

**NOTES FROM THE
CITY OF SANTA FE / SANTA FE COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

**Tuesday, July 17, 2007
4:00 PM
Santa Fe, New Mexico**

Since there was no quorum, the City of Santa Fe / Santa Fe County Regional Planning Authority (RPA) began its discussion led by Chair Wurzburger at approximately 4:20 PM on the above-cited date in the County Commission Chambers in the County Administration Building.

ROLL CALL

County Commissioners present:

Paul Campos
Jack Sullivan

County Commissioners Excused:

Harry Montoya
Virginia Vigil

City Councilors present:

Rebecca Wurzburger, Chair
Matthew Ortiz

City Councilors Excused:

Miguel Chavez
Mayor David Coss

Santa Fe RPA Staff:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Executive Director

County of Santa Fe Staff Members:

Judy McGowan, Planning
Stephen Ross, Attorney
Paul Olafson, Open Space

City of Santa Fe Staff Members:

Ann McLaughlin, Parks

Others Present:

Mark A. Basham
Mark and Mary Ruhlman
Matthew McQueen, SFCT
Alfredo Garcia
Carolyn Stephenson

- **Discussion of Use of Regional Gross Receipts Tax (GRT) Funding for Roads**

Ms. Follingstad stated that this discussion was held during the May 2007 RPA meeting. At that time, Commissioner Sullivan questioned the presence of Richards Avenue on the list of projects. Ms. Follingstad said she brought this matter to Chris Ortega and the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) of the TPB, and they passed on the spreadsheet that is attached within the handouts entitled "Priority List of Streets, Roads, and Bridges Joint Project Options." She stated a question that had been raised was whether or not these projects were in the

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that had been adopted by the TPB or whether they were on the adopted Future Roads Network Map. Richards Avenue is not in the TIP, nor is the Henry Lynch Roundabout, but all the roads on the list are on the Adopted Future Roads Network Map. The roads on the list with X under “Yes” are ones that need to find funding. The Southeast Connector was added to the list and the Future Roads Network Map per request by Commissioner Sullivan.

Councilor Ortiz said his understanding was that the developer would be responsible for building part of the Southeast Connector.

Commissioner Sullivan pointed out that the project the developer is building is the Northeast Connector that connects Richards Avenue to St. Francis Drive, but which is not shown on the map. He said the Southeast Connector is into the future and would be the parallel route to be created as the area in the CCD develops. He asked where the \$9 million estimated cost under Richards Avenue came from and what were the plans for it.

Ms. Follingstad explained that city staff brought Richards Avenue back to the list because it is on the Future Roads Network Map and in the past was in STIP. She said Richards could be taken off the list for GRT purposes. She added that it may be another year before the corridor study that identifies how many and which interchanges will be recommended for I-25 and NM 599 will be ready.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if the city is in favor of an interchange at Richards.

Chair Wurzbarger replied that she did not recall any discussion on this at a policy level and requested clarification from staff prior to the next RPA meeting.

Ms. Follingstad pointed out that all of the funds that will be generated in the next four years have been dedicated to South Meadows, which is a viable and ongoing priority because it has been in the plan for five years and was traded for the Siler extension, which now has its own funding.

She noted the \$50,000 for Design Standards Development for FY 08 and said that Robert Martinez and Chris Ortega have asked her to request approval for use of the funds for the Common City-County Roadway Design Standards Project. This is important because there is a disconnect between city, county and EZO road standards and codes. When a road that straddles jurisdictions is being looked at for funding, the road standards are different and it would be helpful to develop a set of common standards for these roadways that include West Alameda, Agua Fria and Richards, which in particular were on the engineer’s list of problem roads.

The \$50,000 would be used to hire a consultant to review the city, county and EZ standards and come forward with a proposal to make a common set of standards for the roads with multiple jurisdictions.

Ms. Follingstad pointed to the Henry Lynch Roundabout, which is a city project and stated that \$25,000 was granted to this project in the 2007 legislature from Capital Outlay. The funds from the GRT for this year would be used to finish the Henry Lynch Roundabout. Beginning next year, the funds would go for the South Meadows extension to NM 599 and used for right of way, design and perhaps engineering. It is expected that, by that time, the corridor study would be ready.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that the Northeast Connector should be labeled and included on the map and the list. The road has been designed and is under construction by the developer. He added that Richards Avenue is premature to be on the list and map.

Rather than a long wish list, Chair Wurzburger suggested that the list should just contain what is planned for the next three to five years. She asked for consensus for what areas the Authority members would like to see on the list. She noted that South Meadows will use all the funds from FY 08 through FY 12.

Ms. Follingstad also pointed to the Henry Lynch Roundabout and the \$50,000 for the Common Roadway ordinance development, which is an estimate.

Commissioner Campos asked if there were in-house staff that could do the work on the ordinances.

Ms. Follingstad said she was told by staff at both the city and the county that they do not have time.

Chair Wurzburger suggested that appropriate city and county staff be invited to the next meeting to discuss how this could be done and what the cost is.

Commissioner Sullivan said he felt it would be useful for the staffs to have a facilitator or engineering review person to coordinate the standards. He added that a large part of the work would not just be dealing with the standards, but also inter-governmental issues.

Commissioner Campos stated that the South Meadows extension is a big project that will connect to NM 599 and funnel a great deal of traffic to a dangerous at-grade intersection. His issue, which he has raised regularly, is that the extension should be coordinated for a grade-separated intersection at CR 62 and NM 599.

Commissioner Sullivan added that, rather than calling the South Meadows extension a \$3 million project, whatever the cost of a grade-separated interchange might be should be added to build the project up to arterial standards. Without a grade-separated interchange, it would be too dangerous. He said he knew that GRIP projects require a local match and suggested that the RPA funds can be used as leverage.

Chair Wurzbarger suggested that a formal policy statement or resolution be developed stating that the RPA priorities on the list of streets, roads and bridges joint projects be set by looking at opportunities to do leverage. And that this statement be prepared for presentation at the next RPA meeting.

- **Discussion on Regional GRT Funding for Trails and Open Space**

Paul Olafson, County Open Spaces, and Ann McLaughlin, City Parks Division, presented a list of open space and trails projects that fit within the parameters of the Capital Improvement Plan Joint Regional Projects that can be considered by the RPA for Regional GRT funds.

Mr. Olafson stated that the city and the county have worked closely together in developing a list of projects, which were listed on the spreadsheet in the handout packet. He said the Santa Fe River Trail and Parks is a bigger project and so has a bigger dollar figure. The River Trail, the Rail Trail and Arroyo Chamisos Trail are major spines of a regional trail network.

Commissioner Campos asked about connections of trails to the Railyard Park.

Ms. McLaughlin replied that the Rail Trail segments being asked for funding will definitely connect to the Railyard Park. A section of the Rail Trail that does not appear on the map but is listed on the spreadsheet from St. Michaels Drive to Alta Vista is planned to go through the NM DOT redevelopment property, cut to the Acequia Trail behind the School for the Deaf and from there connect into the Railyard Park, which is the connecting point to two major trails. The River Trail will also connect to the Acequia Trail, so that all will connect to the Railyard Park.

Commissioner Campos asked what was planned at the St. Francis Drive and Cerrillos Road intersection for pedestrians and bicycles.

Ms. McLaughlin explained that the City Council Public Works Committee put on hold a proposal for a pedestrian/bicycle overpass for that intersection, pending outcome of the St. Francis corridor study.

Commissioner Campos asked if the appropriation from the legislature is the main funding source for the connections.

Ms. McLaughlin affirmed that is the primary block of money for all the trail connections the city currently has in process. There is a total of about \$6.7 million, of which \$3.5 million from the governor is the largest. The money is distributed among all of the 9 to 10 active projects. The trails identified on the spreadsheet have been coordinated with county staff and are the major spines that are regional in their scope.

Commissioner Campos asked what funding sources are being used.

Mr. Olafson said that most of the county's GRT of about \$3 million for the River Trail has mostly been spent, largely on the county section. Funds will also be used on the county section of the Rail Trail from St. Francis Drive down to Lamy.

Chair Wurzbarger said she would like to see a clearer statement in writing how much of the GRT funds have been spent collectively for the past five years.

Mr. Olafson said he could put together a spreadsheet that would explain past history.

Commissioner Sullivan asked what BTAC stood for and noted some of its proposed trail was in the county.

Ms. McLaughlin said it is the Bicycle and Trail Advisory Committee, which is advisory to the city council. The portion in the county is for connecting existing trails in the Rodeo Road and Pueblos del Sol area down to the Spur Trail in the county with a major connection to the Santa Fe Community College. For the Richards Avenue portion, it will be off the roadway, except where there are bridge/culvert connections, where the shoulder will be used.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if it is already funded.

Ms. McLaughlin explained the project is partially funded and currently underway. The BTAC went to the City Council and requested \$1.5 million in 2004-06 for trail design, acquisition and construction, but there is not yet complete funding to finish every trail for which design has begun.

Councilor Ortiz stated the objective is to take a parks, open space and trails initiative to the City Council to be approved by October 2007 in time for the six-months lead time necessary to put it on as a ballot initiative in March 2008 for the public to decide whether to support some of the trails that need to have completion of resources for full build out. There has been a three-month budget exercise on costs for all the different parks and open space that will now go through the committee process prior to taking it to City Council.

Mr. Olafson said staff is working to take the biggest budget and impact items and dedicate true funds to them, rather than spreading the funds on too many projects. He pointed to a second list, "Additional projects for future year consideration," for both the city and county and said that, if there are funds left over, they can be moved to complete other projects. This creates a realistic funding stream for the projects that can get done in short order and will be an annual process. The County Open Land And Trails Planning Advisory Committee (COLTPAK) is a citizens advisory committee that has approved the staff recommendations.

Chair Wurzbarger pointed to the deficit of \$3 million for the Railyard Park and asked if there was deliberation given to that during this year's consideration of funds from the city.

Mr. Olafson said he has had discussions with Brian Drypolcher at the Trust for Public Land about the possibilities for additional funding. The staff recommended the contingency because they continuously run into projects and opportunities to buy spaces as important pieces, but if there is no budget, they either have to come back to it and rob from other sources for purchase or they wait and risk losing the opportunity.

Chair Wurzburger asked for an explanation of the Trail Stewardship Pilot Program.

Ms. McLaughlin replied that the Santa Fe Conservation Trust has proposed funding a position jointly and equally funded by the city, the county and the trust. This person would coordinate trail volunteers throughout the city and county.

Chair Wurzburger asked what is happening with a mapping program that can be used by the public that identifies parks and trails.

Ms. McLaughlin replied the primary functions of that project are to map easements that have been dedicated to either the city or the county that for various reasons were never recorded. The county also wants to map some of their existing trails that have been built in subdivisions that have not yet been mapped.

Mr. Olafson added the intent is to create a realistic live map that can be used by the public.

Chair Wurzburger noted that this plan will come back in the form of an action item to the next RPA meeting.

- **Discussion on Regional GRT Funding for Joint Water Projects**

Ms. Follingstad stated that her handout included excerpts from the Capital Gross Receipts Regional Plan that shows clearly the Buckman Well Fields and Diversion Route. The plan lists the Buckman supplemental wells, Direct Diversion project (BDD), the rehabilitation of the city well field, and upgrade and enhancement to conveyance and storage. She has had consultation with the city manager, the county water department and county attorney about the BDD, and there is consensus at staff level that, of the funds that have accrued in the last four years, \$1.516 million was spent in FY 04 on the water service agreement. Funds have since accrued and will continue to accrue at about \$3,520,805 per year.

Commissioner Sullivan and Chair Wurzburger asked for clarification of which agreement the funds were spent for.

Councilor Ortiz said the that will be question asked would be whether the funds would be used as a shared credit between the city and county or a sole credit to be gained by the county. He added that staff needs to be prepared for that discussion when the RPA takes action on the item.

Mr. Steve Ross stated that the county funding plan is incorporated in the overall funding plan and consists of two components. The first component is a large influx of general obligation bond proceeds that are the lion's share of the county's half of the \$80 million. The other \$20+ million is going to be contributed from cash reserves and some revenue bonds issued against the half of the water portion of the capital outlay GRT that consists of a county half and a regional half, which is shared. The RPA recommends use of that half of the capital outlay GRT that is divided into the water part. He said that 70% of the half is the water half.

Chair Wurzbarger requested a memorandum from city and county staffs and background prior to the next meeting that outlines how the GRT is divided among the city and county with respect to who gets credit for what when funding BDD. The agreement for this should be included. The context of what agreements have been made should start the discussion. The agenda item goal is to approve the money that goes to the BDD and cover any questions associated with making that decision.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

My name is Carolyn Stephenson. I'm a city and county resident. I knew a lot of the County Commissioners would not be here tonight, and I was actually hoping for more representation from the city ... What I want to say is that, maybe I'll say this again another time. But basically, I don't think, I read a newspaper article recently about, you know, Las Soleras in *The New Mexican*. And I have concerns about that. I feel that, here at the RPA, it's really not the question of winning, you know, or criticizing each other or blaming each other, and I don't want to do that tonight. I actually think there is an opportunity ...

Commissioner Campos asked what *The New Mexican* story was.

... *The New Mexican* story. That would be how we are going to deal with annexations. I forget the date of it, actually. It came out and it indicated that ... okay. It's not a reflection of policy ...

My point is simply, though, that the RPA had an opportunity to take this tension between the city and the county and not see this criticism that we have of each other as something to get defensive about and hunker it, tougher and tougher and tougher, about our own positions. It's actually to take this tension and welcome this criticism and realize, as leaders of the community, it's an opportunity each time to raise the dialogue, to raise the bar. And if one does that, one actually sees new solutions that are solutions that are compromises and actually perhaps a vision that works for both the city and the county.

When I think about a possible vision – and I don't have some of the information you do – I look at the city, for instance, and I see that there are some problems. I would like to see the city and county zoning somehow dovetail. If zoning dovetailed, it doesn't really matter that much what is annexed now or who owns what. Because it can always transfer in time. If you actually have legislation and zoning – just like you were saying earlier today about the roads. Here you have

county roads and city roads that have different standards. And you know that these county roads eventually – and you know which ones come first in terms of priority – will become city roads. So we have to have some consultant look at this and get these standards to match.

I'm asking that we do this same hard work – rather than fighting over Las Soleras or fighting over developments, which we'll fight over down the road – What I'm suggesting is that you do this through zoning, and you have – the city, I remember ten years ago, the city hired a consultant. And then I think they couldn't afford the consultant. But the point of the consultant was to take chapter 14, which doesn't match the General Plan in every way, I mean, they're inconsistent, and I think you councilors would agree to that. I mean, there are some inconsistencies. So you need to do your own homework there. And then the county is doing their work in zoning.

What I'm asking is that the staff of the city and the county get this zoning to somehow dovetail. If that happened, if this hard work happened, in my opinion, and then, well, if that work happened, you could actually annex everything in a much easier way, in a time fashion that was more natural. And you could win over and include the public or the communities much like you do the other project that was mentioned, the trails, where you have stewardships. You would have stewardships of communities. And those communities would weigh in on how they wanted it to look. But it wouldn't be a huge shock to them to become a member of the city if all the rules were complimentary of each other. That's all I'm saying.

* * * * *

Madame Chairman, my name is Mark Basham. I represent a couple of landowners that own land in Area 3, the third landowner, and there's a variety of other parcels. Is Mr. Fred Garcia here. Area 3 is located right off Cerrillos Road and it runs down to Rufina. The San Isidro project comes up to the Rivera piece, and then you have Garcia, and then you have the Packer piece, which is right on the corner of Airport Road. That Packer piece is already in the city. So I'm just here to speak in support of the annexation of Area 3. It is a donut hole. It's bounded by city roads and city land. So thank you.

MH – seemed to be a concern that this was being recorded – couldn't tell if he wanted to be on the record or not. If you want to check with him ...? And, is it Packer property? Sometimes sounded like Packard.

* * * * *

I'm Alfredo Garcia. And when San Isidro Plaza came in, and I am sandwiched in between Plaza San Isidro and what used to be the old Packer property. Because the old Packer property is in Santa Fe in the city limits. We are the only ones left there, without being, we are in limbo. County and then Rufina Street, my property, and I have the rest of it down in the county also. That's part of the historic district, now, so I really would like to see this plan 3 can be heard the next time around. That's at a public hearing as you had proposed before they canceled the March hearing on it.

ADJOURNMENT

This discussion session ended at approximately 5:30 PM.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the RPA will be at 4:00 PM, Tuesday, August 21, 2007.

Because there was no quorum to elect a new RPA Chair and Vice Chair, Chair Wurzburger will chair the next meeting.

Approved by:

Chair, Regional Planning Authority
Rebecca Wurzburger, Councilor, City of Santa Fe

Minutes transcribed and drafted by: Kay Carlson