your decision. Again, I live a half a mile from the main body of the facility and adjacent to some of the land being developed so I can also give --

DANIEL FRESQUEZ (County Media Manager): You have one minute; one minute remaining.

MS. BROM: I'd like to be able to present you with more details on the conditions of the area which I think is really important as well in making a decision. Being I live out there I've, you know, seen a lot. I've videotaped some weather and wind conditions so I would not be up here today if I felt I was just going to repeat what others have already said. I've been researching and involved in this for, unfortunately, almost close to three years and I definitely believe I have valuable information to share and I respectfully request that y'all would give me the opportunity to formally present it.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Do we have any questions from the Commission that would give us more insight as to whether or not Ms. Brom's request would be and the information that she would provide would be unique to any of the other interested parties; any questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much, we will discuss this. Thank you.

MS. BROM: Thank you. Oh, Attorney Boyd.

ATTORNEY BOYD: Chair, in terms of a process, I might suggest seeing if the applicant has any response to the request before proceeding to the next item. Does the applicant have anything to state with regard to the request made by Ms. Brom?

LUKE PIERPONT: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners. My name is Luke Pierpont. I'm local counsel for Rancho Viejo Solar, the applicant. I'll keep it very brief. We do feel that Ms Brom's testimony and presentation would be duplicative. We have four parties withstanding or appellants who are opposed to the project on the same or similar grounds and don't feel that an additional opponent of the project would add substantial information for the Commission. Thank you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Okay, any questions for the applicant regarding that? Okay, thank you.

- **Request to Submit Additional Discovery: Ashley Schannauer**

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: In this interest, discovery is information that would provided to the Commission to help us make a decision. Mr. Schannauer, please.

ASHLEY SCHANNAUER: Good afternoon and thank you. Yes, I filed a renewed motion to compel discovery in this case. It follows a motion that I filed, well that I filed last fall that was never acted upon. The primary reason for the new motion is that I am now a formerly a party withstanding plus I discovered that the County Sustainable Growth Management Plan provides for discovery as a due process right.

The discovery is not specifically provided for in the SLDC but the procedures that are outlined in the SLDC are very short, very incomplete in terms of the types of issues and types of actions that presiding officials, like yourselves, will need to take in the course of this hearing process.

So it's really in your inherent authority as this is a quasi judicial proceeding to provide for discovery. The issues that I'm trying to get at in discovery are extremely relevant in this case. The primary issue, of course, is the harm, the potential for harm that will result from this proposal. And my discovery requests go directly to that. They ask for the amounts of damages that have been sought against AES for prior accidents. AES has had a history of accidents, I'm sure you know –

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'm sorry, excuse me, please, don't provide any information with regard to anything about AES except your request for the information. That last statement was very much an opinion so I don't want to go there yet, okay. Thank you and it's just a reminder. I appreciate it.

MR. SCHANNAUER: Well, what I'm asking for in discovery are the amounts of damages that people and businesses have sought and claimed against AES for those accidents. I'm asking for copies of reports that AES may have prepared that will describe the causes of those accidents. That's relevant to this case because those causes could be recur in this case. And I'm asking for information about who is Rancho Viejo Solar LLC. Rancho Viejo Solar LLC is supposed to be the company that actually operates this facility after a conditional use permit is granted. And my question is and what I'm trying to get at is who is Rancho Viejo Solar LLC and will they have assets to be able to compensate people for any damages that are caused by an accident.

So that's my request. And you know, it's ripe for your decision now.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Schannauer. Do we have any questions for Mr. Schannauer? I have a question. Have you shared your requests with the applicant?

MR. SCHANNAUER: Oh, yes, yes and the applicant has filed a response to my motion.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: To each of the questions that you want to have answered?

MR. SCHANNAUER: No, well, the applicant can certainly state what its position is. But I think just to be to be short and in sum, the applicant's position is that

there there's no rules that provide for discovery that the SLDC does not provide for discovery. And my position is that it's within your inherent authority as the presiding officials in a quasi judicial proceeding to provide for that.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, thank you very much. Are there any other questions for Mr. Schannauer? Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. So this may be a actually a question for Attorney Boyd. If one of the parties withstanding requests discovery that is circulated to all parties withstanding; is that correct?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Madam Chair, and Commissioner Johnson, the discovery requests associated with this motion have been posted on the Commission's docket and therefore have been made available to the parties. In terms of any responses that would be provided as part of a discovery process generally, yes those responses would be shared with all other parties to the proceeding.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Any further questions? Thank you, Mr. Schannauer.

MR. SCHANNAUER: Thank you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Do we have input at this time from the applicant regarding this request?

MR. PIERPONT: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners. As Mr. Schannauer noted we did file a response in opposition to his motion requesting -- motion to compel discovery responses. And the reason we did that is because we're unaware of any other land use hearing either before this body or other or other entities where the authority with jurisdiction has required a land use applicant to answer discovery propounded by an opponent to the project.

Mr. Schannauer is correct that the Sustainable Growth Management Plan does describe that the SLDC shall adopt rules for the adequate discovery and consistent with due process. The SLDC itself does not have any rules regarding discovery and doesn't even mention the right of parties to conduct discovery.

What the SLDC does provide for is the application process by which the applicant has submitted thousands of pages of reports and application and has received notice from Santa Fe County development staff that the application is complete. Beyond that there have been no additional requests for information from the County -- sorry, there have been additional requests for information from the County that the applicant has responded to and the record of the application is complete in our eyes.

Certainly, you know, one of the one of the things that the SGMP requires is that the SLDC provide for discovery and other procedural protections consistent with due process., New Mexico case law is clear that that the due process that's required in a land use hearing is less than that which is required in district court.

Mr. Schannauer's motion is something that you would see in district court. Discovery is how you get information from parties to litigation in court where there isn't an obligation to produce the extensive record that the applicant has already done in this case.

Finally, New Mexico cases are clear that due process does not require discovery in this case. Due process requires notice and by producing thousands of pages of the

application and supporting reports the applicant has provided notice to the public of what the application actually entails and due process requires an opportunity for the parties to be heard. And we have we have seen both through the Hearing Officer process, the Planning Commission and now before this board that both the applicant and the parties are having ample opportunity to be heard.

As to the relevance of the requests that Mr. Schannauer was getting at that, that relevance is a decision for a judge or a discovery referee. If this Board is to allow additional discovery, the Board will also have to be making decisions as to relevance, as to whether certain information is protected, as to whether certain information is otherwise not discoverable by the parties.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Are there any questions for the applicant for Mr. Pierpont. Mr. Pierpont, the question I have, you're correct the with regard to your recognition of the SLDC, my question, we are quasi judicial and we would be asking questions that would be pertinent to the particular case and making the decision about relevance at that given time. In the interest of assuring that we would have the information that we would need to make that decision, have you looked or will you be responding to those questions when they come before us at the meeting that's yet to be planned?

MR. PIERPONT: As I understand your question, will the applicant be responding to questions from the Board, absolutely. And I'm sorry to interrupt. The applicant has made every effort to comply with requests from County staff that it considers relevant to the application and would and would certainly be responsive to any questions from the Board.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, so the Board just to clarify, the Board does have the responsibility for any discovery that may be relevant to this case and you understand that health and safety has been the general, not having the detail of the case and what's happening, it is clear that people are concerned about the health and safety of this project. I think that's something that hasn't been ignored.

That being said if there are any questions that would have or could come up in this discovery will you be providing and when we talk about the discovery whether or not that's something that the Board would already have or what is being requested for submission by Mr. Schannauer would the applicant be providing answers to those questions anyway?

MR. PIERPONT: The applicant will respond to requests for relevant information if directed to do so by the Board.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Thank you very much. Are there further questions? I appreciate it. If there are no further questions – oh, Mr. Schannauer, did you have something? Please, you have to approach the microphone.

MR. SCHANNAUER: I'd like to ask for a brief opportunity to respond to what Mr. Pierpont said.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Since this isn't a hearing to that regard -- let's go ahead and hear it.

MR. SCHANNAUER: Okay, well the reason for discovery is that in any case in which a party presents testimony/prepares an application, they're going to be presenting information that's favorable to their proposal. They're not going to be

presenting information that's not favorable. And so that's the purpose of discovery. At times, you know, parties can do their own research and find information that's relevant to a case but other times there's information that a party has sole control over --

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Understood.

MR. SCHANNAUER: -- which is what we have here. AES has sole control over the information that I'm asking for and so the only way for anybody in this case to get, other than AES, to get that information is by doing discovery.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Understood, thank you, Mr. Schannauer. If there is any question and I'm not going to be secretive about the preference in this one. If there was a way to have these questions answered or shared with the applicant and have them addressed at that time that would largely be the preference. At this point given the schedule and the number of people that we think may attend we're looking at a 10-hour meeting in itself and that's just a guess. That being said um when we get to these requests that can answer these questions straight up without affecting the opportunity to go back which is just going to extend more time we don't have the answers we need, the ideal would be that somehow you share the questions and share the answers and come to some place where there's agreement that those concerns would be addressed. That's what I have. So thank you.

And then one last question for Ms. Brom. If we can get Ms. Brom to the podium?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Madam Chair, I also have a question but I'll yield to you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, I apologize. Okay, Ms. Brom, thank you before we go into the conversation regarding your request; how much time would you need to make your case?

MS. BROM: I would love to have 45 minutes to give you a thorough presentation on the information that I feel is important for you to know. You know, I could 30 minutes at the minimum but 45 would be ideal in order to get the information to you that I think is --

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: And you still stand that that would be completely unique information?

MS. BROM: Yes ma'am.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you very much. Okay we had another question Commissioner Johnson; who was this for?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Ms. Brom, I have a question for you. I needed to digest my thoughts. Ms. Brom, thank you. Did your, did your grassroots campaign have a name or was there some sort of identity umbrella that it came?

MS. BROM: My grassroots campaign originally was New Mexicans for Responsible Renewable Energy. There is a party of standing under that name now. I am not affiliated with that party. That's a registered organization. I temporarily collaborated with the individuals having to do with that registered organization but ultimately it wasn't working out for lack of better word. So I changed my name just a little bit to New Mexicans for Responsible Renewables not to confuse everyone but so we all just continue the same mission. But that's why it might seem strange there's a similar name.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you for clarifying that. Are you a member of the Rancho San Marcos Community Association? Sorry, the San

Marcos Community Association.

MS. BROM: I'm on their mailing list but the information they're providing is not the same information I'd be discussing. I would be discussing the groundwater and hydrology and all that entails and no one's discussed that.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you for that. I'm done with my questions for you. One for Attorney Boyd: regarding the issue of relevance what is the County Attorney's Office's perspective on that? Would it -- what are the consequences?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Chair and Commissioner Johnson, relevance is generally understood to be any evidence that makes some fact more or less likely. And you all are being asked to make a finding of fact as to whether the application meets the standard under the Sustainable Land Use Development Code for a conditional use permit. And so any piece of evidence that would make it more or less likely that you would find that standard met.

So again the applicable standard being generally public health, safety, the standard governing conditional use permit applications any evidence bearing on that would be relevant to the decision. But the question in terms of discovery is the process for getting that information. And I understand the two parties to be talking about whether there should be additional process before the hearing in the form of exchange of information between the parties or the application and all the materials that have already been presented to the Hearing Officer the Planning Commission and this Board in the form of the reports and all of the other materials referenced by the applicant.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. And has Mr. Schannauer submitted those discovery requests in advance in the form of a set of questions or is that an open deadline?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Chair and Commissioner Johnson, the discovery requests were submitted as I understand it to the applicant and again the parties are in a dispute about whether those requests should be responded to. The requests themselves are on the BCC docket for this case. If you pull up the submissions that the parties have made attachment, number one under the heading for Ashley Schannauer contains what I understand to be his discovery request and the specific categories of information he's seeking.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Say where I would find that again.

ATTORNEY BOYD: The website for the appeal which I believe you've been -- it's not on the Boarddocs for this meeting today. It's the appeal docket. There is a heading for Ashley Schannauer and I believe under that heading attachment one contains his specific discovery requests.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So if we were to allow the discovery requests that would be the requests and there would not be further?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Chair and Commissioner Johnson, that's not for not for me to say. You all are deliberating on -- you all will decide on the motion and what form of relief to grant.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So we could grant a motion for these requests but not further ones?

ATTORNEY BOYD: You could, Chair and Commissioner Johnson, the

Board has a number of options before it in terms of the motion and I would I would encourage the Board to consider its options in deliberation after hearing arguments on these on these motions and the other matters and I would encourage again the Board to enter deliberations and reach a decision as to what to do with this and the other requests that have been made of the Board.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you and I asked these just so that we know the range of options available to us and how we structure the these proceedings going forward since they're likely to be complicated and lengthy. Thank you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson and Attorney Boyd.

MS. BROM: Thank you.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Quick question for Alexandra Ladd from Growth Management. Just to clarify, Alex, in this application process with regard to information that would provide any insights on the potential for environmental impact given we just heard a request for someone to speak more on the water contamination potential and I would like to know if there other types of environmental impacts that are part of the application process or are taken into consideration for such process? So would we have that information somewhere?

ALEXANDRA LADD (Growth Management Director): Madam Chair, members of the Commission, there was an environmental impact report that was done for the original application and it is on the County's website.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you very much, Alex. Are there any other questions? All right hearing none we will go into closed session.

3. Consideration of an Order Governing Prehearing and Scheduling a Hearing*

5. B. *The BCC may Deliberate in Executive Session on this order before taking action as allowed by NMSA 1978, 10.15.1.(I)

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: If we look at the bottom of the agenda, we have item A which is the statement about every practical effort to ensure services for those who may not be able to access information. Item B states that BCC may deliberate in executive session on this order to take any actions. And in the interest, as any judge would do, go back to their office and sit and think about what needs to be determined. We're going to step out to consider the request before us today as well as -- we might need to hear that consideration of order governing hearing; correct? Is that why we're you were flagging me?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Yes, Chair, and I would, just to avoid the need for two separate deliberations, I would ask you to cover any other issues with scheduling the hearing.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: That was sincerely my intent so my apology to hear the second.

So we have heard both of the cases in the prehearing conference. We also have on our agenda the consideration of an order governing prehearing and scheduling a hearing. In this case we will be looking at time, place, when, where's and what. So we don't really

need a presentation on this or we do we have any staff who would be providing additional information including yourself?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Chair, I would only direct your attention and the attention of other Commissioners to the staff memo that has been prepared for today's meeting which has also been made available to the public that that memorandum discusses some of the issues the BCC will face when it comes to scheduling the location. time of the hearing. And, again, my interjection earlier was only to see if there were any other matters in that regard that you wanted to cover with the parties before you went into deliberations over that.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Has everyone had a chance to look at the memo from staff? Okay, good. So we need a motion to go into executive.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: I move that we go into executive session.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

The motion to go into Executive Session passed by unanimous roll call vote as follows:

Commissioner Adam Johnson	Yes
Commissioner Justin Greene	Yes
Commissioner Lisa Cacari Stone	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Commissioner Camilla Bustamante, Chair	Yes

[The Commission met in Executive Session from 1:38 – 3:35]

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, let's return to open session.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I will make a motion to come out of executive session.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Second.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: We have a motion for coming out of executive session from Commissioner Greene and a second from Commissioner Hughes. All in favor?

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: During closed session we heard the two items on the agenda today. The first was the request for -- sorry let me just make sure my notes are in front of me -- so we are looking for Camilla Brom to be a party withstanding and for provision of additional discovery from Mr. Schannauer. Do we have a motion for these two items?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah. I make the motion that Camilla Brom be granted standing at the hearing and that Ashley Schannauer not be allowed to conduct prehearing discovery. But we do allow him to conduct cross-examination of witnesses.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: I second it.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: We have a second from Commissioner Cacari

SFC CLERK RECORDED 07/31/2025

Stone. All in favor.

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Motion carries. To be clear on that one in the entering of more discovery is, I ask that both parties be prepared to answer or ask any of the questions that have been provided for this purpose. It is quite possible that they will also come up again for the party presenting explaining the need for that particular information will be helpful for the party for the applicant understanding what the answers may be and being able to answer them to whatever end you're able to. I expect that you will have done some homework to figure out what can and cannot be disclosed at that time.

That being said our next item on the agenda was the approval of the order that will establish the scheduling for the hearing.

3. Consideration of an Order Governing Prehearing and Scheduling a Hearing*

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Madam Chair, would you like me to do that?

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: And I will ask for a motion. Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. So we have a printed order here and we're going to request that everybody that is interested in getting a copy of this give our Attorney Boyd their email and it will be emailed momentarily. In this order we have the items that we just approved right now but also the times and dates and timing for all of the procedures that we're going to go through here. So with that I will make a motion to approve the order governing the prehearing procedure and scheduling of hearing on the merits.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: We have a motion from Commissioner Greene we have a second from Commissioner Johnson. Is there anything that we might want to add in a friendly amendment contingent on providing the attorney with your email address if you're a party in standing?

ATTORNEY BOYD: Yes, Chair and Commissioner Greene, we have a service list for submissions before the hearing and I just need the parties who've been recognized as parties withstanding to provide me with their email address so it can go on that service list that's going to be in the order.

CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Okay, all in favor.

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.


CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, that is conclusion of our prehearing today. We have an action item for adjournment.

SEC CLERK RECORDED 07/31/2025

B. Adjournment

Upon motion to adjourn by Commissioner Johnson and second by Commissioner Hughes and with no further business to come before this body, Chair Bustamante declared this meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Approved by:


Camilla Bustamante, Chair
Board of County Commissioners


ATTEST TO:



KATHARINE E. CLARK
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell, Wordswork
453 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, NM 87501




COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss

BCC MINUTES
PAGES: 13

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 31ST Day Of July, 2025 at 03:22:14 PM
and Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 2064054
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office

Deputy  Katharine E. Clark
County Clerk, Santa Fe, NM

SEC CLERK RECORDED 07/31/2025

