## MINUTES OF THE SANTA FÉ COUNTY COUNTY OPEN LAND TRAILS AND PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (COLTPAC)

## March 12, 2014

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Santa Fé County Open Land, Trails and Parks Advisory Committee (COLTPAC) was called to order on the above date at approximately 6:00 p.m. by Chair Judy Kowalski in the Santa Fé County Attorney's Conference Room, County Administration Building, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

### 2. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

#### Members Present

Members Absent

William Baker [excused]

Judy Kowalski, Chair Coleman Burnett Devin Bent, PhD Patricia Conoway Almudena Ortíz Cué Dave Dannenberg [arriving later] Ernesto Ortega Zach Taylor, Vice-Chair

### Staff Members Present

Lisa Roach, Open Space and Trails Planner Robert Griego, Planning Manager [arriving later]

## Others Present

### 3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Bent asked if for 6B it was the intention to limit the discussion just to the timeline.

Ms. Roach said no.

Dr. Bent proposed deleting "timeline" from that agenda item. Ms. Roach agreed.

Dr. Bent moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Conoway seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

## 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES February 12, 2014

Dr. Bent requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 5 at the top - it was actually a question whether the \$8 million GO Bond of 2012 was available to be allocated. Somebody answered that.

On page 6, 4th paragraph from the bottom - It should say census designated place, not census tracts.

On page 7, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the bottom - It should say, "Dr. Bent asked whether notice was required for the working group or it that was something to take to Legal." It was on what the requirements would be for the working group.

Chair Kowalski requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 8 at the bottom regarding the State Parks where it should say, "Park Management Plan."

On page 9, 4th paragraph she didn't understand.

Dr. Bent said it should say "The advantage that the Committee has is that we can go directly to the BCC." But also added that before that, we should run it by Legal.

Dr. Bent explained that any recommendation of the Committee should be run by legal before going to the BCC.

Mr. Dannenberg arrived at this time.

Mr. Ortega moved to approve the minutes of February 12, 2014 as amended. Ms. Conoway seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

#### 5. ACTION ITEMS

There were no action items.

#### 6. MATTERS FROM COUNTY STAFF

#### A. Discussion of revisions to Resolution 2011-04 to be proposed by Staff to BCC

Ms. Roach provided a copy of Resolution 2011-04 to the members. She said this resolution created COLTPAC originally in 1998, and it had been through several iterations over the years. There were some inconsistencies in it with what is actually the case now. It specifically refers to the open space and trails

plan adopted as part of Growth Management Plan and replaced by the Sustainable Growth Management Plan. She reviewed in it the duties of the Committee.

She also noted an inconsistency on item 5 – makeup of the Committee. Much of that language has to do with staggering terms and was now unnecessary, and the Chair [and Vice-Chair] should have a one-year term to be consistent with the other BCC committees.

Chair Kowalski asked if it should say the Chair can serve another term.

Ms. Roach said it should just say "in accordance with 2009-2 or subsequent resolution." She added that for consistency, the roles needed to be reordered under Item 3 by moving "c" up to become "a" in order to reflect the importance of COLTPAC's role in countywide and site-specific planning. She said she had been asked to add another "whereas" statement that properly referenced previous iterations of the resolution. Part 3 b was to be revised to reflect COLTPAC's role in advising for *potential* funding for the program.

Ms. Roach said she has sent the draft revision to Legal for review and would find out if she could send the revised resolution out once it cleared Legal. Staff would do that.

Dr. Bent asked for a copy of it. He asked if staff was going to make all the revisions without Committee input. He had no copy to look at. He felt like he didn't know what it really looked like without seeing it.

Mr. Griego said regarding protocol that the resolution would be reviewed and approved by Legal. Ms. Roach has had some conversations with Legal to make clarifications. Regarding the role of COLTPAC, it would be a discussion of how roles may have changed but not drafting or approving the resolution.

Mr. Taylor noted under Roles, that COLTPAC had talked about advising on the management of County open space properties.

Ms. Roach said in the revised items b and c it speaks to county-wide and site-specific planning on open space properties and the role of the SGMP. She didn't know whether COLTPAC has the authority to review and make recommendations on capital projects.

Mr. Griego thought on specific things it could be a recommendation from COLTPAC.

Ms. Roach agreed and said they couldn't say COLTPAC would approve a Master Plan or a design.

Chair Kowalski explained that in the past, COLTPAC was presented with project information and was asked for input and suggestions because of our technical expertise, but it wasn't that COLTPAC would approve a plan.

Mr. Taylor said they just needed to change "approve" to "advise."

Mr. Taylor worried about somebody down the road saying "I can't come to COLTPAC except on these three things and not be able to comment on management."

Santa Fé COLTPAC Committee

Ms. Roach said she would follow up on that.

Chair Kowalski thought the Committee could advise on capital projectsbut didn't have to approve them.

Ms. Roach said her predecessor was engaged more in project management, but that since the reorganization, the Open Space and Trails Planner position has been structured to focus more on planning. She would like for staff to provide ongoing project updates and be able to ask for input as appropriate. She appreciate that the Committee provided valuable expertise.

Ms. Burnett supported keeping the language general. She could envision where there might be resource conflicts in the future and staff might want a recommendation on how to defuse that conflict. She didn't see a need for Committee review for active projects but anything under the broad term of management for things like public complaints.

Dr. Bent agreed. The Committee was set up to advise; not to approve. On the other hand, BCC does want citizen input so that was one of our roles. We should have someone from the Committee at the BCC meetings when recommendations are brought forward, but we were not claiming the rights to make any decisions.

Mr. Dannenberg asked if there was anything driving changes to the resolution.

Ms. Roach said there were a couple of things. The program has been restructured and COLTPAC would have a significant role in the planning process for the creation of a new Open Space, Trails and Parks plan. Also, the resolution needed cleaning up due to the discrepancy between it and the County's Rules of Order resolution.

Mr. Dannenberg asked if it was an immediate need to change the resolution.

Ms. Roach said it was a good opportunity to clean up the resolution and to concurrently bring forward the work plan for the creation of the new county-wide plan.

Mr. Dannenberg reasoned that the Committee needed clarity in the organization before going to the resolution.

Chair Kowalski thought they were clear about that.

Mr. Ortega said it was a reorganization of County government as well and what was there now didn't fit into the structure.

Chair Kowalski thought maybe we should include that item on the next agenda.

Ms. Roach said one thing necessary was to take out any reference to the plan that was adopted in 2000 and state that COLTPAC will assist in all planning efforts SGMP relating to open space, trails and parks in accordance with the SGMP (Sustainable Growth Management Plan).

Chair Kowalski said that had caused a lot of confusion so it needed to be corrected.

Mr. Dannenberg was concerned with changes in organization names, etc. that might be changed again six months from now.

Ms. Roach said before we take it forward she would get clarity regarding specific project updates.

Chair Kowalski agreed. That has come up a few times. If people present project updates to COLTPAC, was the Committee just going to listen or was it to give input? Was it a rubber stamp or real feedback?

Ms. Roach said projects could be presented for discussion or presented for action. The gray area was not whether COLTPAC had the authority to make a recommendation on a master plan or design, but whether or not staff was specifically allowed to specifically request COLTPAC's input on capital project implementation.

Mr. Griego said for COLTPAC to make recommendations on projects, we must be clear about what that means.

Mr. Ortega suggested the word "project" might not be the right word. Maybe it was the programmatic responsibility of staff to provide advice without being project specific. There could be programmatic things to review.

Mr. Taylor asked if staff could still run acquisitions past COLTPAC, which hasn't happened this past year, but it was not enough to say COLTPAC would have to make a recommendation to the BCC.

Ms. Roach said that proposed acquisitions would come for COLTPAC review in the future. That wouldn't change, but the governing process for open space acquisitions as per 2009-206 doesn't specifically deal with applications that come in during moments such as now when there is no dedicated source of funding for open space acquisition. But as it relates to the new CIP process for acquisition or purchase of land when no funding was available, would staff review it and bring it to COLTPAC and the Committee could make a recommendation to BCC to buy it when funding became available?

There are way more capital projects than funding is available for, and the process for prioritizing and funding these through the CIP needs more clarity.

Mr. Griego said now with the CIP (Capital Improvements Plan), those projects had been put on a list and there was not ever a clear determination whether they were prioritized of if they would get any funding. The whole Committee went out to a site and COLTPAC had a special meeting but without that dedicated funding, there was no purpose in doing that. The CIP had no clear identification of when that project would ever get funded.

Ms. Roach foresaw there would be future bond cycles. So there would likely be funding for acquisitions again at some point, but that it was unclear as to whether all future acquisitions must be first listed on the CIP via the application and review process as specified in resolution 2009-206.

Dr. Bent handed to Ms. Roach a more recent resolution that talked about staff and making management decisions. He suggested that might be considered too.

Ms. Roach clarified that the resolution he handed her was strictly about the Trust for Public Lands (TPL).

Dr. Bent said the TPL did a study in 2010. As a point of information, he said the Committee was getting into what would be a fairly quick rewrite. This was a big issue tonight and he was uncomfortable with rebuilding our whole role tonight.

Ms. Roach understood but it was not necessarily COLTPAC's role to recommend to BCC what their role will be. It was the BCC who decides that. Her effort as staff was to be as clear as possible. She was bringing it for discussion because she valued the Committee's input but was not under the impression that COLTPAC needed to make a recommendation to the BCC as to their role.

Mr. Ortega said one of the key roles of this Committee on property selection as in 3 d was to examine and make changes to the criteria. It was best for the Committee to offer suggested changes to the criteria. That was his feedback to the process.

Chair Kowalski said it seemed that in the past COLTPAC was responsible for developing its own criteria.

Ms. Roach said that Legal had recommended the language in 3 d be changed to state that COLTPAC would "make recommendations regarding changes to the criteria for property acquisition when necessary."

Dr. Bent said he was not suggesting we tell BCC what our role is. But to have clarity - we were a citizen's advisory committee. He was disturbed if the Committee didn't share with them what the Committee liked and what the Committee didn't like.

Mr. Taylor thought it would be great if Ms. Roach could add management to that and see what they say.

Ms. Roach agreed. She was a liaison for this Committee but also a County employee and was tasked to revise this resolution to conform to County policy.

Dr. Bent believed that was part of the planning process and asked what the goal and objectives were.

Chair Kowalski commented that #2 was pretty broad, to advise the BCC on matters related to open space, trails and parks. Those things listed in #3 were not restrictive. And if the Committee thought something was so important they were saying it could be used in the Committee's ability to advise on overall management and policy.

Ms. Ortíz Cué was curious if the past recommendations made to the BCC had been followed or not.

Chair Kowalski thought the Committee was respected and generally listened to when making a recommendation to the BCC.

Ms. Ortíz Cué clarified she was seeking for the underlying tone here.

Chair Kowalski said the Committee's first work was in acquiring properties but it was a very different world now and the Committee was trying to recognize that. COLTPAC plays an important role and makes a contribution. The Committee was not telling the BCC what it would do but what the Committee could do.

Ms. Roach agreed to follow up on that.

Chair Kowalski agreed with Dr. Bent that it would be helpful to see a draft before it was submitted.

Dr. Bent recalled that at times, the BCC had asked what COLTPAC had said about something.

Ms. Roach said her intention was not to diminish the Committee's role. The revisions should bolster and strengthen COLTPAC's role.

## B. Discussion of Santa Fe County Open Space, Trails and Parks Action Plan

Ms. Roach said the plan was five pages at the end of the packet.

Chair Kowalski asked if there were some revisions from last time. Ms. Roach agreed.

Ms. Roach said they added to the time line for what tasks would happen when and how long each would take. They also needed to identify any contractual services that would be part of this plan. They needed to increase the budget for outreach and advertising in support of the public participation process. There is also a wealth of data now that didn't exist 14 years ago. One of the recommendations of the original Open Land and Trails Plan was to compile and analyze such new data. Conducting an inventory of resources was a top priority for contractual services, involving compilation of existing data and geospatial analysis of natural, physical and cultural resources in the County for idenitification of priority areas for acquisition and resource management principles.

Ms. Conoway asked what visual resources were.

Ms. Roach said it included view sheds and visual quality, of which a study had been conducted in the '90s. She had tried to list what data existed for overall resources.

Dr. Bent asked what appendix B was.

Ms. Roach said the Master Plans were basically maps of existing and proposed projects.

Dr. Bent asked how that fit in with the Committee's work.

Ms. Roach said it would reflect the for needs assessment and inventory. She showed the Master Plan from the 2000 Open Land and Trails Plan, which showed planned trail corridors and proposed areas for open space acquisitions. It depicted them in an individual spatial way. It showed neighborhood parks and regional parks, separating parks from trails and open space.

Dr. Bent asked Mr. Griego if a developer came in and wanted to develop 1000 homes he would have to contribute land for parks and trails. He asked what the Committee's role would be in that and if it was in locating trails.

Mr. Griego said in the Code, COLTPAC did provide a way to identify - to update the official map to identify locations of trails and open space properties. That was the way the Code was structured now.

Ms. Roach said the official map as the Committee discussed in November included all the projects of the CIP and staff would review them at the time of development application. COLTPAC would be part of that in so far as they have a role to play in advising on needed updates to the Official Map for Open Space, Trails and Parks.

Dr. Bent asked if the Committee needed to look at those areas separately.

Ms. Roach said that was included in section 6 - the Level of Service analysis by SDA. But when talking about the needs in the Growth Management Areas, they needed to have that as part of the conversation and part of this process.

Mr. Taylor appreciated her knowledge but was having trouble keeping up with the acronyms.

Ms. Roach said SDA was Sustainable Development Areas as identified in the code and LOS was level of service. SGMP was Sustainable Growth Management Plan.

Chair Kowalski understood Ms. Roach had identified contractual services for the next step and needs analysis.

Ms. Roach said item 10 was the broad structure for the management plan. She handed out the public participation plan draft. They were doing a survey of constituents and had a recent public opinion survey as the starting point. COLTPAC served as the core advising body.

Ms. Conoway asked what kind of survey they were using and to whom it was sent.

Ms. Roach said they had a list of several hundred people and could put it out broadly to the public through a press release.

Dr. Bent reminded them the County had general news that comes out on the web too.

Ms. Roach said they would have regional working groups in each of the four Growth Management Areas. They would structure the meetings based on starting with a clear expectation of the planning process, review of the vision and mission, and identifying key issues, reviewing inventory of places and

#### resources.

The "how" was strategy for projects and once they had a draft, to bring it back for feedback and revising. They also talked about focus group meetings based on interests such as different uses of trails; looking at conservation as a group - stewardship groups; youth engagement; land management interagency - how to more effectively collaborate in management, etc. Recreation might be broken out by specific uses - at least four and more likely six. They would identify key issues important to them - management strategies, etc.

Ms. Ortíz Cué asked if they could have something for off-leash dogs.

Ms. Roach added it as a recreational use.

Mr. Taylor suggested one to identify an inter-generational focus.

Ms. Burnett asked if she was thinking of having an equestrian focus group and a hiking focus group that seemed too intensive for staff. She suggested having a broad meeting on recreational uses with focus group tables - if we just talked to equestrians and then to the cyclists it would be harder to identify conflicts. That would also reduce the number of meetings.

Ms. Conoway agreed. Recreation could be in one group. Ms. Roach agreed.

Ms. Conoway thought having committee members do that would help but none of us were skilled focus group leaders. They needed to use trained people for that. Also, each project might require a different strategy so you might want to put projects first.

Ms. Roach thought it was critical to invite other agencies to the table. The focus group meetings were not seen as public meetings but with targeted invitations.

Ms. Burnett thought they would be public meetings by default.

Dr. Bent asked if they needed to have a handicapped focus group.

Ms. Roach asked what was missing from the rough draft.

Dr. Bent said the Committee needed to think about evaluation of what they had done.

Chair Kowalski suggested to focus on public participation. Evaluation could be part of the survey questions.

Ms. Ortíz Cué pointed out that if these questions were being asked, perhaps people could give solutions.

Mr. Taylor mentioned design charettes where people come and participate in design and not just asking for information. Then the community would have much more ownership with them.

Mr. Taylor asked if they would be district specific.

Chair Kowalski said before, they discussed them and decided on Growth Management Areas.

Mr. Taylor thought it would be interesting to see what input community groups likeAgua Fria Village Association would have.

Ms. Roach said she communicated with them regularly. She thought they could vary the location in different communities.

Ms. Conoway thought a lot of solutions would come up from the public in those public working group meetings and a lot of them would be implementable.

Dr. Bent asked if they would order it with the survey first.

Ms. Roach agreed according to the time line on the last page of the handout.

Dr. Bent asked what the stakeholder list was.

Ms. Roach said it was a working list of everyone who might be interested in the process. At some point she would send out a draft.

Dr. Bent asked who would do the Level Of Service analysis.

Ms. Roach said she would and most of these were staff tasks. She invited the Committee to share ideas to improve the public participation or phasing or anything else and send her a note.

Chair Kowalski reasoned that their main role would be with 2 b.

Dr. Bent asked if the working groups would be staffed and one member be on each one.

Ms. Roach said she would facilitate with the help of other Planning Division staff, but they were public meetings. They would not have a chair.

At this point, Ms. Roach transitioned into providing other miscellaneous updates.

Ms. Roach mentioned that the Santa Fé National Forest was conducting forest plan revisions. She had attended some of their meetings. She handed out flyers on the process for the members. There will be 2-hour meetings throughout April and May and a technical workshop in April. It was similar to what the County was doing with trails only on forest lands. The County needed better collaboration on how they interfaced with the national forest.

Ms. Roach mentioned that staff had been asked to provide feedback on the Cerillos Hills State Park Management Plan.

At the request of some Commissioners, Ms. Roach had been asked for a schedule of tours at Petroglyph Hill and thought one could be a COLTPAC tour in April to avoid the heat of the summer. It would be fun thing to do on a weekend.

Dr. Bent excused himself from the tour because of a bad back.

Ms. Roach said she had already started a waiting list.

In response to Ms. Conoway, Ms. Roach said it would take four hours. She pointed it out on the map by highway 42 near Galisteo in the middle of the Galisteo Basin. She asked what day of the week would work best.

Mr. Taylor suggested using Doodle Poll to get consensus.

Ms. Conoway and Ms. Ortíz Cué favored the weekend.

Ms. Roach preferred to have no more than 15 and it would require a waiver.

# 7. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

There were no matters from the Committee.

# 8. MATTERS OF PUBLIC CONCERN

There were no matters of Public Concern.

# 9. NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, April 2, 2014

# 10. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Bent moved to adjourn the meeting. It was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Approved by:

ówalski, Chair

6-12-20

2012/11/10/10

 RK

COLTPAC MINUTES

PAGES: 12

Attes aldine Jalana

Geraldine Salazar, County Clerk

Submitted by:

Carl G. Boaz, Inc. by Carl G. Boaz

STATE OF NEW MEXICO ) 55 I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for Record On The 16TH Day Of June, 2014 at 03:37:52 PM And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1739222 Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

COUNTY OF SANTA FE

My Hand And Seal Of Office Geraldine Salazar Clerk, Santa Fe, NM Deputy



Santa Fé COLTPAC Committee

March 12, 2014

١

134