

La Cienega/La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting  
Meeting Notes: 1/12/2011

Attending:	contact #	contact e-mail
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
David Camp (lower LC)		david@laurencamp.com
Ivan Trujillo (upper LC)	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
Robert Griego	<u>995986-27746215</u>	rgriego@co.santa-fe.nm.us

Also attending: JJ Gonzales

Meeting started at 6:05 pm +/-

Gene's opening comments explained the purpose of the committee: to revise the existing La Cienega Community Plan (LCCP). SF County has adopted the Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP) which updates their county growth plan. The LCCP needs to incorporate SGMP ideas as appropriate and update the language to current conditions.

The existing LCCP and associated ordinance (SF #2002-9) both allow for updating the documents per County regulations and procedures. In order to meet these requirements, the committee will adopt the necessary procedures.

Introductions were made around the table.

Gene turned the meeting over to Arnie Valdez and Robert Griego from the County Planning Dept. to explain procedures and regulations and introduce the County's program to support the committee's efforts.

Robert reiterated the community planning process and explained explaining that the legal procedures and ~~that~~ a draft proposal-resolution would be generated to ~~take present~~ to the Board of County Commissioners for authorization to amend the LCCP. The planning dept will draft the proposal-resolution. The committee needs three reps from each district (Upper & Lower LC and La Cieneguilla) before the proposal is completed. Robert and Arnie expect to draft the proposal-resolution this month and present it to the Board in early February. The committee must demonstrate

representation from the broad planning area ~~and with~~ residential as well as business interests. Robert also brought up the question of incorporating the ~~Santa Fe horse-Horse park-Park~~ property into the planning area. Jose Varela Lopez commented that Los Alamos National Bank is the current owner to contact ~~about this~~ regarding the status of the property.

Arnie reviewed the basis for the SGMP and explained that the County hopes to update all community plans to be ~~in agreement~~ consistent with it.

Tom Dixon asked about the County's progress on its own definitions of zoning density and whether our efforts would be negated if the County's zoning definitions turned out to be different.

Robert explained that the SGMP has base zoning definitions in place and that these would carry over in code definitions. The SGMP is intended to adopt new ideas in local community zoning so long as it doesn't negate county wide zoning.

Arnie reviewed the procedural requirements needed to meet county regs:

- Open meetings with proper notices. - need to post meetings on local community boards.
- County to publish meeting schedule in their agenda and make a press release announcing the process

Tom voiced concerns that notifying the community was not always complete or easy. Rick noted that public notices as above should be sufficient for legal purposes, and that open meetings should satisfy the requirement. Gene asked that anyone who knew of an area of the community where notice was not being given should let the committee know so the area could be contacted.

Arnie ~~called for~~ suggested that the committee a vote to elect a chair person for the committee. Jose nominated Gene, Rick seconds, all committee members voted in favor, Gene was elected.

Arnie continued to review procedures:

- Committee members need to commit to attending meetings once schedule is adopted
- Meetings will be conducted according to Roberts Rules of Order
- The review process should consider plan and ordinance documents, and SGMP

Gene noted that the committee's task was the LCCP now, that the ordinance review would come afterward.

Arnie continued:

- Some technical work sessions may be needed with special interest groups or at the county planning dept. to review GIS data or other information.
- The committee should work with stakeholders to be sure they are aware of the plan review process and have a chance for input. Other stakeholders include: Kewa Pueblo (Kenny Pin), Borrego Construction, and the County rep representative for the Old La Bajada Ranch property.

JJ asked whether the Calle Debra and Las Lagunitas communities should be contacted about the review. The committee felt that these areas were already included in local notices and that they were past the stage of needing to plan for new development.

Arnie continued:

- The committee will need to define consensus in order to make decisions.
- Meetings will need to be recorded - meeting notes will be kept and reviewed for accuracy.
- Public notice and proper representation of the community were the responsibility of the county in order to keep the review process legal.

The meeting was turned over to Gene to continue. As chairman Gene declared the committee officially in order.

Gene reviewed the meeting protocols for action by the committee. The committee voted on and unanimously approved the following actions:

- meetings will be noticed on the 4 community boards
- the county will ~~put out~~ draft a press release announcing the meetings schedule and purpose
- the county will ~~put the~~ list the meeting schedule on its agenda/announcement s
- the committee will meet every other Wednesday at 6 pm at the LC community center to review and revise the LCCP. Estimated time range is 2 – 3 months to produce as draft revised plan. Once the draft is prepared, the county will advertise a public community meeting for public review of the draft. The meeting will be noticed in the newspapers, county agenda, local notice boards, and in the LCVA newsletter. Other steps to notify the public should be considered.
- the committee will operate under Roberts Rules of Order
- meetings will run for 90 minutes with one 30 minute extension if needed and agreed to by the committee.
- the committee will operate by consensus agreement consisting of a majority of the committee members. Dissenting opinions will be noted in the record and included (if appropriate) in the draft proposed LCCP.
- sessions will be documented by meeting notes. The committee will review each prior meeting's notes and approve / amend as needed.
- Jose was authorized to contact Los Alamos Nat'l Bank with regard to the horse park property to invite them to let the property become a part of the LC/LC Planning Area.

Tom asked for a hard copy of the SGMP, and Robert and Arnie indicated that a copy was available for temporary loan at the SFC planning dept. Tom would pick it up there.

Gene reviewed the LCCP revisions and suggested that the committee start with Sections 2 through 11. These sections should require less intense revision and will be easier to revise. Sections 1 and 12 include the zoning descriptions that will require more discussion.

The committee voted on and unanimously agreed to schedule a review of sections 2, 3 and 4 at the next meeting (Jan 26). Sections 5, 6 and 7 to be reviewed on Feb 9<sup>th</sup>, sections 8, 9, and 10 to be reviewed on Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>. Subsequent meetings will review section 11, and then sections 1 and 12.

The meeting was adjourned at approx . 7:30 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes January 26, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com

Also attending: JJ Gonzales, James Borrego, John Herbrand

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Meeting notes from 1/12/11 were reviewed and approved with grammatical corrections.

Gene reviewed the membership requirements for the committee. With the addition of Kathryn Becker as a representative from La Cieneguilla, the committee now has three or more reps from each district – La Cieneguilla, Upper La Cienega, and Lower La Cienega.

Gene proposed a format for review that would include:

- page by page review of the LC plan document at meetings
- proposals for major changes should be submitted in writing for the committee members to review at a subsequent meeting
- once a section was reviewed during a meeting, changes should be documented and circulated via e-mail to committee members. These changes would receive a final review at a subsequent meeting.

The committee agreed by unanimous vote to the review format.

Review of the LC Community Plan began with part 2, Water Quality.

Rick D. noted many instances where references to maps, information, etc. need clarification. Updated maps, documentation of water systems, etc. should be included in the plan to avoid confusion and provide better definition.

Page notes:

(All page numbers reference the original LC Plan document, revised edition 12/2010 with preliminary revision notes.)

(See revised document for specific language where not cited here.)

Page 12:

- a map showing all planning area water sources – streams, rivers, springs, supplemental ground water wells (to acequias and local water systems), and other pertinent water features will be provided by the County and referenced in the introduction. This would be an update of existing Map 3: Irrigable Lands, Acequias and Water Resources in La Cienega d La Cieneguilla already noted in the map section of the document.
- para. 2, Sen. 2, Arnie: substitute “discontinued” with “minimized”. Approved by unam. vote.
- an map of the Santa Fe watershed will be provided by the County. This will update Map 4: La Cienega Watershed showing the entire SF watershed which affects the LC area.
- Alonzo G. noted that Ray Ortiz of (? Location?) still uses a local spring as a domestic water source. Springs and local users will be included in the County’s map of local water resources (map 3).

Page 13:

- para.1 sen1, Arnie: substitute “aims” with “goals”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 1, Arnie: add reference to FEMA and flood zones to affect new development. Proposed language forthcoming by Gene.
- Under section Acequia Associations, para. 2, add reference to Map 2: La Cienega and La Cieneguilla Existing Land Use, and Map 3: Irrigable Lands, Acequias and Water Resources in La Cienega d La Cieneguilla. These maps to be updated by County.
- under section La Cienega Mutual Domestic Water System, update description of the system with info on users, extent of piping, connection to County system, added fire protection. Carl D. to contact the LCMDWA to obtain current info.

Page 14:

- under section County Water System,
- para. 1, Sentence 1, revise description of system extents.
- para.1, sentence 2, revise language noting fees and costs for hookup to system.
- para 1. Add reference to Map 4 – revised map to show extents of system and any future extensions in the works.
- para. 2, add language clarifying aquifer recharge with imported water.
- para. 3, sentence 3, delete “40 year”.
- para. 3, item C, substitute “mining” with “depletion”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 3, add new item G, include language about County growth areas and how this affects access to County water and other County resources.

Page15:

- under section Private Wells,
- para. 1, sentence 3, add “LCMDWA”, remove “mentioned above”, split into 2 sentences.
- para. 1, add reference to map 3.

Page 16:

- Arnie: title changes to reflect language in the SGMP (to be carried through entire document): Substitute “Key Issues” for “Problems”.
- item #3 – add reference to Map 2, La Cienega and La Cieneguilla Existing Land Use. Map to be updated by County to reflect lot sizes, identify sub-minimum lots, and all current lot/land division information.
- item #4 – add referene to Map 1: La Cienega and La Cieneguilla Community Planning Area. Map to be updated by the County with info on area area-wide high-volume water users. Substitute “Office of the State Engineer (OSE)” for “State Engineer’s Office (SEO)”.

- item #6 – revise language to reference the SGMP and support for centralized sewer and water systems.

Note: committee voted on title change language to be applied throughout, approved by unam. vote.

Page 17:

Rick: investigate the status of the Fleming Report and whether a County-recognized report exists. Add reference if appropriate. County to research current standing of the report.

- Arnie: title changes to reflect language in the SGMP (to be carried through entire document): substitute “keys to Sustainability” for “Goals”.
- Arnie: add references to SGMP and coordinate LC goals list with SGMP – look for consolidation of lists?

Page 18:

- Arnie: title changes to reflect language in the SGMP (to be carried through entire document): Substitute “Goals, Strategies, and Policies” for “Actions”.
- Arnie: revise “Ordinance Actions” language to incorporate SGMP and new County code references (when code is available.)

- section A:

- para. 1, add language about County system capacity and preferential service to existing users versus new users.
- para. 1, sentence 3, add “limit”. Approved by unam. vote.
- Tom: para. 2, sentence 1, delete “in”. Approved by unam. vote.

Section B:

- para. 1, sentence 1, retain current .25 afy volume limit. Approved by majority vote.
- para 1, sentence 1, add language “per lot of legal record”.
- para. 1, sentence 2, change “.50 acre feet” to “.25 acre feet”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 1, sentence 5, change “.75 acre feet” to .50 acre feet”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 1, sentence 6, add language “or other regulation that may apply.”
- para. 1 new sentence 7 – add language requiring water conservation measures.

Page 19:

Section C:

- para. 1, sentence 2, add language: “or within 500 feet of”.

Section D:

- para. 1 - add new sentence 2: language about County system capacity and preferential service to existing users versus new users.

Section F:

- para. 1, sentence 1, add language including community water management authority in notice requirements.

Page 20:

Section G:

- para 1, sentence 1, add language “as well as current sustainability practices”.
- para 1, sentence 3, add language: “but not required to”.

Section I:

- para 1, sentence 1, add language “satisfy”.

Section J:

Jose to investigate riparian water consumption and report back with info. This section to be revised with specific language about volumes, consumption limits, etc.

- Arnie: revise “program Actions” language to incorporate SGMP and new County code references (when code is available.)

Program Actions Section A, #2 – Add language about preferential water service for existing users.

Page 21:

Program Actions Section A:

#3, sentence 3 – add language “at least once every six months” to effluent testing time frame. Delete language allowing effluent injection into aquifer. Injection shall not be used.

#4, - add language encouraging 3 year time frame for water study.

Program Actions Section B:

- sentence 1, change SEO to OSE.

#3 – delete return flow credit language.

Part 3 Water Quality and Wastewater

Page 22:

- para 3 – add reference to SF city effluent volume – committee to investigate current volume and insert data.

- para 4, sentence 2 – Arnie: substitute “goals” for “aims”. Approved by unam. vote.

Page 23:

Title change (see above)

Key Issues

#1 – Alonzo: add language identifying issue of leaching of septic fields into waterways.

#3 – Jose: sentence 1, delete “River”. Approved by unam. vote.

New #6 – add language identifying issue of non-enforcement of state law requiring septic system inspection at the sale of property. (Issue identified by John Herbrand)

New #7 – add language identifying issue of permit process not requiring mapping of wells, waterways, etc. on adjacent properties. (Issue identified by Jim Borrego)

Title change (see above)

Page 24:

Title change (see above)

Revise ordinance action language per Arnie (see above)

Actions:

#A – Rick and Tino to propose new language for this section.

Proposed language specifying better waste treatment systems was discussed and felt to be too restrictive. The committee agreed to review language (to be developed by Gene) specifying better treatment systems in proximity to waterways, springs, etc.

Revise program action language per Arnie (see above)

Page 25:

Actions:

#4 – add language “and local ordinance compliance as appropriate”.

Part 4 – Open Space

Page 26:

- para. 1, sentence 3 – substitute “common” for “open”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 2, sentence 2 – add “common lands”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 2, sentence 3 – delete “running”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 2, sentence 4 – delete “fee”. Approved by unam. vote.
- para. 3 – Jose to investigate current BLM documentation to see if reference here needs to be updated.

Title change (see above)

Problems

#2 – Rick: delete language: “such as hiking, horseback riding and grazing”.

Page 27:

Title change (see above)

Page 28:

Title change (see above)

Revise program action language per Arnie (see above)

---End of Page revision notes---

Projects identified during this meeting:

Arnie Valdes and the County staff will develop a current map of water resources within the planning area. This map will include surface waters, acequias, springs, supplemental ground wells used to support acequia systems, and residences currently using springs as their primary source of water. The map will show irrigable lands, irrigated lands, and other water related data.

Additional maps to be provided by the county:

Vicinity map with planning area to include high-volume water users in the vicinity – identified by name and volume of water use.

Planning area map with all lots delineated. Sub-minimum sized lots to be clearly identified, and show whether these were created by family transfer lot splits or other means.

Watershed map showing LC watershed area where Watershed Conditions apply, upstream users within the watershed, sources of upstream contamination and high-volume use, and other information that affects the LC watershed.

The County will investigate the current status of the Fleming Report and research other reports to see one of similar scope and content exists that is supported by the County. If a report exists, it may be referenced in the Community Plan.



Carl D. will contact the Mutual domestic water association to get current figures on capacity, users, potential extensions, fire protection capacity, and shared capacity with the county water system.

Jose will research wetland/riparian area requirements for better definition of water use – clearer language is needed to define what constitutes consumptive use so that assessment of the effect on surrounding areas can be determined. Arnie suggests looking at the NM State research on Alcalde specific to this issue. Alonzo suggests looking at info from Sandia (labs?) for information.

Committee should investigate availability of SF City effluent discharge records to be cited in part 3.

Committee should investigate NM state law requiring inspection of septic systems at time of sale of property – to be cited in part 3.

Jose will research the current BLM plan for the LC area to provide updated info on BLM intent. Update part 4 with new info.

Other notes:

At approx. 7:25 the meeting time was extended by unanimous vote to 8:00 pm.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Meeting notes: task assignments resulting from the meeting:

(Rick D. noted many instances where references to maps, information, etc. need clarification. Updated maps, documentation of water systems, etc. should be included in the plan to avoid confusion and provide better definition.)

Projects:

Arnie Valdes and the County staff will develop a current map of water resources within the planning area. This map will include surface waters, acequias, springs, supplemental ground wells used to support acequia systems, and residences currently using springs as their primary source of water. The map will show irrigable lands, irrigated lands, and other water related data.

Additional maps to be provided by the county:

Vicinity map with planning area to include high-volume water users in the vicinity – identified by name and volume of water use.

Planning area map with all lots delineated. Sub-minimum sized lots to be clearly identified, and show whether these were created by family transfer lot splits or other means.

Watershed map showing LC watershed area where Watershed Conditions apply, upstream users within the watershed, sources of upstream contamination and high-volume use, and other information that effects the LC watershed.

The County will investigate the current status of the Fleming Report and research other reports to see one of similar scope and content exists that is supported by the County. If a report exists, it may be referenced in the Community Plan.

Carl D. will contact the Mutual domestic water association to get current figures on capacity, users, potential extensions, fire protection capacity, and shared capacity with the county water system.

Jose will research wetland/riparian area requirements for better definition of water use – clearer language is needed to define what constitutes consumptive use so that assessment of the effect on surrounding areas can be determined. Arnie suggests looking at the NM State research on Alcalde specific to this issue. Alonzo suggests looking at info from Sandia (labs?) for information.

Committee should investigate availability of SF City effluent discharge records to be cited in part 3.

Committee should investigate NM state law requiring inspection of septic systems at time of sale of property – to be cited in part 3.

Jose will research the current BLM plan for the LC area to provide updated info on BLM intent. Update part 4 with new info.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes February 9, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Stan Jones (La Cieneguilla)	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net

Also attending: James Borrego, John Herbrand

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Meeting notes from 1/26/11 were not complete and will be reviewed for approval at the next meeting.

Review of prior chapters 2, 3, and 4, and task list:

Prior to the 2/12 meeting a task list was compiled by Gene from the 1/26/11 meeting. These projects aim to complete the content of chapters 2 through 4 with clarifying information and other data.

Updates to the list:

- New/revised maps to be provided by the County: work in process on. Arnie brought sample land use map with lots. Water resources map will require some community input to locate springs. A day in March will be arranged to bring GPS equipment to pinpoint springs.
- Fleming Report – Arnie brought a copy of the report for review by committee members. No updated report has been identified. Could the County adopt the conclusions of the Fleming report? –tbd
- Jose has investigated riparian/wetland water consumption and has not found quantitative data so far. More research to be done.
- SF City effluent discharge – Jose has data from recent 10 months. Committee will use this to estimate volume.

- State law on septic system inspections – Kathryn verified that the law exists. She will provide reference language for inclusion in the plan.
- BLM reports – Jose investigated current BLM documents and no new report has come out. The existing language in the Plan is still current.
- commercial uses language: Rick and Tino are working on revised language. Rick suggested simple language to permit anything allowed by state and county laws. Proposed language to be provided by Rick and Tino for committee review.
- language on waste treatment systems – Gene provided proposed language requiring stricter controls near waterways, etc. This will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Page notes:

(All page numbers reference the original LC Plan document, revised edition 12/2010 with preliminary revision notes.)

(See revised document for specific language where not cited here.)

Page 29:

- para. 1, sentence 1, revise description of agriculture to include farming and ranching
- para. 3: Rick proposed deletion of “primary” from last sentence. After considerable discussion it was the consensus of the committee to leave it. As a clarifying point, the County map showing land use should be consulted to see how much of the planning area is used for agriculture purposes.
- para. 3. Add reference to Map 2 with land use information.

Page 30:

Title changes, ongoing, to match SGMP language.

Key issues;

#2 – Jim Borrego proposed substitute “to” for “for other”.

#4 – tom – delete “often”

Goals, Strategies, Policies:

Add SGMP references

Page 31:

Community specific goals:

#A – Kathryn – add language to include a local farmer’s market among the goals

#F – Jose- add language specifying Federal and State lands for grazing; Jose: delete “seen as”

Arnie: consider adding SGMP references to local goals to show overlapping goals

Page 32:

Part 6 - Transportation and Roads

Note: Ivan has volunteered to revise this section and update the language to current.

- para. 1 – add Railrunner description.
- para. 2 – Arnie: change “Camino Real” to “Camino Real de Tierra Adentro”.
- para. 2 – delete “and home sites”. Consider other language to clarify roadways leading to home sites.

- para. 4. Revise description of County roadwork.

Title changes, ongoing

Page 33:

Key Issues

#6 – Arnie suggested that blind and sharp curves be identified on Map 6 of roadways

Alonzo: New #8 – add issue of poor emergency access to many homes

Goals, Strategies, Policies:

Add SGMP references

Arnie: consider access to transit systems – trains, and more, as a goal

Title changes, ongoing

Page 34:

Arnie suggested revision of Program Actions language when new SGMP and County code are available for reference.

Program Actions

New #11 – Kathryn and others: add goal of developing better walking trails and walking access along roadways.

Part 7 Overhead utility Cables

Page 35:

Revise chapter title to Utility Infrastructure

Title changes, ongoing

Key issues

New #2 – Jose – problem of no means to add easement access for utilities to existing lots.

Goals, Strategies, Policies:

#A- substitute “services” for “fixtures”.

Arnie suggested revision of Program Actions language when new SGMP and County code are available for reference.

Program Actions

#A- substitute “services” for “fixtures”.

Jim B. suggested a look at the Colonias code as a model for easement access.

Part 8 Garbage

Page 36:

Revise chapter title to “Solid Waste”

- para. 1 revise description of dump access and permit fees.

Title changes, ongoing

Key issues

#2 – revise language to reflect problem of too broad of a service area for the transfer station.

Keys to sustainability:

Add SGMP reference

Community goals:

#2 – revise language to specify enforcement of law against illegal dumping

Page 37:

Title changes, ongoing

Goals, Strategies, Policies:

A1 – revise language to make goal of additional transfer sites

A7 – delete recycling goal – already done.

Other notes:

In general discussion Rick suggested that the issue of crime prevention be incorporated into the Plan. The committee will look at it for an appropriate location for the language.

Arnie suggested that an Energy Plan be included in the document. This would probably require a new chapter.

Ivan mentioned “night skies’ and light pollution/lighting as an issue that should be included in the Plan. The committee should consider where this would be included.

The meeting was extended, by unam. vote. From 7:30 to 8:00.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes February 23, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones (La Cieneguilla)	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Also attending:		
For Santa Fe Canyon Ranch partners:		
James Borrego	473-0348	jrb3056@qwestoffice.net

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Meeting notes from 1/26/11 were reviewed and approved as written. 2/9/11 notes were amended to correct the date and approved as amended.

Review of prior chapters 2 through 8, and task list:

Jose provided documentation of the city of Santa Fe effluent discharge volume from 2009 and partial 2010. The committee agreed to use these numbers to determine an average volume for insertion into chapter 3, Introduction section. Gene will provide an average figure for review.

Jose provided a document from the OSE, dated 6/24/2002, with reference information on riparian and wetland water consumption. After discussion of option including footnoting the letter into the Plan or citing parts of it direct in the document, it was agreed that a citation would be included. The citation will reference:

- the U.S. Soil Conservation Service Modified Blaney-Criddle Method as a guideline for determining consumptive irrigation requirements for vegetation.
- U.S Bureau of Reclamation Consumptive-Use Coefficients for riparian vegetation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley

- Consumptive Irrigation Requirement (CIR), an annual measure of water uptake by vegetation, exclusive of precipitation

This language will be inserted into chapter 2, Goals, Strategies, and Policies section, Item J.

Kathryn provided specific reference the NMAC requirements for septic system inspections at time of sale of a property. Kathryn will provide appropriate language to be inserted into Chapter 3, Key Issues section, item 6.

Arnie brought several updated maps with information on current uses, lots, zoning, and more. Maps are progressing well. Rick submitted revised language for Chapter 3, Goals, Strategies, and Policies section, item A. Gene voiced some concerns regarding the language, specifically that some county, state and federal standards may not be strong enough or may not be enforced. A discussion of gas station standards included reference to underground tank standards in particular – Federal standards permit a single wall tank in some circumstances. Some states require a double wall tank as a higher standard. New Mexico does not require double wall tanks.

Gene also noted that mortuaries (also on the list of excluded uses in item A) have standards to prevent groundwater contamination, but New Mexico has minimal enforcement of these regulations.

Rick and Tino proposed moving the existing language in item A to the chapters on zoning. Tome voiced concern that the language be preserved in the zoning chapters.

The committee voted unanimously to move the language from Item A to the zoning chapters (1 and 12).

Gene asked that the proposed new language for item A be considered another time in case stronger wording with regard to regulations and protection of water was needed.

Gene submitted revised language for Chapter 3, Goals, Strategies, and Policies section, item E, on waste treatment standards. Kathryn agreed to rewrite the language with current references.

The meeting was extended, by unam. vote. From 7:30 to 8:00.

Jim Borrego asked to be included in e-mails from the committee. The committee agreed.

A discussion of the horse park property included:

- Jose is looking for an incentive to take to the current bank owners to encourage them to apply for inclusion in the Planning Area.
- the current status of the property is non-conforming use according to County zoning maps.
- inclusion in the LC Planning Area might allow them to convert to a conforming use status as part of the revision of the LC Plan.
- more discussion is needed.

A date (to be determined) in March will be set for the County GIS staff to visit the community and locate existing springs for inclusion in the mapping. Tom will help coordinate the effort and a notice will be included in the LCVA newsletter.

The committee agreed to defer review of chapters 9, 10, 11 until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.



La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes March 9, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us

<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com

Also attending:

For Santa Fe Canyon Ranch partners:

James Borrego 473-0348 jrb3056@qwestoffice.net

Mike Taylor: Upper La Cienega, airport area

Darrin Muenzberg, La Bajada

Meeting started at 6:10 pm

Meeting notes from 2/23/11 were reviewed and approved as written.

Review of prior chapters 9 through 11:

Page 38:

-Part 9 Fire Protection, para. 1 – updated info on fire hydrant locations is needed. The County will provide a map of the current system. Carl will check to see if Sunrise Springs has a fire hydrant at Los Pinos or elsewhere.

Page 39:

- Add new Goal #11 – Extend fire protection down Capilla Vieja, and extend protection into La Cieneguilla.  
- Arnie to investigate whether federal funds may be available to extend fire protection.

Page 40:

Part 10 Airport:

Discussion of airport issues:

- Rick: Are noise abatement procedures employed at the airport, any particular times?

Mike Taylor: An Environmental Impact Statement was created when the airport last proposed to expand services. The statement focused on expanded service, not existing service. The EIS was probably adopted, but unsure. The EIS may have language regarding noise abatement or other issues important to local the LC community.

Jose has a copy of the EIS and will review it.

Mike Taylor: the City of SF needs to be involved in any discussions about airport impacts – noise control, etc.

Tom D: noise levels are higher than in the past, from private planes, not commuter jets.

Mike T: helicopter flights and weekend flights are up in number in recent years.

Page 41:

- modify Goal #7 – “work with the National Guard to reduce the impact of flights over populated areas and undeveloped private property in the Planning Area through higher flight patterns, noise abatement efforts, and other means.”

- add new Goal #8: “ Encourage the airport management to educate pilots and other airport personnel about the importance of noise abatement procedures, common courtesy toward local residents, and the locations of private property in the airport vicinity.”

- Mike T: there has been talk of a new airport in the past. Is this a real possibility?

- Kathryn B will investigate new airport proposals

Page 42:

Part 11: Community Facilities

Discussion:

Rick D put forth idea of using the Downs property to develop a new community center facility, playground, etc. The Pueblo would like to consider a center as part of their development plans.

Kathryn B: would a community center include a community/commercial kitchen?

Carl D: a grant is pending from the Santa Fe Alliance to develop the existing kitchen facilities at the current community center into a commercial kitchen.

Arnie: Duncan Sill’s proposal for development of the County’s La Bajada Ranch property includes a potential commercial kitchen.

Key issues: modify #1: “The Planning Area’s existing community center is not centrally located and does not have adequate facilities to support a sufficient range of community activities, particularly outdoor activities. The facility is too small, lacks adequate parking, and is not convenient or central in location.”

Goals section, revised area-specific goals language:

Arnie V: “All proposed community facilities shall be designed through consultation with a representative community body and shall include low water use design, energy efficient construction, passive solar features, and low-maintenance design.”

Page 43:

Goals:

Modify #4: Add language: “A message board or kiosk shall be included at the community center.”

Add new goal #5: “develop a commercial kitchen for community use.”

Add new goal #6: “develop a permanent funding source for community outreach, including announcement board signs, community website expansion and maintenance, community newsletters, and other informational programs.”

End of chapter review

Preparation for review of chapters 1 and 12 will include maps for the committee to mark up with proposed zoning ideas.

Updates of chapters 2 – 8:

Carl indicated that Robert Romero is willing to provide info on the mutual domestic system, but has not yet.

Language describing the city's effluent discharge - with modifications – was approved for inclusion in Part 3, introduction, para. 2:

“The average volume of effluent discharge from the Santa Fe City waste treatment plant was 3.64 million gallons per day for 2009 and 2010. Volumes were higher from November through march, averaging 4.59 million gallons per day. Volumes were lower from April through October, averaging 2.96 million gallons per day. June volumes were lowest overall, averaging 2.52 million gallons.”

Language describing the wetland / riparian area water use – with modifications – was approved for inclusion in Chapter 2, Goals section, item J:

“OSE guidelines for determining the consumptive needs of the riparian area or wetlands shall use the U.S. National Resource Conservation Service (formerly the U.S. Soil Conservation Service) Modified Blaney-Criddle Method, long-term weather data for the period from 1867 onward, and consumptive-use coefficients developed by the U.S Bureau of Reclamation for riparian vegetation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley. The Consumptive Irrigation Requirement (CIR), an annual measure of water uptake by vegetation, exclusive of precipitation, shall be calculated for all proposed types of vegetation to be incorporated into the riparian area or wetlands.”

Ivan was not present to review chapter 6 language.

Kathryn provided language from state regs regarding setback requirements for septic/waste treatment systems from various water sources. The setbacks include 10 ft from lined canals (including acequias) and 25 feet from unlined canals(including acequias) . No local modifications were suggested.

The date for the County to GPS local springs is being coordinated by Carl, Tom, and Arnie. An announcement will be included in the next LCVA newsletter.

Arnie presented information on a development/design process for the County's la Bajada ranch property. Duncan Sill (County planning dept.) has put together a proposed process that would involve the community and area groups with interests that could overlap. A separate working group may be put together to work with this proposal.

Jim B. noted that the County property lacks water resources and will difficult to develop as the infrastructure will be expensive.

Two announcements prior to adjournment:

Carl: ditch cleaning days are coming soon, volunteers are needed.

Rick: the Downs is looking into hosting a “Mexico Night Dance” event, every other weekend through the summer.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

The meeting was extended, by unam. vote. From 7:30 to 8:00.

Jim Borrego asked to be included in e-mails from the committee. The committee agreed.

A discussion of the horse park property included:

- Jose is looking for an incentive to take to the current bank owners to encourage them to apply for inclusion in the Planning Area.
- the current status of the property is non-conforming use according to County zoning maps.
- inclusion in the LC Planning Area might allow them to convert to a conforming use status as part of the revision of the LC Plan.
- more discussion is needed.

A date (to be determined) in march will be set for the County GIS staff to visit the community and locate existing springs for inclusion in the mapping. Tom will help coordinate the effort and a notice will be included in the LCVA newsletter.

The committee agreed to defer review of chapters 9, 10, 11 until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes March 23, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com

Also attending:

From the proposed mixed use/commercial zone in Upper La Cienega:

Barry Martinez  
Martha Ruiz  
Gloria Gallegos  
Jerry Velarde

Meeting started at 6:10 pm

Meeting notes from 3/9/11 were reviewed and approved with corrections.

Review of prior chapter 1:

Pages 1 through 8:

Carl Dickens and Arnie Valdez agreed to review these pages on the history of the community and community plan and present proposed changes to the committee at a future meeting.

Page 9:

There was a discussion of the future of the community planning committee/review board. The committee agreed that representation should continue to be spread among the community areas (La Cieneguilla and Upper and Lower La Cienega). The County would still be responsible for appointing members. The new group would probably be a "Community Organization" using the language of the SGMP. The community should develop a

method for nominating members to the CO, but anyone interested could apply to the County for potential appointment. Possible local interests to be part of the CO group might include ranch and agriculture groups, mixed use/commercial groups, other local interests. Guidelines for membership on the CO should be considered by the community. Part of this may be a task for the LCVA.

Pages 10 & 11:

Gene reviewed the existing zoning based on hydrological zones. The LC planning area includes four zones: Traditional Community, Homestead, Basin Fringe, and Basin. The latter three zones are no longer a part of the SGMP. These zones have a base density ranging from 10 to 160 acres. All can have greater density with access to water – the minimum for all three zones is 2.5 acres per unit. The TC is a special zone that may or may not carry through with the new zoning. The TC has a maximum density of .75 acres per unit.

Gene described the proposed zoning based on a base density and incentives to increase density. Incentives would encourage sustainable development per the SGMP.

The committee felt that the concept was workable.

Arnie asked the committee to begin by defining the TC zone. The current boundaries are not exact, but they cross many property lines, dividing pieces of land into more than one zoning district. This has created a conflict at the zoning/planning level as land owners try to figure out what their zoning densities are.

Arnie asked that documents relating to the TC be sent to the committee. Gene will e-mail these.

Gene suggested that the TC issue has three possibilities:

- eliminate the special zoning designation (but not the historic cultural designation) so that properties follow the same guidelines as the rest of the community.
- keep the zoning as it is.
- modify the zoning.

If the special zoning designation is eliminated, the boundary will no longer be an issue as far as development is concerned.

If the special zoning is maintained or modified, a better boundary definition should be considered so that properties are not split between zoning districts.

The committee agreed to consider these issues until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes April 6, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Bob & Jan Cochran (for Alonzo)	984-1947	
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
Timothy Cannon	995-2727	SF County Planning Dept.
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com

Also attending:

Ken Luckie – Upper la Cienega  
Mike Rondeau

Meeting started at 6:10 pm

Agenda approved.

Meeting notes from 3/23/11 were reviewed and approved, Bob Cochran abstained.

The meeting began with a (continuing from last meeting) discussion of the boundary and definition of the Traditional Community zoning area. The current boundary cuts through many lots, creating land parcels with multiple zoning. Can the boundary be adjusted to reduce this?

Tom D.: are traditional communities still maintained in the SGMP? Arnie: yes, they are recognized in the SGMP

Tom D.: are family transfers (FT) maintained in the new county code? Arnie: the issue is unresolved.

Discussions about the new code will begin soon, and family transfers is one of the issues to be resolved.

Tom D.: if the LC community plan disallows family transfers, but the County maintains them in the code, how will this resolved? Tim C.: a community can restrict family transfers by size, density, etc. Whether FT's can disallowed is an unresolved legal issue.

Arnie presented background info on traditional historic communities (THC). THCs were adopted by the 1980 county code. The boundary to the LC THC dates to that time. A hand drawn document was submitted as part of the LC boundary, but its origin is unknown. In 2000, the county began to survey the LC THC to better define it. Adjustments were made to better follow some lot lines..

Tim: Old zoning boundaries were basically random, not following lot lines, geography or other features. Current planning guidelines try to look at lot lines, landscape, hydrology, and other factors to determine zoning boundaries.

Tim presented a revised LC THC boundary that follows lot lines wherever possible. Except along the Arroyo Hondo, most lot lines are followed. Tim provided a map of the proposed new boundary.

The committee reviewed the map and the general feeling was that it made small adjustments to the THC boundary and cleaned up many of the lot line issues.

Bob Cochran asked that the old Gallegos ranch property – now Tres Rios - (Bob and Jan are the current owners) be considered for inclusion in the THC. The water rights for the ranch were lost in the 1970's during the state's registration efforts to catalog all water rights. The rights were returned in the 1990's. Similarly, the Gallegos family did not ask to be included in the THC in 1980, but this can be corrected now.

The ranch is one of the oldest settled properties in the valley, and it has some of the oldest buildings including the oldest chapel. It was once the village center of the LC community. The property is contiguous to the current THC.

Kathryn: the expansion of the THC boundary is good for the community.

Tom: The THC should include traditional settled areas – where people lived versus traditional pasture lands. The Gallegos property has settlement and pasture lands. Although splitting parcels is not generally a good idea, in this case it would be more appropriate to only include the settlement part of the ranch.

Tom: is it in the best interest of the community to expand the higher density zoning area?

Rick: Would inclusion of the ranch in the THC give it ¾ acre zoning?

Arnie: generally, the THC would include ¾ acre zoning, but this is subject to discussion and possible change.

Tom: could the inclusion of the ranch also specify the zoning?

Discussion: if separate zoning was specified, this would effectively create a different zoning area than the THC. It would be better to keep the single zone with the same density.

Bob agreed to provide a map of the property showing the settlement area so that the committee could consider it for inclusion.

The committee generally agreed that the ranch should be considered for inclusion as it met the historical requirements to part of the THC.

Jose asked the committee to consider a similar request to create a THC zone for the La Cieneguilla area. He provided a map from 1898 of the original settlement area dating to much earlier.

The committee agreed to consider the request and asked Jose to work with the County planning dept to develop a proposed boundary.

Tom: does the zoning in the THC (and in the rest of the planning area) promote the preservation of agriculture in the community? We need a way to preserve it that makes economic sense as well as zoning sense.

At 7:30 Rick proposed an extension of the meeting to 8. Unanimously approved.

Tom asked if the transfer of development rights (TDR) could be considered in the plan as a possible way to preserve ag lands.



A discussion of TDRs included the possibility of creating a beneficial situation to preserve ag lands and promote commercial and mixed use development in other areas within the community planning area. A goal could be to preserve the ag lands and provide mixed use areas with greater development potential through TDRs.

A discussion of conservation easements – these could be used to preserve ag lands, but they don't fit into the zoning / community plan format. They are a good concept, but one that individual land owners would need to pursue. The committee agreed that language to encourage the use of conservation easements should be included in the LC Plan.

Gene asked if a proposal on Tim's proposed THC boundary adjustment should be considered.

Rick proposed that the boundary be adopted, open to exceptions and subject to adjustments by the committee as the review process continues, with the additional of the partial Tres Rios property , boundary to be determined, and with the addition of the la Cieneguilla historic community, boundary to be determined.

Tino seconded the motion.

Discussion: Bob: are split lots included in Tim's adjusted boundary? Tim: yes.

Kathryn: does the boundary follow lot lines as much as possible? Tim: yes.

The committee voted to accept the proposal (unanimous).

In preparation for the next meeting, Gene asked the committee to review the proposed zoning guidelines.

Kathryn asked if the county had a "suitability for development" scale or weighting factor to help with the discussion. Arnie referred to the list of General Zoning District Boundary Considerations he provided, the list had not been prioritized. Tim referred to the county's suitability map as a potential guideline – it includes many zoning factors in weighting areas for development potential.

Tom asked if the proposed zoning guidelines to be reviewed followed the SGMP?

Gene said that it included SGMP info and other zoning info relating to sustainable zoning. The committee should look at the SGMP to be familiar with it so that the LC plan can work with it.

The discussion of the THC to be continued as more info is available. Bob and Jose will try to have maps for consideration of the additional zoning areas.

Carl made two announcements: development of the land across 599 from the LC planning area is ongoing. Meetings with the developer are in the works.

The LCVA has dedicated the next year to focusing on water issues.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.



Discussion included whether to simplify the list for the LC area, combining some residential definitions into one type, and whether the commercial definitions allowed for mixed use.

The committee felt that the list as written (pg. 47, SGMP) would work, and that the LC planning area might not need to include all the various zoning types. Mapping the community would determine which zoning types were needed.

Rick proposed adoption of the SGMP zoning definitions (per page 47, SGMP). Tino seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Rick also suggested that the committee review the SGMP for info on TDR (transfer of development rights). Gene noted that he had spoken to Jack Kolkmeier (head of SF county planning) and asked jack to do a presentation at a future meeting of the committee to talk about TRDs.

At 7pm a review of the traditional historic community zone commenced.

Bob Cochran supplied a map of the Tres Rios property. He proposed inclusion of the entire property in the THC. After discussion, the committee asked that the map be reconsidered to exclude grazing lands, particularly at the south end of the property. A new map will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Jose supplied a map of the La Cieneguilla area showing an overlay of the 1898 map onto the current map. The committee suggested that a boundary for the historic zone follow current lot lines wherever possible. Jose will work with the County staff to develop a proposed boundary. The proposed historic zone for La Cieneguilla would not mean a change in zoning densities, rather it would recognize the historic nature of the area.

In preparation for the next meeting, Gene will send the committee copies of the LC planning area maps from the county. At the next meeting the committee will begin mapping work to define zoning areas based on the zoning types adopted earlier.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes May 4, 2011, La Cienega Community Center, amended & approved, 5/18/11

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com

<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com

<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net

<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
Tim Cannon	995-2727	

<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com

<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net

Also attending:  
John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega  
Bob & Jan Cochran – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:30 pm

Agenda approved.  
Meeting notes from 4/20/11 were reviewed and approved.

Continued discussion of zoning issues: determining density and mapping of various zones.

The committee requested a copy of the County SDA map for reference – shows the Sustainable Development Areas according to current reckoning. SDA 1,2,3 are potential development zones in order of preference, area 1 being most likely to be developed in the near future, area 2, being less likely, and area 3 being least likely. SDAs are supposed to consider many factors – access to utilities, proximity to current development, etc.

The proposed mixed use zone that would include the racetrack and the area between Los Pinos and NM599 – this area is currently shown in the SDA2. The committee discussed asking that it be moved into SDA1. No vote was taken.

Government lands

The LC planning area includes a large amount of government land, including Federal, State and County lands. Discussion of the zoning for this area included:

- the zoning types list (adopted from the SGMP, pg. 47) includes a conservation designation that is already used for the County's land within the planning area.
- much of the gov. land is currently used for ranching
- the Federal (BLM) lands have a management plan already in place. Jose believes that this plan does not foresee the sale or transfer of any of these local lands into private hands. The BLM management plan identifies areas of critical concern that the gov. intends to protect.
- Kathryn proposed a "common lands" designation for these lands in keeping with the historical common lands practice of the early settlers to the area. This would be a type of conservation designation with a "common lands" addition.
- as long as the gov. lands remain in governemtn control, any zoning proposed by the community would not apply. Gov. lands are exempt? The creation of a zoning designation for these lands would only apply in case the lands (or any part thereof) were transferred out of gover. Control or ownership.
- putting a zoning designation on these lands sets a baseline in case of changes in the future, fully understanding that it has no impact while the lands are gov. owned.

Stan made a motion to designate all government lands within the planning area, except the 470 acres of SF canyon ranch, as Conservation zoning

Tom seconded.

Discussion:

Jose disagreed with making a zoning designation on these lands as no potential change in ownership was likely. He pointed out that the lands were already managed, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) were identified, the Camino Real was recognized with these management plans.

Tom favored conservation zoning as it had a preservation effect.

Rick felt that the County's lead in setting the conservation zoning for their land was a good precedent.

Vote: in favor: Rick, Stan, Tom, Sylvia, Kathryn. Opposed: Jose, Alonzo, David.

The motion passed.

Stan asked if this was in keeping with the community's nature.

Carl read the community Vision Statement.

Tribal lands:

The large section of land owned by the Tewa pueblo is located at the southwest section of the planning area.

A discussion of the status of the land:

The land is currently in the process of being incorporated into the traditional tribal lands, making it "sovereign in keeping with other tribal lands. This process may take years to complete.

Once the land is incorporated, no outside zoning will apply.

The committee felt that putting any zoning designation on this land would serve no purpose.

The land will be identified as "Tewa Pueblo Tribal Land" on the planning area maps.

Private large parcels.

There are a small number of large parcels of private land remaining within the planning area. Some of these include: Varela-Lopez family property in the La Cieneguilla area, SF Canyon ranch property, Tres Rios property.

Discussion of the Varela-Lopez property:

Currently used for ranching.

Potential zoning designations could be Agriculture and Ranching, or Rural.

Kathryn felt that maintaining a rural distinction is good for the community – perhaps a non-subdivisional zoning would be useful.

Tom asked Arnie and Tim what the County's goal was in defining sustainable development?

Tim: the former geo-hydrological zoning was based on a 100 year supply model – this meant that after 100 years, all the water would be used up. This was not sustainable. The new model was meant to maintain resources – water, etc. by not using them up – equilibrium.

Tom: How do we limit development potential on lands that should be preserved?

Gene: zoning's goal is to set limits on development in keeping with community or other criteria – preservation, mixed use, etc.

Jose: Maintain the right for rural lands to be developed in the future. Off-grid development may not need infrastructure from the outside.

Gene: Zoning does not set permanent limits. Zoning designates current limits that can be modified through gov. or community process. Changes in zoning density are usually done in small steps – larger steps are allowed by the process.

Arnie: areas can be designated as opportunity centers – this allows for development.

Rick ask about the lands adjacent to the V-L property – currently it is next to government land and residential land.

Alonzo: can the discussion be expanded to include all the large parcels?

The committee agreed.

The committee agreed to extend the meeting time to 8pm.

Tom said that it was difficult to discuss potential zoning of large parcels without knowing the impact of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs). If no TDRs were available, then lower density may be appropriate to preserve lands.

A discussion of TDRs:

Arnie and Gene will contact Jack Kolkmeier about a presentation about TRDs.

Gene: should all large parcels be considered as potential TDR areas?

David asked why we were looking at mapping before we determined what the density of the zoning definitions was?

Gene: thought it might be better to understand what lands we were talking about before we tried to define zoning densities.

Arnie felt it was important to define the zoning areas on the map first and then work on the density and TDR issues later.

Tom: how do TDRs affect density versus value? How does a TDR's value get determined.

Rick: market value sets the TDR value. In his experience TDRs were used to allow accelerated development schedule – this worked where there was a long wait or backlog of developments to be approved.

Kathryn: Would mixed use include residential use?

Gene: mixed use could include all residential to all commercial, anywhere in between.

Tom: suggested the committee wait on defining large lots zoning until more info on TDRs was available.

Rick: TDRs can be used to increase density.

Gene: This usually means decreased density at the other end.

Tom: is there any way to assure that the value will be there if a TDR is created?

Gene: value is market driven, but successful TDR should be beneficial to both sides so that there is value.

Carl: LC watershed conditions may be a criteria for TDRs. Future scientific studies will confirm that the water supply is shrinking.

Alonzo: the community could recycle water downstream and send it upstream to reduce depletion.

Discussion to be continued.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes May 18, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
Duncan Sill		
Beth Mills	992-9857	bmills@santafecounty.org
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net

Also attending:

John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega  
Bob & Jan Cochran – Lower La Cienega  
JJ Gonzales – lower La Cienega  
Jim Borrego – Santa Fe Canyon Ranch

Meeting started at 6:10 pm

Agenda approved.

Duncan Sill provided a presentation on the County's evaluation of the 470 acre La Bajada ranch property. A study is in the works to assess the property, including an in-depth environmental evaluation.

The County is looking for resources to perform the study.

The County sees the work on the property as a longer term project, with the study being the first step.

Duncan is trying to arrange a clean-up/information day when the community is invited to help begin the assessment process and participate in a County-lead clean up of the ranch house area.

The committee recommended that this event be coordinated through the LCVA.

Tom asked if the County was considering the purchase of more land as part of the assessment.

Duncan explained that they were looking to procure funds for the assessment, but not for more land.

Gene asked if there was any funding for assessment at this time.

Duncan said no, but he is working on a scope of work report that would allow the County to move on procuring funding for the assessment. He is looking for LC community help in developing this report.

Arnie indicated that the current master plan for the property may have to be abandoned as they develop a new plan based on the assessment results.

Alonzo asked what the County was thinking about zoning for the property.

Arnie said that the County is looking to this committee for recommendations on how it should be zoned.

Gene said that the committee had not discussed zoning issues on the property yet, this is coming up soon.

Bob Cochran asked about the clean-up day schedule, and clean-up days for the community.

Gene said that the LCVA has re-instituted a committee to schedule clean-up days beginning this Spring.

Tom asked if the clean-up day at the County property would be this Spring.

Duncan is looking to schedule it as soon as possible.

Tome asked if the ranch house and property would be an "open house" event.

Duncan said yes.

The committee reiterated the idea of the County and Duncan working with the LCVA to schedule the event.

Duncan completed his presentation.

Beth Mills provided an update on the County's work at the Los Carrizales site where invasive trees, etc. were removed to revitalize the areas springs. The cleanup was done 2 years ago, no cleanup has been done since.

The spring is still running.

The County is managing the property as a conservation easement, and they are looking for local management/coordination of efforts to maintain it. Past efforts to work with local people broke down over issues regarding the ranch and grazing use of the land. The County has no plans to include other uses for the property at this time, instead they will keep it as a conservation easement.

Beth is looking for help to keep the area clear of new growth to keep invasive plants at bay. There is currently no funding to help with this project. They are looking for help to cut down invasives, not to dig them out.

There are Russian olives and willows that need to be cut out.

Beth asked if the committee would consider incorporating provisions into the Community Plan for stewardship of this property and possibly other properties with the planning area.

Arnie suggested that open spaces and trails could also be managed locally under a stewardship program.

Alonzo asked about the size of the Los Carrizales property.

Jose indicated that it was about 5 acres that had been treated before, but the entire property is larger.

Tom asked if the cleanup effort would be a joint venture between the community and the County.

Beth said yes.

Tom asked there were any other places where the County was working with locals in a stewardship program.

Beth said that there were none in SF county, but she knew of others elsewhere. The County has acquired new properties in the last ten years that make this idea more timely. Local feelings of ownership is strong for most of these properties, and locals don't want the properties open to the entire county. Trails, etc. are maintained locally and used mostly by locals. Arroyo Hondo has trails that are maintained in this way.

Tom is looking for a model to follow to set up the program, and likes the idea.

Beth indicated that County resources would support a program if there was local interest.

Rick asked if participation in the cleanup project would include labor and/or money.

Beth said they were looking for labor help.

Gene asked if the state stewardship program for preservation sites could be a model.

Alonzo noted that careful management was critical to preserving sites.

Kathryn suggested that Beth contact the LCVA for help finding volunteers for the cleanup.

Beth asked Jose to comment on the cleanup and suggest a course of action.

Jose thought that the willows should be removed or reduced in number, including sprouts, and that no more willows should be brought in.

The committee felt that Beth should go to the LCVA for help with the cleanup program.

The committee agreed to consider the stewardship idea for the Community Plan.

Beth completed her presentation.



Arnie provided an update on the County plans to extend sewer and water to the mixed use area and the adjacent Downs property. The County utility director is considering the idea of a public improvement district to help finance the project. They are considering an extension of sewer from the community college district.

Jim B. suggested that they consider putting a new treatment plant at the lower elevation end of the community – this could be the SF Canyon Ranch property.

Tino asked if the County was considering using the existing plant near the prison – the Valle Vista plant. JJ Gonzales indicated that the VV system must be rebuilt in order to be used.

Arnie indicated that this was one of the possibilities.

The committee reviewed meeting notes from 5/4/11 and made some corrections. Rick asked if a vote could be taken in the recommendation to redefine the Downs and adjacent mixed use zone as SDA 1. It is currently SDA 2.

SDA = sustainable development area. County future land use maps show SDAs 1, 2, and 3. 1 indicated the most immediate areas to be developed, 2 are less immediate, and 3 are least immediate. SDA 1 areas are most likely to be slated for improvements including County sewer and water (but not guaranteed).

A motion was begun by Rick. Gene asked him to retract the motion until the meeting notes were reviewed. Rick took the motion back. The meeting notes were approved by unanimous vote.

Rick made the motion that the committee formally recommend that the County change their future development map(s) to show the Downs property and adjacent mixed use zone as SDA 1.

Tino seconded the motion.

In discussion, Tom was concerned that the committee was not taking all potential properties into consideration. There may be other areas that would want SDA1 status. The motion may be too piecemeal and the committee may want to consider the entire planning area first.

Kathryn asked if the boundary of the commercial zone needed to be considered before the motion was considered.

Tino indicated that the boundary had been discussed with all the property owners and was based on their agreement and understanding. This was the boundary discussed over the last 4 years.

Tom asked if the Community Plan should incorporate growth. Perhaps the committee should look at the entire area before making any decision.

Arnie suggested that this mixed use zone was already discussed and that a vote to make it SDA 1 made sense now. Arnie also suggested that the committee needed to move along or it would never get done.

Tino asked if the mixed use zone was in question as far as the committee was concerned. He pointed out that it had already been voted on and that the SDA1 designation made sense to encourage the extension of utilities.

This was in keeping with the idea of preventing further use of local water.

Tom voiced concern that not everyone in the community was being represented at the meetings.

Kathryn asked if an amendment to consider other areas was needed.

Gene suggested that other areas should be considered in other motions, but this one needed to be acted upon.

Tino called for a vote.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was extended until 8pm.

Gene asked Bob if there were revised plans for the proposed extension of the traditional community boundary to include the Tres Rios property.

Bob asked to postpone the review until more maps were completed.

Gene asked that the committee be informed when this was ready for review.

Jose presented a new map showing a proposed boundary for an historic district in La Cieneguilla. The area would recognize the historic nature of La Cieneguilla, but it would not change any zoning designation. The committee like the name "La Cieneguilla Historic District" (LCHD).

The map shows areas that were inhabited beginning in the 1600's, with buildings dating to the 1890's and earlier.

Kathryn asked if this area was part of a Spanish land grant.

Jose indicated that it included the old settlement area, where buildings and roadways were located.

Tom thought it included the areas irrigated by the old acequias. It also includes some County land.

Tom mad a motion to recommend that the LCHD be recognized on community and County maps.

Jose seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Arnie reviewed his notes on changes to the history of the valley portion of chapter one. He noted additional information on the archeological sites in the area, reference to the prehistoric settlements in the Galisteo basin, and reference to the La Cieneguilla historic settlement (as noted in the LCHD).

The committee will look over the changes once more and vote on their inclusion in the Community Plan.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes June 1, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com

Also attending:

John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega  
Bob & Jan Cochran – Lower La Cienega  
Jim Borrego – Santa Fe Canyon Ranch

Meeting started at 6:40 pm, with agreement to extend past 7:30pm.

Agenda approved.

Carl made two announcements regarding:

The cleanup effort for Los Carrizales may happen in late June.

The SF County cleanup and assessment event at the SF Canyon ranch house may be scheduled for July.

Meeting notes from 5/18 were reviewed and approved by unam. vote.

Traditional Community boundary extension for Tres Rios (formerly Gallegos) ranch:

Bob & Jan Cochran presented a map that proposed inclusion of 112 acres (approx.) in the TC zone. The total property is approx. 290 acres. Discussion included questions about the extent of the farming area and traditional building area on the property. The owner's goals include recognizing the historic significance of the property. The ranch was one of the first Spanish settlements in the area, an outpost on the trip from Mexico to Santa Fe, and the last stop before Santa Fe on the Camino Real. Committee members clarified that this

proposed 112 acre area included farmed lands and historic buildings. Most grazing lands and escarpment lands are excluded from the proposed TC area.

There was concern voiced about the potential for more development if the TC zone was expanded. Bob stressed that no development would take place on the property without the approval of the community. The added zoning density created by inclusion in the TC is recognized as added value to the property by appraisers and lenders.

Note that the TC boundary has been (proposed) adjusted to follow lot lines wherever possible, and to leave out all public lands. These adjustments were discussed and approved by the committee at prior meetings.

Questions were asked about the potential development ideas being considered for the Tres Rios property. Ideas being considered include an aquaculture-based waste treatment facility to serve the LC community, water recycling efforts to provide water for the community, restoration of the church and other historic sites on the property, and traditional uses including ranching, farming, etc..

A motion was made to adopt the 111.6 acres as shown on the map into the TC area.

The motion was seconded, there was no further discussion. The motion passed, with one abstention.

A discussion of the zoning of the LC planning area was resumed from prior meetings.

Arnie stressed that the resulting map of the LC planning would be a future uses map indicating how the immediate uses would carry forward in the short term.

Future zoning and development would be based on the SGMP guidelines. Water would be one of several considerations in determining development, not the only consideration.

The larger lots of 40 acres or more were discussed next. There was consideration of designating all these large lots as Ranch and Agriculture use.

A motion was made to designate all 40+ acre lots as R& A. The motion was seconded.

After discussion, the motion was retracted.

A second motion was made to designate a specific group of large lots – the 9 tracts of the former Santa Fe Canyon Ranch proposed development, the Tres Rios tracts, and the Varela-Lopez tract in La Cieneguilla – (The Group) – as R& A use.

The Ranch and Ag use category would probably include the lowest density base zoning of developable lands within the planning area.

The motion was seconded. After discussion, the motion passed 5 for, 2 against.

Opposing votes felt that the properties should be considered for higher densities.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes June 15, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us

Also attending:

John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega  
Bob Cochran – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved.

Meeting notes from 6/1/11 approved by unam. vote.

Continued discussion of future land use categories:

The committee discussed the residential areas that include a few large lots (up to 102 acres) and many smaller lots (down to less than 1 acre). Discussion included the possibility of applying more than one category to these lots. The residential categories include Residential Fringe and Residential Estate. Fringe density would be lower than Estate. Most of the lots are already built – more than 90%. The large lots are surrounded by much smaller residential lots, many already with homes built on them.

A motion was made to place all of these lots, large and small, in the Residential Fringe category. The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous vote.

The committee was asked to take another look at the Ag & Ranch lots designated at the 6/1 meeting. There was a continuing concern expressed about the problem of labeling lands as one use when they may change in the future. Two properties were reconsidered: the Puerta del Canyon property (approx. 330 acres) in la Cieneguilla, and the Tres Rios properties (approx. 270 acres total) in Lower La Cienega.

After discussion it was proposed that these properties be placed in the Rural Fringe category. The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous vote.

In preparation for the next meeting, the committee was asked to review the notes on potential zoning density from the December proposed draft of the Community Plan.

Arnie will revise the County's Future land Use Map to show the proposed uses approved by the committee.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes June 29, 2011, La Cienega Community Center revised per 7/13 meeting notes.

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com

Also attending:  
Bob Cochran – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:10 pm

Agenda approved.  
Meeting notes from 6/15/11 revised and approved by unan. vote.

Arnie asked that the committee review the procedure for notification of upcoming public hearings as well as notification of committee meetings.

Based on the County's request, the committee will review the land use designation of the 470 acres of county land from the former SF Canyon Ranch property. The County has asked that this land be designated Rural Fringe instead of Ag & Ranching. To be discussed at the 7/13 meeting.

The discussion of zoning density began with consideration of the base density for each land use. Base density would be the starting buildable lot size, which could be reduced by factors including available water, etc. Existing base zoning within the community ranges from 160 acres to 3/4 acres. Many people think that the base starts at 40 acres because the regulations specify that the 160 acre lot size is granted 40 acre lot size. This is based the availability of a 100 year water supply. Since lots have historically been guaranteed the right to a

well, the 100 year water supply is usually granted, allowing the lot size to be reduced to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the base density size. ( $160 / 4 = 40$  acre lot size.)

The question was raised as to whether these zoning density determinations would change zoning procedures. It was agreed that they would not change procedures – as the County develops new ordinance regulations, these density numbers will be used as the starting point for the process, whatever it may be.

Tom asked why the  $\frac{1}{4}$  lot size granted by water availability should be considered as the starting point for Ag & Ranch lands since the status of the land had not changed from existing use. The Ag & Ranch designation should be upheld and the density also upheld.

Kathryn asked if the County's SDA overlay applied.

Suitability for Development is a County designation used by their planners to determine where resources should be directed. The LC zoning may influence their decisions, but the LC mapping and density figures would not include specific designation of SDA category.

The committee began with a consideration of the Conservation land use category. It was suggested that these lands have no starting density as they were not intended to be developed.

Jose pointed out that some of the government lands were slated for potential development, and that the community would be misled by the conservation status and might think that the lands were not to be developed. The NM state land holding is for the benefit of the schools and may well be developed.

After further discussion, Tom made the motion that the government lands be designated as such on the LC planning are map. Areas within the Federal lands that were currently specified as conservation lands would be shown within the larger Federal lands.

Rick seconded the motion, and it was approved by unan. vote.

The County will provide a revised map.

Further discussion of the zoning density of the Conservation land use was postponed until the revised map was available from the County.

The committee moved on to a discussion of the Agriculture and Ranching land use category. After discussion of the existing density (mostly 160 acre lot size for lands under consideration), Rick made a motion to designate the starting density at 160 acres. David seconded.

In discussion Jose suggested that the 40 acres be used since most people thought that was the real minimum lot size for these lands. He said that the County's water conservation rules have reduced the amount of water that a residence can use from  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre feet per year to  $\frac{1}{4}$  afy. This means less water use even with higher density, and a more sustainable level of development. Kathryn suggested that the SF Canyon Ranch tracts which are 140 acres in size would be unbuildable with 160 min. lot sizes. Tom suggested that factors other than what people thought the lot sizes were should be considered. The tradition Ag and Ranching areas were the most rural of any lands, and should be encouraged to remain the most rural.

The committee considered looking at the definition of AG & Ranch land use, and also considered reducing the starting density.

Rick asked that his motion be tabled pending more consideration, to be reintroduced at the next meeting. David seconded and the committee agreed by unanimous vote.

Arnie asked that public notices be put up advertising future meetings. The County will provide the text of the notices.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.



La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes July 13, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net

Also attending:

J.J. Gonzales – Lower La Cienega  
Bob Cochran – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved.

Meeting notes from 6/29/11 revised and approved by unan. vote.

Gene made a statement reminding that the purpose of the LC plan was strongly oriented to maintaining the rural lifestyle and agricultural traditions. Making major changes to the plan by revising the starting densities may not be in keeping with the Plan's goals. The committee needs to consider the impact of these types of changes.

The discussion of the base zoning density for the Ag and Ranch category resumed with consideration of the motion tabled from the last meeting.

Jose reiterated the position that the ¼ lot size (40 acres minimum instead of 160 acres) was in fact more sustainable since the County's restrictions on water use required that a residence now be allotted ¼ acre foot per year instead of 3 afy. More density can be achieved with less overall water use.

Tom expressed concern that small starting lot size or base density would translate into greater final density, possibly even ¾ acre lots through the community. He disagreed with the premise that current water planning and regulations promoted preservation of the aquifer. 100 year supply was calculated on depletion, not

preservation. The developers should still be required to prove water supply, not have it automatically granted by the reduced lot size.

David voiced the need to maintain the rural character of the community despite regulations that allowed more houses with less water.

Jose suggested that the base density could also be the minimum lot size without the ability to divide it.

In a discussion of lots splits, it was agreed that we could not depend on the County to enforce minimum lot sizes as they would make exceptions for family transfer splits and probably other types of lot splits.

Tom felt the County would continue to use loose enforcement leading to lot splits.

Jose felt that minimum lot size could be enforced.

Rick felt that the 160 acre lot size would be looked upon favorably by the community and lend support to other changes in the Plan.

In a discussion of conservation of water, it was agreed that this would probably result in greater densities, not lesser.

Jose felt that the community was growing anyway, and that this pressure would lead to more density. Access to utilities would also drive development. The undercurrent of rural preservation is that no more growth should be allowed once you have yours.

Tom talked about the overlay of the Traditional Community zone and how it was destroying much of the traditional agriculture by putting pressure on the land to be divided into smaller lots for building. Allowing smaller lots not only increased density but destroyed the agricultural core of the community. An agriculture overlay district is needed to begin reversing the trend and help to preserve ag uses.

A discussion of agriculture overlays included reference to other Ag zones created in the County that may be useful as models.

Kathryn brought up the NM State Subdivision Act as guiding standards for development. In discussion it was understood that the County's rules took precedence. State Act rules only apply where no local zoning rules are in place.

Kathryn expressed the feeling that there was no need to reduce the starting density lot size as long as there were rule and regulations in place – i.e. subdivision rules – that allowed for the reducing of lot sizes based on proving the potential for development (based on the rules). Conserving the rural character of the community was worth placing restrictions on development.

Alonzo asked why the plan needed to be changed if there were no changes allowed.

The motion came to a vote. The motion passed with one No vote by Jose.

The committee moved to discussion of the base density for the Rural Fringe land use.

Arnie stated that the County was considering a Conservation use for the parcel of their 470 acre property with the ranch house. The other two parcels would be developed, possibly as an Opportunity Zone. He asked the committee to consider 50 acre starting lot size for the base zoning density in the RF land use areas. This would be in keeping with the County's zoning densities.

Jose made a motion to set the base density at 12.5 acres.

Rick seconded the motion.

In discussion, David asked if that meant that the 12.5 could be automatically divided by 4 (creating 3.125 acre lots) with proof of water.

In discussion it was agreed that the County rules would probably allow that split.

Tom asked if the motion could be modified to make the 12.5 a firm minimum lot size that could not be split.

A motion to extend the meeting until 8 pm was approved.

Kathryn thought that the new code would begin with larger base density lot sizes and that the community should also as there was no incentive to make a smaller starting density if the lot size could be reduced through subdivision rules.

Jose proposed amending the motion make the lot size firm, but he retracted the proposal based on a lack of support.

Arnie reiterated that the 50 acres size should be considered.

In voting, Jose, Rick, Tino and Alonzo voted in favor, Tom, David, and Kathryn voted against. The motion passed.

Kathryn asked if the motion could be revisited to include the firm minimum of 12.5 acres lot size that would not allow splits.

Gene polled the committee and found that no one was willing to consider changes to the motion at this time. No revised motion was made.

Gene expressed the opinion that the two base densities approved by the committee so far are inconsistent and send the wrong message to the community. The committee should consider making a consistent set of density recommendations or risk rejection by the community and the County.

Arnie asked if the next meeting could include a discussion of TDRs and whether Jack Kolkmeier could make a presentation.

The committee agreed and encouraged Jack to attend.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes July 27, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com

Also attending:

J.J. Gonzales – Lower La Cienega  
Jose Villegas Sr.

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved with addition of statement from Jose Villegas.  
Meeting notes from 7/13/11 revised and approved by unan. vote.

Jose Villegas addressed the committee regarding a number of community concerns:

Jose had 18 concerns listed and will provide a list to the committee. Items include:

- maintaining SF river integrity and downstream flow for farmers
- BLM's management practices and lack of attention to area concerns
- closure of BLM lands – no access through community?
- Hagerman well use and effect on local wells and springs

Arnie noted that a working group was being established to address specific local concerns with the river treatment and BLM lands.

Jose noted that the County has leverage with BLM that private citizens don't have. The community could have better access to the BLM management by going through the County.

Arnie said that County Land Us and Governance departments could have a dialogue with BLM.

Alonzo noted that the LC plan calls for the BLM to obey local rules, and it would be up to the County to enforce them.

The committee thanks Jose for his presentation and agreed to look at the list he will provide.

The discussion of future land uses and zoning continued.

Arnie brought numbers for starting densities for future land uses – these are to be the set starting densities county-wide and cannot be changed.

Based on several questions, the following methods will still be available to allow increased density from the starting or base numbers:

- family transfers
- NM state subdivision regulations allowing large lots to be divided into 35 acre or more lots, up to 4 lots in a single division without requiring additional subdivision procedures
- master planning through the county subdivision process
- master planning of opportunity centers to allow special uses in locations that are not otherwise permitted

Developers can still purchase water rights to transfer as needed in order to increase density through the master planning process.

In the past, variances have allowed lots of 1/3 acres size if the property has community water and sewer. This is allowed in Agua Fria, for example. This regulation has been allowed at the state level as well as the county level. Arnie did not know if this would be continued under the new county code.

Alonzo made a motion to designate the SF County 470 acres of land of the la Bajada Ranch as Rural Fringe. David seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Kathryn made a motion to adopt the county's base density of 20 acres for the Rural Fringe land use. David seconded.

In discussion, Jose opposed the measure because he felt that the county's numbers were arbitrary.

Arnie was asked if it would be possible to find out how the county arrived at the base density numbers. He will look into it.

The motion passed with one opposed and three abstentions.

David made a motion to adopt the county's base density of 5 acres for the Residential Fringe land use. Tom seconded.

In discussion Kathryn asked if the map need to be adjusted to change land uses once the county's base densities were accepted. The current map of Residential Fringe may need to be divided into other land uses.

The committee agreed to consider the map designations and open further discussion at a future meeting if necessary.

The motion passed with one opposed.

Carl asked if the committee could be involved in a public forum on the county la Bajada ranch property to solicit possible ideas for its future use.

Arnie said that the County wanted the committee involved.

A joint LCVA/LC Planning Committee forum was acceptable to the committee.

Tom suggested that past LCVA work on this was pertinent to the discussion. This would be presented at the forum.

The committee asked Arnie to set up a presentation on TDRs for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes August 10, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
Jack Kolkmeier,		
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	<a href="mailto:kathryn.becker@state.nm.us">kathryn.becker@state.nm.us</a>

Also attending:

J.J. Gonzales – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved by unanimous vote.

Jack Kolkmeier of the SF County Planning Dept. gave a presentation on Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs:

- the existing SFC ordinance on TDR was designed to preserve open space along the 599 corridor and frontage roads. It was never utilized. The ordinance includes placeholders for specific programs for La Cienega and Santa Fe Canyon Ranch.
- approx. 18 programs have been implemented around the U.S.
- the philosophical basis for most programs is preservation of open space or protection of sensitive areas.
- TDR expert Rick Priets (sp) may be available to help draft the ordinance of LC.
- the program must be done by ordinance. We have 3 potential places to put the language:
  - the existing La Cienega ordinance
  - the existing County TDR ordinance
  - the new sustainable land code not yet written

The first two ordinances would be much quicker to implement changes.

- the TDR program is voluntary, no one can be forced to participate.

4 elements of a TDR program are:

1. sending areas – the lands where development rights are transferred from. (A 2000 UNM study looked at the potential sending areas in LC and analyzed the potential for a program.)

2. receiving areas – the lands where development rights are transferred to.

3. threshold densities – base zoning densities that determine the amount of development in the receiving areas. These base densities would be exceeded through the TDR program. The maximum density allowed through the use of TDRs must also be determined. Densities must be determined for residential and commercial uses.

4. TDR units must have a valuation to determine. Sending areas must be evaluated to determine the number of TDR units for each property. Value will depend on location, size, current use, water rights, etc. Agricultural lands are usually given a higher valuation that allows more units per acre in order to realize the full value of the land.

- developers usually drive the sale price of TDRs based on market value.

- a TDR manager must be identified who will manage the program. This could a County position, or in other programs a bank has acted as the manager.

- TDR units could be “banked” by the County or others to be saved for later use. The units would be purchased from the sending area owners and held until a receiving area was determined.

Going forward:

- LC must determine sending and receiving areas, map out exact properties

- a valuation must be determined by appraisal or other acceptable means

- threshold densities must be determined for receiving areas – set reasonable densities for everyone, then determine maximum densities allowed by use of TDRs

Q&A;

- all the development rights for a property can be sold, or some can be retained. If 100% are sold, no development of the property is allowed. For ag lands, the ag use is still preserved, and buildings directly related to ag activity – barns, etc. would still be allowed.

- Ag lands are usually valued higher than grazing or other lands.

- in a prior TDR valuation proposed for LC, ag lands were given 10 TDR units per acre, grazing lands 2 TDRs per acre.

- it would probably be easier and faster to use the LC ordinance or the existing TDR County ordinance to move forward. The new land code may be too long in coming.

- the County La Bajada ranch property could be looked at as a receiving or a sending area. As a receiving area it might use TDRs to increase its development rights by importing water. The water rights would have to come from somewhere for this to work. As a sending area some of the archeological lands could be preserved.

After Jack finished the TDR discussion, Carl asked about the County’s upcoming retreat to discuss the la Bajada Ranch property. Jack suggested that conceptual ideas on use would be helpful, but specifics would also be welcome. The commissioners will be looking for uses that show a return on investment.

The committee thanked Jack for the presentation.

After Jack left the discussion of TDRs continued:

- the Committee can set guidelines for a TDR programs in the LC plan without having to define the exact program. The details would be part of the revised ordinance.

- there may be more advantage to the community to have the La Bajada ranch property as a receiving area. This would encourage preservation of ag lands and allow the ranch property to realize its value. As a receiving area it might compete with other development in the community.
  - the County would have to determine how to work out the water right for the ranch property if the TDR program allowed imported water.
  - the committee is concerned that the zoning density for the mixed use areas must be determined, but the County has not set any base density. The community should determine the base density for this area, not the County. Mixed use zones will have varying densities around the county, not one set level. The committee needs confirmation of this from the County.
- A subcommittee was set up to work on TDR parameters: Gene, Rick, Alonzo.  
A subcommittee was set up to work on mixed use zoning density: Tino, Rick, Sylvia.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.



La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes August 24, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com

Also attending:

J.J. Gonzales – Lower La Cienega  
Bob Cochran - Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved by unanimous vote.

Meeting notes from 7/27/11 and 8/1-/11 amended and approved by unanimous vote.

Discussion of TDRs:

The committee felt that the program would benefit from being open to receiving areas throughout SF county. The County may develop receiving areas in future that could use sending are units from our community.

Jose was concerned that creating a loophole in the ordinance to allow imported water on the County 470 acres would set a bad precedent, and it may invite loopholes for the entire LC area.

Kathryn asked if the program could be expanded to outside SF County. Since the ordinance would be done at County level, it would be limited as such.

The sending areas would be prioritized to make units available in order:

- A) irrigated agricultural lands
- B) environmentally sensitive areas
- C) Traditional grazing lands
- D) other areas as determined in the future

Receiving areas would be designated and all be available:

- 1) Mixed use zone including racetrack and adjacent zone along Los Pinos
- 2) County 470 acres
- 3) Other receiving areas as available county-wide

Rick motioned to extend the meeting to 8pm, Kathryn seconded.

Arnie provided a summary of the County retreat regarding the la Bajada ranch property:

- commissioners were divided on the future best use of the property, including selling, master planning, or other uses. A variety of potential uses were discussed, including agricultural, educational, residential, and light commercial.
- The LC community ideas were not reviewed.
- the status of the existing master plan is undetermined.
- the environmental assessment has not been started, lack of funding.
- the County manager has been directed to work with staff and the community to develop a plan for the property.
- any plans must enhance the value, and options for use outside the needs of the community may be considered.

Jose asked if any further information was available on how the County determined the base zoning densities. Arnie has not been able to get more info from the County attorney or others.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes September 7, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com
<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us
<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us
<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com
<u>Absent reps:</u>		
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com

Also attending:

Bob Cochran - Lower La Cienega  
Ellen Wittman – La Cienega  
John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved as amended by unanimous vote.  
Meeting notes from 8/24/11 approved by unanimous vote.

Discussion of Mixed use Zoning densities:

The subcommittee (Rick, Tino, & Sylvia) on mixed use zoning presented proposed language to define the zoning, including specific zoning for three areas:

The Downs at Santa Fe – about 320 acres

The Erica Road/Los Pinos area at 599 & I-25 and the Las Lagunitas site – about 100 acres, 70+ lots

Sunrise Springs – about 69 acres, 2 lots

Discussion considered the density in light of the rural nature of the Community, and whether these mixed use areas should be limited due to their proximity to low density residential areas.

The definition of Maximum Floor Area ratio was explained as the total allowable square footage of floor space on a given lot, including all floor area from multiple stories. This is not the same as the maximum building footprint area, or Maximum Lot Coverage for building area.

The mixed use zoning language would define lot coverage, floor area, heights, setbacks, residential building units, and non-residential square footages.

Language was added to require that all mixed use areas hook up to community or regional water and/or sewer systems when available. This would apply the La Cienega watershed conditions to mixed use areas.

Rick proposed that maximum lot coverages be the same for all areas.

Discussion considered whether any area should have higher or lower coverage, and whether larger lots should have lower coverage to prevent too much development.

Smaller lots may have more need for greater coverage in order to be useful for development.

Larger lots could be divided, and the smaller lots might then need the higher densities.

While the committee considered the language, Arnie gave a short update on the County's La Bajada Ranch property:

- the County would like to have the zoning changed to and Opportunity Center on the Future Land Use map.
- this committee would be asked to define specific uses for the property
- uses must have county-wide application
- opportunity center zoning currently has no restrictions on use or set density. This would be part of the definition requested from the committee.

The committee did not agree to undertake the project. Concerns were raised that the committee may not be the best group to make County-wide decisions. The committee agreed to consider the request and get back to the County.

Discussion of the mixed use zoning resumed.

Rick made a motion to set all of the maximum lot coverage densities for all mixed use areas at 35%. Sylvia seconded.

In discussion, the difference between large and small lots was addressed once more – large lots could turn into very large buildings with higher densities, but any lot could be divided into smaller lots so long as the minimum lot sizes were preserved.

The motion passed, 5 in favor (Rick, Tino, Sylvia, Tom, Alonzo) 2 against (Kathryn, Stan) 1 abstain (Jose).

The mixed use language will be revised per the committee's discussion and reviewed once more for final inclusion in the draft Plan.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

La Cienega – La Cieneguilla Planning Committee Meeting Notes  
Meeting Notes September 21, 2011, La Cienega Community Center

<u>Attending:</u>	<u>contact #</u>	<u>contact e-mail</u>
<u>Lower La Cienega reps:</u>		
Gene Bostwick	471-9248	gnb100@wildblue.net
David Camp	474-7943	david@laurencamp.com
Tom Dixon	690-3573	greentractorfarmer@gmail.com
Alonzo Gallegos	690-2887	mglopez@juno.com

<u>Upper La Cienega reps:</u>		
Rick Dumiak	603-6400	rdumiak@gmail.com

<u>La Cieneguilla reps:</u>		
Jose Varela Lopez	660-5828	jjvlchimex@aol.com
Stan Jones	310-2426	stan.jones@earthlink.net
Kathryn Becker	699-5949	kathryn.becker@state.nm.us

<u>Santa Fe County:</u>		
Arnold (Arnie) Valdez	995-2774	avaldez@co.santa-fe.nm.us

<u>LCVA:</u>		
Carl Dickens	424-2235	cedickens2@yahoo.com

<u>Absent reps:</u>		
Tino Gallegos	469-6973	americanspirit@windstream.net
Sylvia LeMaster	306-5970	sylvialemaster@hotmail.com
Ivan Trujillo	989-7788	itrujillo@louisberger.com

Also attending:  
JJ Gonzales - Lower La Cienega  
John Herbrand – Lower La Cienega

Meeting started at 6:05 pm

Agenda approved by unanimous vote.  
Meeting notes from 9/7/11 approved as amended by unanimous vote.

Gene provided a update on the County's la Bajada ranch property with regard to committee actions. The County agreed with the committee's land use designation as a base zoning density, and acknowledged that a county-wide process to determine it's future planning was the County's responsibility. The LCVA will put together a list of questions from the community regarding the property's status – existing master plan, water availability, etc.

Adjustment to base density for Rural Fringe land use:

Based on discussion with the County, the committee voted to change the base density for Rural Fringe from 20 acres to 12.5 acres. This is in keeping with the principles established by prior hydrological zoning densities. Jose made a motion to change the density, Rick seconded, and approval was unanimous.

Review of Mixed Use Zoning language:

David presented several corrections to the language to clarify meanings. His motion was seconded by Rick, and approval was unanimous.

Rick proposed a revision of the first paragraph to clarify the use of existing sewer and water, and to specify the requirement about connecting to community or regional facilities. His motion was seconded by Jose, and approval was unanimous.

Discussion of TDR language:

The “bonus” to density (resulting in a Maximum Density) allowed in the Mixed Use area of the racetrack and Los Pinos/599:

Proposed base density is 35%. Discussion considered whether larger lots should have a lower Max. Density. Tom and Kathryn thought that lower densities made some sense. Rick felt that the penalty to larger lots was unfair.

Discussion continued regarding the need for the TDR language to be flexible so that the program was given the best chance of success. This would allow Max. Density to be adjusted based on lot size or other parameters in order to increase the viability of the program.

Rick made a motion to set the starting Maximum Density with TDRs bonus for the Mixed Use area at 45%. Alonzo seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Arnie presented some information from County staff:

The staff will review the Plan document for consistency with the SGMP. This review will be done before the next committee meeting. The goal of staff is to incorporate the Plan into the SGMP.

Staff will develop an “insert” of the Plan for the SGMP which will probably be 5 or 6 pages. This would reference the Plan document which would be an addendum to the SGMP.

As the new land code is developed, a section on LC/LC would be incorporated as a zoning overlay. The community’s zoning ordinance would become a chapter of the county code.

The committee requested that the county develop insert-size maps for the Plan. Arnie will try to have these for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.







community planning. The Op Center status for the La Bajada ranch has not been approved by the community and must be removed from the map.

Further discussion of the land use chart:

A second chart should show the land uses within the Planning Area and specify how activity center overlays are applied.

Discussion of activity centers:

Should Regional Center – large shopping center designation, be excluded from the Planning Area?

The committee was divided on this issue, but felt that any application for this status would undergo thorough review by the community. It was decided to leave the designation in the Plan and solicit community opinion.

Tom made a motion to add a second land use map clarifying the land uses within the Planning Area and clarify the activity center uses as overlays on base zoning. The land uses included in the planning area are Ag & Ranch, Rural Fringe, Residential Fringe, Mixed Use (2 parts) and Traditional Community. There are no currently approved Activity Centers in the Planning Area.

Kathryn seconded.

The motion passed 5 for, 1 abstention.

Arnie provided census info from 2010. These figures, including current number of households and current population will be updated in the plan Section 3 introduction.

The committee felt that the Plan is ready for public review. Arnie was asked to schedule two community meetings, one evening and one daytime, in early to mid-December. All proper public notices need to be made.

The revisions approved at this meeting will be incorporated into the plan, and a final draft will be made available to the public.

Hooray!

The committee adjourned until the public meetings in December.

Adjourned at 7:40.