

Comment #	Page	Subject	Date Received	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Amendment
1	8	Diagram	6/3/2019	I still don't think this captures how each piece fits together but I don't really know how to fix this. The first go around was probably clearer	Agreed, still needs modification. Committee discussion?	Committee Discussion?
2	41	Rural Commercial Overlay	5/31/2019	the Rural Commercial overlay is presented as stretching well south of the existing commercial zone and with the same decided-ness as the Arts and Agricultural overlay. At the May 15th. meeting I think there was general agreement that the Arts and Agricultural overlay should cover pretty much the whole district, as in the second draft, but there was significant questioning of whether the Rural Commercial overlay should stretch as far south as in the second draft. As I remember it, you made the point that it was at least worth asking the community at large about that, and I think it would be much better -- less likely to trigger immediate hostility etc. -- to in fact make it an explicit question. Perhaps the map could use the same color but cross hatch the extended part or something like that (because more people will see the visual and think it set in stone than will actually read the text). You've asked us to think about what we want to get from the public meetings -- I think this question of the extent of the Rural Commercial overlay would be a good thing to foreground.	Agreed. Committee Discussion?	Committee Discussion?

3	Cove	Title	5/29/2019	Change "Draft 2" to "Public Presentation Draft"	Agree	Change Draft 2 to "Public Presentation Draft"
4	4	Map	5/31/2019	For people looking at a paper copy, the map on page 4 is too small to read the legend.	Agreed. Change to larger map.	Add larger map
5	7	History	6/1/2019	<p><u>-regarding the decline and de-occupation of San Marcos Pueblo (discussed on pages 7 and 29), the following text is more detailed and accurate than that currently written in the plan: "According to oral history and descendants of Ancestral Puebloan peoples, the inhabitants of Pueblo San Marcos moved south and west to join Santo Domingo, Cochiti, San Felipe, and Hopi. Recent research suggests there may have been some Puebloan reoccupation of the site following the Revolt, but its extent and timing is uncertain. Today members of Santo Domingo, Cochiti, San Felipe, and Tesuque Pueblos, as well as the Hopi Tribe, claim Pueblo San Marcos as an ancestral site and continue to use the area for traditional purposes."This text comes from http://galisteo.nmarchaeology.org/sites/pueblo-san-marcos.html also, on page 29 where the document discusses how the Pueblo is used today (i.e. "training young professionals"), that statement is true. However, many of the local (often retired) residents are site stewards for the Conservancy or are members of the Site Watch program, so it might be important to note that local residents are working and volunteering at San Marcos and other archaeological sites in the district.</u></p>	Important input. Change wording.	Quote text from NM Archaeology resource. Include information about residents working and volunteering at site as well as interns.

6	7	History	6/3/2019	Change location of History in the document	Agreed. Change location of History	Delete p. 7 history and expand on History in San Marcos/History section on p. 29
7	8	Planning Process	5/31/2019	Most people who attend the public meetings in June are going to be concerned mainly with the zoning and the SMCD Use Tables. We are going to have to explain how our plan contributes to the generation of these Use Tables. I think it would be useful to include a flow chart showing the process, similar to what you have shown on page 8 but continuing all the way to the final Use Tables. This could be in tabular form without the pictures. You could show who is responsible for each step in the process and where we currently are (basically at the beginning).	Agreed. Add flowchart of process steps.	Create and add process flowchart for visual representation of how San Marcos District Plan becomes basis for zoning and San Marcos Community District Use Tables in Sustainable Land Development Code.
8	10	Committee Objectives	6/3/2019	Bullet 5: add "new businesses"	Agreed.	Add "new business" to list.

9	11	Key Issues	5/31/2019	<p>The only content change I've seen that I'm concerned about is the much shortened Key Issues list. I feel we've lost something by losing some of the very specific concerns we all identified. Also, what we have listed feel very negative, rather than concerns that were focused on positive things. For example, in the original list we had things like "littering problems along Hwy 14", "Night lighting causing light pollution", "Water resources diminishing..." Each of these, thought identifying an issue illuminates our values as a community: a desire for a clean environment, dark skies, preserving our water resources. The current list is very inward and alarmist with key words like "threatened", "limitations", "lack of", and "insufficient". They also sound like we're under attack. I am particularly bothered by the 3rd and 4th bullet, and I'm not sure we really address these the way they are written in our Goals at the end. So I'd like to return some of the items removed from this list and rework or delete the current list. This may require some discussion in the group.</p>	<p>Agreed. New "Key Issues" List may be too short.</p>	<p>Create two lists, "Initial Key Issues" with more of the group's original issues and "Issues to Address in San Marcos District Plan" with distilled issues identified through planning process.</p>
---	----	------------	-----------	---	--	---

10	11	Key Issues	6/3/2019			Agreed. Change Key Issues list.	Create two lists, "Initial Key Issues" with more of the group's original issues and "Issues to Address in San Marcos District Plan" with distilled issues identified through planning process.
				This section changed a lot since the first draft. When I go back to the original meeting minutes we discussed as key issues things like walking trails, clean air, dark skies, rural character and those are the issues we focused on through this process. I am not sure these key issues really reflect any of those issues.			
11	11	Key Issues	6/3/2019	Bullet 3: What is meant by "Lack of adequate public facilities"? What public facilities would support small business?		Adequate public facilities are things like internet and electricity in a rural setting. Noting the quality of these services indicates the circumstances under which small businesses face obstacles to operate.	No change
12	11	Key Issues	6/3/2019	Bullet 5: This seems to mix 2 ideas....we discussed large set backs restricting use of property but that was not really related to small scale businesses		Agreed. These are two separate concepts	Make bullet 5 into two separate bullets, one for residents and another for property owners.

13	11	Key Issues	6/1/2019	<p>"Current development standards place limitations on long-standing agricultural and equestrian uses in the District" What current standards does this refer to? How do they limit long-standing uses?? This does not appear to be an issue for us.</p>	<p>Try to align more with Goal 2: Support the traditional use of the San Marcso area for agricultural, ranching and equestrian purposes.</p>	<p>Change wording to: "Agricultural and equestrian uses of the area face constraints by the development standards in Sustainable Land Development Code San Marcos District Overlay."</p>
14	11	Key Issues	6/1/2019	<p>"Limitations like large setbacks and disregard of topographical restrictions on small-scale businesses, especially arts galleries, create onerous restrictions for property-owners" This bullet item also does not state the issue adequately or correctly. Wording could be: Large setbacks in certain topographic locations may limit property-owners' ability to build structures such as studios or greenhouses.</p>	<p>Agreed. Rewording of issue may be better.</p>	<p>Change wording to: "Large setback requirements in certain locations with topographical issues may limit property-owner's ability to build structures in more logical locations."</p>
15	11	Key Issues	6/1/2019	<p>Many issues listed in Draft 1 should be included in Draft 2, e.g., residential density seem to be increasing; water resource depletion follows increased development and residential density.</p>	<p>Agreed. Bring back some of the key issues raised by the group in the beginning of the planning process.</p>	<p>Create two lists, "Initial Key Issues" with more of the group's original issues and "Issues to Address in San Marcos District Plan" with distilled issues identified through planning process.</p>

16	15	Map	5/31/2019	For people looking at a paper copy, the map on page 15 is too small to read the legend	Agreed.	Include larger map on p. 15
17	15	Community Con	6/1/2019	last paragraph, first sentence- when was this determined? Should sentence be present or past tense?	This calculation was estimated by County staff to account for the mismatched boundaries of the San Marcos District with US Census boundaries.	No change.
18	24	Arts and Tourism	6/1/2019	You probably want to also add Bonanza Creek Movie Ranch.	Agreed.	Add Bonanza Creek and Eaves Movie Ranch.
19	27	Ranching and Gr	6/3/2019	add "horse boarding"	Agreed.	Add "horse boarding"
20	29	San Marcos Pueblo	6/3/2019	Much of this is already stated on page 7 "History" While I think it is important I wonder if it could be summarized in one of the sections and have more detail in the other section	Agreed.	Quote text from NM Archaeology resource. Include information about residents working and volunteering at site as well as interns.
21	34	Fire Station	6/3/2019	Change text to be consistent- are they manned or unmanned? Reword	Agreed.	Change wording to be consistent. "Rancho Viejo also serves this area."
22	35	School	6/3/2019	Update with most current information on school's operation	Agreed.	Get information from Turquoise Trail Charter School to update section.

23	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	I am trying to understand why these issues have been singled out as bullet points. By singling these issues out, it makes them the most important and I am not sure they are, especially the first bullet point. What do we mean when we say "new development" conflicts with equestrian culture? I don't remember that as the issue.	These issues were identified as Land Use Issues to address in this section. The "new development" bulletpoint could be modified to be clearer.	Change wording to: "Agricultural and equestrian uses of the area face constraints by the development standards in Sustainable Land Development Code San Marcos District Overlay."
24	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	Reframe setback issue- "SM residential dimensional standards for front, rear, side property lines are more restrictive than others in the County and they have caused issues for residents to develop their property."	Agreed. Reframe issue to be clearer.	Reframe setback issue- "SM residential dimensional standards for front, rear, side property lines are more restrictive than others in the County and they have caused issues for residents to develop their property."

25	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	Add non-residential setbacks issue	Agreed.	Add bulletpoint for non-residential setbacks: "Setbacks in non-residential areas vary from the format of other setbacks in the District, creating confusion and some issues between neighbors of the non-residential developments."
26	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	Specify highway setback to be addressed	Agreed.	Add bullet point: "Setbacks along NM 14 are more restrictive than others in the the ounty and they have caused issues for residents to develop their property."

27	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	Clarify second bullet point- what does this mean?	These issues were identified as Land Use Issues to address in this section. The "new development" bulletpoint could be modified to be clearer.	Change wording to: "Agricultural and equestrian uses of the area face constraints by the development standards in Sustainable Land Development Code San Marcos District Overlay."
28	37	Land Use Issues	6/3/2019	Add bullet point for development in non-residential districts	Agreed.	Add bulletpoint for non-residential setbacks: "Setbacks in non-residential areas vary from the format of other setbacks in the District, creating confusion and some issues between neighbors of the non-residential developments."
29	38	Land Use Categories	6/3/2019	Change "this purpose of this district" to "the purpose of this category"...I think that is more correct?	Agreed.	Change to "The purpose of this category . . ."

30	38	Land Use Catego	6/1/2019	paragraph 1, about 1/2 way down- what does this mean--"density transfers and clustered development shall be allowed---". I don't recall discussing this.	This language comes from these standard categories in the Sustainable Growth Management Plan. Density transfers are when a property owner purchases the right to develop their property above the base zonign allowed. Cluster developments allow a certain type of residential development that protects open space, agriculture and recreation by not placing a house in the middle of a big property, thereby preventing any future use of the land for those uses.	No change.
31	39	Land Use Map	6/3/2019	Clarify, are these existing boundaries?	Yes, these are the current boundaries.	Change label on map to "Existing San Marcos Land Use Map"
32	42	Goal 1	6/3/2019	Which strategy addresses protection of "significant land"? Also I know the strategies are not ordered by importance but I really think it is confusing when the last issue in the goal which is water is addressed by the first strategy. It makes this very hard to follow and is confusing. I don't think the order has to be perfect by to lay it out more in order will make it much easier to read and make sense of	Staff believes that Action 1.3.1 addresses protection of significant land including archaeological/historical sites, parks and trails, and creating buffesr between significant lands and new development.	No change.

33	42	Strategy 1.3	6/3/2019	This is a big diverse content heavy strategy...should it be broken into smaller strategies?	Agreed.	Break into smaller strategies: 1.3: Inspire rural character and lifestyle of the region by enhancing scenic views (including the Turquoise Trail Scenic Byway). Strategy 1.4: Maintain archaeological assets of the area. Strategy 1.5: Create trails that coexist well with the landscape and archaeological assets. Strategy 1.6: Set an example for education, sustainability, and resource management, including a balanced wildfire ecosystem.
----	----	--------------	----------	---	---------	---

34	42	Action 1.3.1	6/3/2019	I don't think there are any current parks or true trails...(except the state park) so how are we going to protect them? should we say something more like "Develop parks and trails" and then protect the integrity of the historical sites?	Santa Fe County has open space in the Western part of the District. There are also private conservation organization lands and Bureau of Land Management resources in the District.	No change.
35	42	Implementation	6/1/2019	rewrite sentence to read appropriately	Agreed.	Reword
36	42	Implementation	6/1/2019	-- this addresses water but not natural resources. Strategy 1.2 addresses natural resources.	Agreed.	Move Action.
37	42	Strategy 1.2	6/1/2019	Reword (e.g.) Conserve natural resources by encouraging use of renewable energy systems---. Oh, actually this is an action. What would be the strategy for this?	Agreed.	Add strategy to introduce this action.
38	42	Strategy 1.2	6/1/2019	What does this mean-- "Sustainable land use patterns", and how does it protect natural resources? Reword or explain, please. Perhaps rewrite by identifying strategy and related actions more clearly.	Agreed.	Reword to be clearer.
39	42	Strategy 1.3	6/1/2019	I'd say: Conserve rural character and---, maintaining and enhancing scenic views ---, respecting and maintaining the integrity of archaeological assets---.	Agreed.	Change wording to: Conserve rural character and---, maintaining and enhancing scenic views ---, respecting and maintaining the integrity of archaeological assets--.

40	43	Strategy 1.4	6/3/2019	Isn't this already addressed by strategy 1.1.2?	Agreed.	Combine 1.4 with 1.1.2
41	43	Action 2.1.2	6/3/2019	Can this relate better to Action 1.3.1 so they align and support each other?	Agreed.	Align Action 2.1.2 with Action 1.3.1
42	43	Strategy 1.4	6/1/2019	Strategy 1.4 and 1.5 are water-related and should be incorporated under Strategy 1.1	Agreed.	Incorporate Strategy 1.4 and 1.5 under Strategy 1.1
43	43	Action 1.3.11	6/1/2019	...prevention of light pollution and enforcement of existing County regulations for confining light to immediate property	The wording in this Action is more consistent with an action than the proposed language.	No change.
44	43	Action 2.1.2	6/1/2019	Add- while honoring the integrity of private property	Agreed.	Add- while honoring the integrity of private property
45	44	Action 2.2.1	6/3/2019	I am not sure "food security" is the correct term. Not sure what this means...to me it means making sure food supplies are safe from terrorist activities! None of this action really addresses supporting sustainable practices in terms of manure management, water use, care of animals	This could be clarified to be a less scary term. Making sure that food and resources are available to support the ongoing habitation of this area is pertinent.	Reword to frame around supporting agriculture.
46	44	Action 2.3.1	6/3/2019	what is meant by "flexible zoning"? We have had some serious discussions about the inability of the county and plan to address grandfathering or variances so what is meant by "flexible zoning"?		
47	44	Strategy 3.2	6/3/2019	This stagey is about internet and communication technology so the first action 3.2.1 should be eliminated as it is about public facilities and housing	This action could be reframed to be more consistent with the Goal.	Change Action 3.2.1 to better address Goal 3.

48	44	Action 3.2.2	6/3/2019	Again does not align with the strategy and I am not sure that we ever discussed this....encouraging local business to retrofit buildings to achieve code compliance? If this stays in we need to discuss	Agreed, may not be a feasible Action	Eliminate Action 3.2.2
49	44	Strategy 2.2	6/1/2019	Add - appropriately scaled	Agreed.	Add - appropriately scaled
50	44	2.3.1	6/1/2019	Commercial enterprises other than small home-based operations must be restricted to existing commercial zone	Small businesses should be allowed anywhere in the District. The scale of businesses will be addressed after the Plan is adopted and the San Marcos District Overlay indicates the size of buildings.	No change.
51	44	2.3.2	6/1/2019	WE do not wish to support significant economic development in this district as it is counter to rural nature of district.	This will be detailed in the Overlay when staff can identify the scale of development in the District.	No change.
52	44	2.3.3	6/1/2019	Confine to existing commercial zone along NM 14	Agreed.	Add language to confine Commercial zone to NM 14.
53	44	Action 3.2.2	6/3/2019	"incentives" like what? Is this feasible?	Agreed.	Remove this Action.
54	44	Goal 3	6/3/2019	What about the non-residential district? What is supported here?		
55	45	Strategy 3.4	6/3/2019	There are very few public buildings in this district...is that the right emphasis...do we mean new buildings of all kinds?	Agreed. This should be on all public and new buildings	Add language to indicate all public and new buildings should use renewable energy.

56	45	Strategy 3.5	6/3/2019	This is the most important strategy as discussed in the meeting and is buried so deep no one will notice....it should be moved up	Agreed.	Move Strategy 3.5 up in the list.
57	45	Goal 4	6/3/2019	Which strategy supports protection and preservation of Archaeological and historic resources	Action 1.3.1 addresses protection	Potentially combine Action 1.3.1 with Goal 4
58	45	Strategy 4.1	6/3/2019	what are San Marcos "elements"....is there a better word?...distinct features? Create more ways to identify San Marcos distinct features...?	Elements could be reworded.	Replace elements with "Attractions"
59	45	Action 4.2.4.	6/3/2019	at end add ..regarding best practices for issues like low water use landscaping, lights to promote dark skies, building practices for water conservation...some way make it a bit more specific	By naming "best practices" this allows flexibility in the Plan to adapt as needed to new types of technologies or practices. Being more specific could be helpful in the short term but harmful in the long term.	No change.
60	46	Strategy 5.1	6/3/2019	What do we mean by "support rural lifestyle" This is a really important strategy, much of what we have discussed is meant to preserve, maintain, "support" this lifestyle but there is no action, and just saying "support" seems vague.	This comment could relate back to the statement that was made on p. 20: "What makes this place?" "It is a value to live a rural lifestyle which includes equestrian and artistic uses, a love and respect fo rtheland, and a desire to enjoy the privacy and freedom of a rural setting "	Perhaps add an Action to address this definition on p. 20

61	46	Strategy 5.2	6/3/2019	Can this be clearer about what is meant by "amenities" especially in context of the rest of the strategy of amenities focused on allowing opportunity to provide for themselves and share expertise...would the amenities be internet?	Agreed.	Clarify amenities: useful or pleasant facilities or services. Explain how this relates to San Marcos District.
62	46	Strategy 5.3	6/3/2019	The elephant in the room.....this stagey does not align with strategy 5.1 nor does it align with much of what we discuss through out this plan and during the majority of the meetings we held. Protecting the rural lifestyle, protecting scenic views, and other outcomes are not supported by this strategy. Some setbacks in certain situations need to be changed. I did a quick search on community planning and found on page 171 of "Community Planning" by Eric D Kelly that variances are discussed as a necessary and reasonable part of the zoning process. Variances for things like unusual topography benefit both the community and landowner. It seems to me that we as a community and county should be able to figure out ways to fairly address special needs lots while still supporting the rural lifestyle that we all desire.	Agree. Variances are always an option for property owners, however, through this process, we have identified that there is an issue with how a much larger restriction has been placed over the entire District, without regard to the vast differences in property sizes in the District. Variances are an option, but they should not be the primary vehicle for land development. Santa Fe County does vary from other jurisdictions in that it takes a very strong stance on variances, whereby Staff recommend denial on almost every variance. This places a large burden especially on residential properties.	No change.

63	46	Strategy 5.6	6/3/2019	the word finding is confusing....maybe ...by allowing temporary structures that comply with reasonable construction and infrastructure requirements	Agree.	Change "finding" to something else.
64	46	Strategy 5.3	6/3/2019	<p>Page 46, Strategy 5.3, only expresses one viewpoint - that all setbacks in the entire District should be changed from 100 feet to 25 feet (excluding those special categories like Commercial, Hwy 14, etc.). For some reason, this is presented as the only position of the entire committee, and we all know that is not accurate or true. The idea is to present at least three alternate positions for this Strategy, with other possible ideas to further expand the discussion. Strategy 5.3, Alternative A: Align District standards with County setback standards. Alternative B: Align standards in the District Rural Residential zone with County setback standards. Alternative C: Maintain the current District setback standards. Added Strategy if either Alternative B or C is adopted: Strategy x.x: Work with Santa Fe County to encourage and facilitate more flexibility in the variance process in cases where development standards unfairly impact potential for reasonable development, such as setbacks on lots of five acres or less.</p>		

65	46	Strategy 5.3	6/1/2019	<p>This decision was NOT the decision of the whole committee. I think the 25' setback should be allowed ONLY on plots where reasonable construction of residence, barn, etc. cannot be conducted due to topographic restrictions. I strongly urge the County to consider a flexible approach to setbacks. In the meantime, I DO NOT agree with the 25' setback and I know many in the committee agree with me. A 50' or even 100' setback respects the rural character of the district. A 25' setback does not. I'd settle for a 50' setback, but definitely not a 25' setback.</p>	<p>This has been the topic of discussion at numerous meetings. Strategy 5.3 could list numerous Actions below it breaking down zoning districts and more specifics.</p>	<p>Add Actions below Strategy 5.3 to enumerate the desired changes to the District's zoning categories.</p>
----	----	--------------	----------	--	---	---