

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE / SANTA FE COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

**Tuesday, May 19, 2009
4:00 PM
Santa Fe, New Mexico**

The Regular Meeting of the City of Santa Fe / Santa Fe County Regional Planning Authority (RPA) was called to order by Chair Patti Bushee at approximately 4:00 PM on the above-cited date in the Santa Fe County Commission Chambers in the County Administration Building.

ROLL CALL

County Commissioners Present:

Kathy Holian
Virginia Vigil

County Commissioners Excused:

Harry Montoya
Liz Stefanics

City Councilors Present:

Patti Bushee, Chair
Rosemary Romero
Rebecca Wurzbarger

City Councilors Excused:

Matthew Ortiz

Santa Fe RPA Staff:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Executive Director

Santa Fe County Staff Members:

City of Santa Fe Staff Members:

Jon Bulhuis, Santa Fe Trails
Jeanne Price, Legislative Liaison

Others Present:

Ivan Guillen, Assistant Regional Coordinator, NCRTD
Deanna Einspahr
Jennifer and Keith Fallis
Lindsey Grant
Tamara Lichtenstein
Rick Martinez
Sidney and Henry Monroe

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Follingstad requested that item IX.C.2., Introduction of Charlier Associates, be removed from the agenda, since there was no one from Charlier Associates in attendance.

There followed a discussion by several Authority members who expressed their concern that Charlier Associates would be able to complete their work by July 1 in time to present the Transit Service Plan to the NCRTD.

Ms. Follingstad explained that Charlier Associates did not feel it was appropriate for them to spend the money to travel to Santa Fe to meet with the Authority until the contract has been signed. She added that the contract for Charlier Associates has been signed by all necessary

parties except for the Chair of the RPA. Once the contract is signed, Charlier will be able to hit the ground running. She has been in constant communication with them and has made sure that they have been provided with all of the information they will need to begin work.

Commissioner Vigil noted that people were in attendance who would like to hear the report on the Rural Protection Ordinance and may want to make comments. She requested that their comments be heard following Ms. Price's presentation.

Commissioner Vigil moved to approve the agenda, as amended, seconded by Councilor Romero and approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 17, 2009, REGULAR MEETING

Councilor Wurzbarger moved to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2009, Regular Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Holian, and approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- **Update on the Annexation Settlement Agreement – Status of the proposed City Rural Residential Zoning Ordinance**

Ms. Jeanne Price stated that the City Council approved Ordinance 2009-18, Establishing a Rural Residential Zoning District, on Wednesday, May 13, 2009. The ordinance outlines four different allowable densities, depending on public sewer and water. She said that she would like to read the standards of the ordinance into the record.

- Allows one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres if neither public sewer nor water is available.
- Allows one dwelling unit per acre if public sewer or water is available.
- Allows two dwelling units per acre if public sewer and water are available.
- Allows three dwelling units per acre if public sewer and water are available and 40% of the site remains undeveloped and is dedicated to a homeowner's association or other private entity as common open space accessible to the residents of the development. The land to remain undeveloped is also intended to serve as a buffer to adjoining property and to protect natural features. As an alternative and upon approval of the City as to its suitability, all or part of the designated open space may be dedicated to the City as park or open space accessible to the public.
- The basic rules are that permitted uses are the same as the R-1 District, except they do not allow accessory dwelling units or guesthouses in the R-1.
- In the R-1, animal production, crop production, commercial stables, greenhouses and plant nurseries and veterinary establishments are allowed as special exceptions.
- Have a minimum front yard of 25 feet for the larger lots, otherwise 7 feet is the city code.
- Maximum lot coverage of 40% for the 2.5 and 1 acre lots; otherwise 40/50% depending upon private open space.
- All other code requirements are as set forth in the R-1 districts.
- The floodway is subtracted from the site to calculate density.

For the record, Councilor Wurzburger requested that Ms. Price explain the process staff went through with respect to comparing what would have been permitted in the County, what would have been permitted in the City, and what would have been permitted in the City according to the General Plan.

Ms. Price explained that the first two categories of one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres or the one unit per acre or the two dwellings per acre if public sewer and water are available are essentially the same as the EZO applies to the property in that area now. The three dwelling units per acre came up as an additional option, because the General Plan for the City states in several different places, for land within the City limits, a density that is no less than 3 and generally up to 5 as a minimum.

Commissioner Vigil asked for further explanation about the buffer requirement.

Ms. Price replied that there are no specifics about the buffer. If the 3 dwelling units per acre with the 40% is chosen, the code says that one intention of the open space is to serve as a buffer. So that when a development is proposed, staff and the Planning Commission evaluate it upon its merits, and it would be discussed with the neighborhood. There are no specifics saying that a buffer has to be provided, but it is one of the stated purposes. The buffer would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis at the time of approval.

Commissioner Vigil asked if the City requires individual property owners who purchase individual acres for a private dwelling to build affordable housing.

Ms. Price replied if the owner is just coming in for a building permit, it does not apply. But it does apply to a lot split, except it would probably be as a contribution for one 2.5-acre lot.

Councilor Wurzburger stated that her intention of establishing the buffer was that the primary intention of the buffer is to protect the surrounding neighborhoods.

For emphasis, Ms. Price reiterated the statement in the bill, "The land to remain undeveloped is also intended to serve as a buffer to adjoining property and to protect natural features."

Chair Bushee asked Ms. Price for a brief summary of the process.

Ms. Price explained that, following the Annexation Settlement Agreement between the City and the County, she started drafting a Rural Residential Zoning District (RRZD) following several meetings with RPA Director Follingstad, and City and County staff members. Eventually, the bill was introduced by Councilor Wurzburger and others at a City Council meeting. The bill was then sent to the City Planning Commission, which recommended approval. It then went on to other committees. At this point, the process was stopped because staff decided the bill need more tweaking. Following these revisions, the process was again started through the City.

The first draft of the bill said specifically that it was to apply to Area 1 of the Annexation Settlement Agreement. It was decided that it was better to leave the area silent and just create the district and not to where it applies. The Planning Commission recommended approval after a time out to distribute more explanation to the various parties that attend the Planning

Commission meetings. The bill went on to other City Council committees that recommended approval. It then went to the City Council. The first time the Council heard the second bill, it postponed action to get more information out to the public through agenda publications and legal advertising. Because this is a legislative issue, notice to individual property owners is not required.

Commissioner Vigil stated that she has received several emails and phone calls from residents who are concerned about not having notice of this legislative matter. She has explained to them the history going back to the RPA's original meetings on annexation in the Southwest Sector. A major concern to the residents has been the density component, which appears have a huge gap between what they thought was going to be the density and what was acted upon. On their behalf, she asked if there is a way for this ordinance to be reviewed, even though the City has taken action on it.

Councilor Wurzbarger stated that the decisions for actual application of the zoning will be done by the Extraterritorial Land Use Committee (ELUC) and Extraterritorial Land Use Authority (ELUA). There will still be public hearings where there will be opportunity for the communities to debate whether or not the zoning is applied to the neighborhood, with the option of more specific zoning and including not being annexed.

Councilor Romero noted that the City has put together a two-part contract with a facilitator that will be working with the annexed areas. What she and other City Councilors have heard is that people did not know what was going on. The suggestion that has been made that there be an intense public involvement process to inform the community about what is going on with annexation in a variety of committees. Part of the public process will include full page ads and large maps at the different malls and the Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) and other public places.

Councilor Bushee asked how the process of zoning will work following annexation.

Ms. Price replied that the ELUC and ELUA process will zone the areas prior to annexation pursuant to the ELUC and ELUA ordinances. The City will have responsibility for the review of projects and building permits in all of the presumptive city limits even before they are annexed.

Councilor Bushee added that the Planning Commission felt the RRZO was not dense enough as required by the City General Plan and wanted to recommend a minimum of R-5. The RRZO that was just passed is less dense than R-5, because it does not allow for accessory dwellings such as a guest house. The result will likely be a denser core of where the housing will be put and mandated buffer areas.

▪ **Communications from the Public**
(quoted directly from testimony)

Good afternoon. My name is Sidney Monroe. I represent the Coyote Ridge neighborhood, a neighborhood association of 25 homeowners. I am new to all of this. I don't know our exact acreage, but I believe it's about 75 acres. We also have in the several other surrounding organizations of the area 1 zone. I'd like to thank Commissioner Vigil very much for voicing some of our concerns, and although it has been said that this process has been long and no doubt

many, many people have spent a lot of good hours on it, it is very confusing and happened very quickly; and for the people that I represent, we feel like it is happening without our prior knowledge.

It was referenced, and I think it's a very valid point and one of the greatest causes of our concern, discontent, that for well over a year, I believe for two years, this map (*held up a map of the 2006 Annexation Plan*) has been the information we were given as to what rural residential zoning would mean. There is a nationwide movement for rural residential protection, and the generally accepted definition is that it will preserve the rural nature of the land. Now I'm hearing that we may have to take this or take R-5. I believe there should be and there can be some leeway between these choices.

Our neighborhood was initially opposed to annexation. There are many other nearby landowners that have also been opposed to annexation. We were basically assuaged with this and then presented with a new ordinance at last Wednesday's meeting.

By the way, I can't find that ordinance on the website. I can't find the new maps. I can't find the new descriptions. If you went on the website today, the City of Santa Fe website, this is still there with 2.5 or the other situations. That is very problematic. I would like to say that I did attend last week's ELUC meeting and if you are not aware of what happened, there was a very significant turnout, probably about 75 people, from all areas affected by the annexation, not just us, people from Airport Road, Country Club Lane, all over.

Interestingly, nobody that came to speak was aware of the new adopted rural residential ordinance. They were there to speak solely against the annexation, overwhelmingly, the sentiment was expressed that they were unaware, they had a myriad of problems of commercial zonings and being caught in lot splits. So there's a lot of problems here and I know you've done a lot of work. But when things happen where citizens are not aware of, and then we're presented with it and basically told, this is the best you're going to get. And then to hear, in the future if you want to appeal or bring something to the city, there is no trust, there is no trust on our behalf.

I just heard that when the zoning goes into effect, the city will have say over zoning decisions. I can't vote in the city now. I can't vote in the city next year. I can't vote in the city for, until it's fully annexed. Yet you will be making decisions affecting possibly my land and other land. I said this at last Thursday's ELUC meeting, because we're in protection of property, justice, equal justice, and it just really rubs me the wrong way.

... *Chair Bushee – if I could, it's been about 4 minutes ...*

I have one final thing to say, which is I have previously invited City Commissioners, City Councilors, County Commissioners, the Mayor, the City Attorney, the City Planner, anybody else who would like to. I am very open to giving a tour of our neighborhood. I don't believe most of you are familiar with our area. It might be very useful to come take a walking tour and walk in our shoes. Thank you very much.

Ms. Chair, members of the Planning Authority. My name is Lindsey Grant. I also live in Coyote Ridge. Though I prefer that you consider what Sid said to stand for what the association feels. I have belabored most of you in the past five months with letters, phone and email messages.

I would like to make a different point, which is not the formal position of the association. We have city planners, we have county planning. None of them have addressed the weight of scientific evidence, which is more universal that we are living in a dry climate and getting into a much drier. There is nothing in all these planning documents that even suggests that population and the water should be part of a triangulation. I would hope that you will still consider this openly so in the next 2 to 3 years you can bring scientific evidence to bear upon the planning process.

I want to say just one other thing, basically, this last as a question. Our problem didn't start recently. It started actually with the agreement of last March, I think it was, which really came as a surprise to all of us. A major change incorporated in the settlement with Las Soleras, which affected us deeply and we really haven't had a chance to get at. I do think that you should reconsider this as a done deal as you seem to describe. Councilor Wurzburger just mentioned that there should be meetings with the public by ELUC and ELUA, in which the alternative of non-annexation would still be open. ELUC and ELUA has nothing to do with that, and every other statement has talked about educating the public. I'm not sure the public is totally uneducated. I think it is necessary to see whether what you propose to do has the kind of opposition that we sense among our neighbors. Thank you.

My name is Tamara Lichtenstein, I live in the Agua Fría Traditional and Historic Community. And I just want to thank Commissioner Vigil for being our voice here. Because as county residents we really depend on our County Commissioners for our political representation. One of the points raised earlier is that people in the County will be dealing with the effects of City jurisdiction in County areas and unable to vote for City Council.

I have a copy of the ordinance, it's 2009-12, is the only copy I have that I've seen. And on the second page under H. Rural Residential District, it says the purpose and intent, the Rural Residential District is intended to respect the existing rural residential character of the area and prevent urban densities. To me, that's pretty clear that anything that you propose, including what was passed last Wednesday, that does not meet this language, in fact contradicts it. Anything that's going to allow or promote greater densities than what are there now does not meet this intent. And I would like to see what's occurring to the ordinance and what it looks like.

The other thing I wanted to say is when I attended the City Council meeting Wednesday, there were a lot of opinions expressed by the City Councilors and by folks that were purporting to represent affordable housing interests expressing a lot of disdain for rural residential living, rural residential lifestyles. Basically, particular ideologies were presented that if you don't like to live where we tell you, you should move, tough. I'm very concerned that that's going to be the prevailing attitude by the City towards those rural neighborhoods that will be taken into annexation. And that anything that those people say, or what we want to do to protect their rural lifestyles, will fall on deaf ears. Because it already did Wednesday night. It was clear that the city values much higher densities than what we see in the County rural residential areas. And

there is really no, regardless of what the intent is, I, quotation marks, that there is, there's not a sense of good will and trust that will be respected.

I also had a question for staff if any traffic studies have been done showing the impact on all of the roads, arterials, private and public roads, in the whole area. From the higher densities, including the highest densities that will be permitted. Thank you.

Rick Martinez. I'm in support of everything she said. I think she said it right. We need to have a voice. Because right now it sounds like our voice has been silenced by the actions that City Council took last Wednesday. And without our voices, our neighborhood is just going to be turned into something that urbanists believe in should be happening in these rural areas. So the rural protection of existing neighborhoods is important in this whole issue. Go back and look what existing neighborhoods are and respect what the existing neighborhood is. Respect what they do, what they bought that land for. Because that's what they came for.

Chair Bushee said that she would attempt to clarify the decisions made during the night of the City Council meeting. Her understanding is that both Councilor Wurzburger and Commissioner Vigil worked on every aspect of that ordinance together. The understanding was that the public's voice was being conveyed. She said she was not defending anyone, just relating her understanding of the debate throughout the community process and at the City Council level. Her concern was that R-1 would be even more dense than the RRZO category, because it allowed for accessory units. This RRZO has generally designated one dwelling unit for 2.5 acres, if the city sewer and water is not available. That's a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres, one unit. The next step, one dwelling unit per acre, if there is sewer and water service available, and the minimum lot size is 1 acre. From her understanding, the only thing that changed Wednesday night is that 2 dwelling units per acre were allowed if the public sewer and water were available. The next category was 3 dwelling units per acre if the public sewer and water was available and if 40% of the site remains undeveloped and is dedicated to the homeowner's association or other private entity as a common open space accessible to the residents in the development, thus this buffer. Chair Bushee repeated her understanding that the RRZO is less dense, even with this new amendment.

Chair Bushee also clarified that it is common practice in a legislative proceeding that amendments can be suggested and accepted and voted on or denied or approved.

My name is David ___ and I also reside in Coyote Ridge. I understand what you've just said, and there's a missing piece to this that we have invited you to experience personally. In the topographical area where we are, there is approximately 40% of space that's not buildable anyway. So in our code situations, where we have one per 2.5, one per acre, depending on the sewer and water, we have that 40% buffer space anyway. So it's not accurate what you're saying is that you're going to create buffer space of 40%. Because we have that now. 40% of this land is not buildable, between arroyos and steep hills, etc. So we really will have a higher density, because more houses will be built on a given parcel of land.

I'd also like to call attention to something that happened earlier in the meeting. There was a discussion about this free land being buffer. The words that were used was that it was the intention for it to being a buffer. But prior to opening this up to public discussion, the Council referred to it as a mandatory buffer. And I think that's what the discussion is about here.

Councilor Wurzbarger interrupted to note that it is a mandatory buffer. And that this is a disagreement with the staff comment. She said she asked the staff member to clarify that the original intention in the language itself does provide that buffer and perhaps there is disagreement on that particular comment. She stated that the land will remain undeveloped and dedicated to the homeowner's association.

David asked if that clarifies whether or not the land is to be a buffer between the neighborhood and new construction.

Councilor Wurzbarger stated that it does for her, but there will be further discussions.

Chair Bushee added that additional clarifying amendments may need to be made.

Commissioner Vigil recommended that those residents who are interested in further clarification and perhaps pursuing amendments contact her and that she would coordinate an informal meeting. Also, the constituency services person can contact the networking system to bring forth interested parties. She expressed her hope that everyone here understands that they are dealing with two government entities. She is trying to assist from the County side, but it is really the City that is the authorizing entity for the RRZO.

Chair Bushee stated that the two authors of this worked hand-in-hand and really felt they were providing a good RRZO. She said that perhaps there is fine tuning and amending yet to be done. She thanked the community members for coming this evening and assured them that everyone on the Authority is here for them and their concerns.

ACTION ITEMS

- **Energy Task Force**
 - **Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair to the RPA Energy Task Force**

Commissioner Vigil said she would like to nominate Commissioner Holian as Chair and did so with a lot of gratitude for all the work she has put into the task force so far. Commissioner Holian said she would accept the nomination and that serving as Chair is a great honor and responsibility.

Commissioner Vigil moved to appoint Commissioner Holian as Chair of the RPA Energy Task Force, seconded by Councilor Wurzbarger, and approved unanimously.

Commissioner Holian moved to appoint Councilor Bushee as Vice-Chair of the RPA Energy Task Force, seconded by Councilor Wurzbarger, and approved unanimously.

- **Appointment of members to the RPA Energy Task Force**

Commissioner Holian explained that the task force will have seven members total, including the Chair and Vice-Chair. She presented the names of four nominees for the other members: David Van Winkle from the Sierra Club, David Blackman from First Community Bank, Brendan Miller, the Green Economy Manager from the New Mexican Economic Development Department, and Randy Grissom who is the Director of the Sustainability Complex at Santa Fe Community College. At the next meeting she will make a recommendation for the fifth member.

Commissioner Holian moved to approve the RPA Energy Task Force members as recommended, seconded by Councilor Romero, and approved unanimously.

Commissioner Holian said that she will work with Ms. Follingstad in convening the first meeting, hopefully before the next RPA meeting, and will make a report on their progress and meeting schedule.

Councilor Wurzburger requested a copy of résumés of the members.

- **Appointment of RPA Member to the NCRTD Tribal Advisory Committee**

Commissioner Vigil moved to postpone appointment of an RPA member to the NCRTD Tribal Advisory Committee, seconded by Councilor Romero, and approved unanimously.

- **Charlier Associates**

- **Approval of Contract with Charlier Associates for Transit Service Plan**

Councilor Wurzburger moved to approve the contract with Charlier Associates for the Transit Service Plan, seconded by Councilor Romero, and approved unanimously.

Councilor Wurzburger moved to re-prioritize the agenda to address item XI.A., Update from RPA members serving on the Board of the NCRTD concerning NCRTD activities, seconded by Councilor Romero, and approved unanimously.

MATTERS FROM THE REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

- **Update from RPA members serving on the Board of the NCRTD concerning NCRTD activities**

Commissioner Romero explained that Mr. Ivan Guillen, Assistant Regional Coordinator for the NCRTD was at the meeting to answer any questions. She added that Mr. Jon Bulthuis would provide information on NCRTD activities.

Mr. Bulthuis stated that, of primary interest, is the NCRTD budget that is to be presented to the Board for adoption on May 20. There is a component of that plan that talks about funding being set aside for the RPA to prioritize, which are the dollar amounts that will be available if this budget is approved. This is an allocation of \$1.29 million that will be set aside for the RPA to prioritize in terms of new service delivery or to fund services that have recently been put into play. The new GRT will start to be collected July 1, 2009, and the funds from that tax should be dispersed to the County in late September or October, which is what was said at the last NCRTD finance subcommittee meeting. The \$1.29 million is 75% of what would be anticipated on a regular year.

Mr. Bulthuis added that in the shorter term work will be done to identify how the existing services that are operating today will get funded while the service plan is being developed. It will take a few months to get through the planning process, and once the budget is approved, the next task is to develop an arrangement between the City, the County and the NCRTD to make sure that those services continue.

Councilor Wurzbarger said that she and several other Councilors have been approached by Ski New Mexico regarding service to the ski basin and asked if that can be considered under this plan. Chair Bushee confirmed that the same comments were received during the public meetings this past spring and asked if that will be included in the mix that is delivered to the consultant.

Councilor Romero stated that Commissioner Stefanics has expressed concern for the County services that could be cut off at the end of June.

Mr. Bulthuis recommended that a plan be worked out by July 1 in which the RPA could fund a continuing resolution of service until the planning process is completed and decisions are made about who is going to deliver the service. As of July 1, it will be up to the RPA to decide how to spend the \$1.29 million.

Councilor Romero suggested that staff work on a resolution to provide current services through the end of June, and that the resolution be brought to the June RPA meeting for approval.

Chair Bushee requested that Ms. Follingstad work with Steve Ross, Jon Bulthuis and any other necessary staff to write a resolution with regard to delivery of current services and bring it to the June 16, 2009, RPA meeting.

Commissioner Vigil agreed that a ski route would be most appropriate for the seasonal service. She recommended that the transit route between the Santa Fe Community College and the *New Mexican* building include a stop at the Santa Fe Outlet stores so that people do not have to cross such a large intersection.

Mr. Bulthuis replied that the issue of stopping at Santa Fe Outlets was simply a running time issue because only one vehicle could be assigned to the route. New vehicles that were purchased with the assistance of the state for connections to the Rail Runner are expected to be delivered in June that will take care of that limitation. He has met with Santa Fe Outlets, and they are excited about having a stop located on their site.

Commissioner Vigil suggested that the draft resolution be provided to the Authority members for their review prior to the June 16 meeting.

Commissioner Holian asked if the GRT funds will come to the County in a lump sum once a year or in monthly installments.

Mr. Bulthuis replied his understanding is the funds will come on a monthly basis. However, since the tax will begin to be collected on July 1, the payments will lag for the first quarter, and the first payment should be in late September or early October.

Chair Bushee pointed to the City's shuttle operation for riders of the Rail Runner and suggested that be paid for out of those funds once the money is available, since it is a service that is directly related to the Rail Runner.

Mr. Bulthuis said he is aware of that interest and will include it in the work given to Charlier and Associates in getting all the interests lined up so that a discussion can be had. He added that there are absolutely more projects lined up and on the table than can be funded with the \$1.29 million.

Ms. Follingstad commented that there are existing dollars that are being provided to Santa Fe County by the NCRTD that might be combined into those services.

Chair Bushee suggested that the RPA be provided with an outline of what services are being delivered in the County.

Councilor Romero pointed to an issue Commissioner Stefanics has brought up several times. Commissioner Stefanics was concerned about trying to save money for the county around transportation issues and broached something that Councilor Romero thought may have the potential to take off inappropriately. That is that the City and County consider turning the City's transportation department over to the NCRTD. Councilor Romero said she would like to state publicly that, while this is a money saving consideration, the City of Santa Fe is not interested in pursuing this in any way. She said that when the Mayor was approached about this, he had said no, that the City has a fully functional system and it will continue to maintain its own independent transportation system.

Councilor Wurzbarger agreed and said she would add one thing that is based on the very serious discussions from over a year ago when they were trying to negotiate the contract with the NCRTD. The perspective she wants to put on the record again is the key question about the efficiency and effectiveness of the services delivered by the NCRTD. The City has a transit system that works very well, and she still has questions about the NCRTD.

Chair Bushee stated that transit items will continue as a regular item on the agenda and will be first on the next agenda to discuss the resolution.

MATTERS FROM STAFF

- **Discussion of Work Plan**

Chair Bushee stated that the Authority had not revisited the work plan in a while and that it is time to have a discussion of priorities, how to proceed as a body, where progress has been made, and where more progress could be made. She said she would like input on the work plan from the members before setting the next agenda.

- **Presentation and Discussion of Possible City/County Collaborative projects**

Commissioner Vigil suggested that this item be heard at the June RPA meeting when Commissioner Montoya could be present, since Anne Stewart from Zona del Sol has been in contact with him. Commissioner Vigil recommended that the criteria for funding joint City-County projects be brought to the next meeting and also the available balances and what the projected GRT income will be.

Chair Bushee requested that Ms. Follingstad bring forward to the next meeting all previously discussed criteria and how the funding will be considered.

DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT RPA MEETING

The next regular meeting of the Regional Planning Authority will be held at 4 PM, Tuesday, June 16, 2009, in the County Commission Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the RPA, this Regular Meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:20 PM.

Approved by:

Chair, Regional Planning Authority
Patti Bushee, Councilor, City of Santa Fe

Minutes transcribed and drafted by: Kay Carlson