

Chapter 1-Introduction: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	1.1 Introduction Page 7, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence, After “will comprise” strike “the constitution for and controlling document over” and insert “the general planning guidelines for...”	Staff acknowledges that the language may be more authoritative than necessary and suggests that the SLDP tone should direct rather than mandate. This section also includes “general police power” which staff feels does not set the best tone for the plan.	Revise Chapter 1 to establish the SLDP as a guide rather than a mandate.
EGMA	1.1 Introduction, Page 7, Paragraph 2, Last Sentence, strike the entire sentence and insert : “Significant changes in conditions within some of the Growth Management Areas of the county require that the new SLDP replace the General Plan. However, the SLDP must contain sufficient flexibility to promote and nurture the continuance of preferred life styles and traditions in those Growth Management Areas where no compelling circumstances exist to change them.”	The SLDP is an update of the 1999 General Plan. The purpose of the plan is to look at the County in its entirety. Specific needs for communities or districts may be looked at through	No Change.
EGMA	Introduction, Page 7, Paragraph 3 should be stricken in its entirety, or at least, add a period after the words “...survival depends...” and strike the balance of the sentence. Rationale: The rest of the sentence promotes a “new and different relationship” which is a social engineer’s dream which can only be interpreted to mean the uniqueness of our culture and our cherished lifestyles must now <u>end</u> ! No one in the county wants this and there exists <u>no valid reason</u> to inflict this thinking on the residents of the Estancia Valley GMA.	Preamble to SLDP was drafted by community members. We recognize that the history of the county reflects that communities have had a relationship with their natural resources and their neighbors and we may have gotten away from these traditions through history for various reasons, therefore, we may need a renewed relationship.	Revise Section 1.1: Rewrite sentence to read: “...and the need for a renewed relationship with our local and government environments and with each other.”
EGMA	1.1.2 Page 8 Binding Principle, In second sentence after “be consistent with the SLDP,” add “(where applicable.)”	Staff recognizes that the binding principles section under the directives is confusing and does not clearly coincide with the directives which are the Goals, Policies and Strategies. The SLDP principles are listed in Chap 1 on section 1.4. but staff feels that these do not should not be part of the directives.	Revise Section 1.1.2 to remove Binding Principles definition from Plan Directives and change the title for Section 1.4 to Principles for Sustainable Land Development Plan.
EGMA	1.2.1.1, Page 10, What is “sustainability”? Suggest all references to the U.N. Brundtland Commission and the United Nations vision of “global planning” be eliminated. If this is in fact the vision of Santa Fe County and the basis of this SLDP, then a serious disservice and significant deception are being done to the citizens of the county, which can only result in the destruction of our unique southwestern heritage.  Suggest the phrase “...restoring the natural environment...” be changed to “respecting the natural environment...”	Staff recognizes concerns from the EVGMA regarding their understanding of the U.N. Brundtland Commission. Section 1.2.1.1 defines sustainability and 1.2.1.1 states a definition for Santa Fe County. Staff recommends that this definition be removed because this source may have negative connotations. Staff also recognizes that in the Sustainability definition in 1.2.1.1, that “protecting and restoring” is not a clear direction and concurs with the language change to “respecting the natural environment”.	Revise Section 1.2.1.1 to remove sustainability definition from the U.N. Bundtland Commission of the U.N. Also revise the definition of Sustainability for Santa Fe County to remove protecting and restoring and replacing with “respecting the natural environment”.
EGMA	1.3.1 Bullet 1, Page 11, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Sentence after “transportation choices can be provided” add “when feasible and appropriate.”	This is a part of the County vision to be more sustainable. This bullet indicates that growth should be focused in specific community <i>settings</i> , therefore the appropriateness of these choices is being considered.	No Change
EGMA	1.3.1 Bullet 4, Page 11. For the EGMA, the “discernable edges” could only be the Edgewood Town limits and the exterior boundary of the EGMA or when communities within the EGMA define their own particular boundaries. Also the statement that the county’s “distinctive character is the opposite of sprawl” requires staff to define sprawl with the assertion that planned large lot development as it pertains to the EGMA, does not necessarily mean “sprawl.”	This is a Countywide Plan which needs to reflect the County vision. A revision to reflect this might be to recognize <i>transitional edges based on a deeply rooted cultural landscape</i> .	Revise Section 1.3.1 bullet 4 as follows: <i>Definable distinctions between the traditional and the modern should be maintained through sensitive scale and design and transitional edges based on a deeply rooted cultural landscape.</i>
EGMA	1.3.1 Bullet 5, Page 11, add “some” before “specific” at beginning of sentence, and “or can be provided” at the end.	This references to specific designated growth areas which is general enough.	No change
EGMA	1.3.1 Bullet 6, Page 11, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence, after “for place, compact development..” add “(where appropriate)” and delete “the opposites of sprawl.”	County’s distinctive character includes efficient development patterns that may be different based on area or setting.	Revise 1.3.1 bullet 6: The elements that contribute most to Santa Fe County’s distinctive character are respect for place, efficient development patterns, and regional traditions.

EGMA	Change 8A. 1.3.2 Page 11, Bullet 2 After "...fiscal responsibility..." strike "and" and add "..., fiscal health and fiscal accountability."	Fiscal Responsibility for the County is reflected in the bullets.	No Change
EGMA	1.3.3, Page 11, "Focus on..." , after the words "Relation to" add "Respecting Existing and..."	There is a need to recognize and respect existing communities.	Revise 1.3.3 Focus on Existing and Future Community Needs and Values for Planning and Economic Development
EGMA	1.3.1 Page 11, #3, 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet, after "agricultural activities" add "responsible residential development, building construction..."	We should add language that includes the building and construction industry.	Revise 1.3.3 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet to include building and construction industry.
EGMA	1.3.3 Page 12, Bullet 1, Strike "...and acts as a mechanism to control sprawl" and add "while protecting individual property rights."	Open space acquisition can be used to control sprawl but there is a need to respect private property rights. One option is to add private property rights. Another is to remove and acts as a mechanism to control sprawl.	Revise 1.3.4 bullet: remove <i>and acts as a mechanism to control sprawl</i> .
EGMA	1.3.4 Page 12 1 <sup>st</sup> Bullet, Change "Acquire" to "Purchase"	County does not always acquire open space through purchase agreements. Various mechanisms include land donations, trades or conservation easements, etc.	No Change
EGMA	1.3.5 Bullet 1, Page 12, Change the word "Ensure" to "Move toward..."	Plan is a guide.	No Change
EGMA	1.3.5 Bullet 2, Page 12, at end of sentence add "only in GMA's where this is appropriate."	Add language that will distinguish an area like Estancia GMA where they solely rely on groundwater.	Revise 1.3.5 bullet 2: Rely less on groundwater for future development through conservation and use of surface water where appropriate.
EGMA	1.3.6 Bullet 1, Page 12, Replace existing sentence with "Existing hydrological parameters should be only one of many criteria used to determine zoning, and should be retained in the EGMA plan unless existing or potential imported water resources are available."	Hydrology should not be the sole determinant of zoning.	Revise 1.3.6 bullet 2 to: <i>Change existing hydrologic zoning to a more comprehensive zoning approach.</i>
EGMA	1.3.6, Bullet 5 Page 12, Add "logical" between the words "creative" and "sustainable."	This bullet is not clear. Revision needed.	Revise 1.3.6 bullet 5: Implement zoning that fosters creative, rational sustainable design and development.
EGMA	Change 12B. 1.3.8 page 12 Add a third bullet as follows: "Ensure fiscal responsibility and accountability."	Fiscal responsibility is already addressed in bullet # 2. Accountability however would be a good bullet addition for #8.	Revise 1.3.8 bullet 2: Ensure accountability for County governance.
SFRA	<b>The 2010 SLDP Final Draft's proposed "Binding Principles" are unnecessary and questionable as the basis for consistency determinations under the New Mexico statutes.</b> <b>Recommendation:</b> The Association requests that the County reconsider the need for the Binding Principles as they appear to be redundant with other, more specific, goals and policies within the plan. The Association asks the County on what basis it believes it has the authority to create and use "Binding Principles" as the basis for consistency determinations. The Association also requests that the Binding Principles identified in this memorandum be appropriately rephrased, if they are going to remain in the SLDP.	The principles of the SLDP do not need to be "binding" as this may indicate to some that we are trying to authorize consistency determination and a legal framework. Specify that the principles are guidelines rather than binding or mandates.	Revise 1.4 title to: Principles for Sustainable Growth Management Plan.
EGMA	1.4 Binding Principles 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3 "How we design and build...etc." Many objectionable principles which negatively affect the EGMA are set out within the various bullet points on pages 13 through 17. These objectionable items will be addressed in the details of the chapters where they are found.	No specific change recommendations	No change
EGMA	Change 12D. 1.4.4.4, Page 18, "Community Planning" should be changed to read "District Planning."	Community planning includes district planning as well as area and corridor plans. Currently stated at the end of paragraph for Contemporary Communities section.	Revise 1.4.4.4 to Add language to reflect community plans include district, area and corridor plans.
EGMA	1.4.4.5, Page 19, New Ruralism..., 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence, after "preference in" add "some GMA's in..."	These preferences are identified from a countywide perspective. Specific areas may have different perspectives. This section should be moved to Chapter 8.	Move to Chapter 8
EGMA	1.4.4.6 Page 19, New Ruralism Design Elements, Bullets 1,3 and 4 do not fit the EGMA's stated traditional and desired development criteria and are impractical and inappropriate for the EGMA. Staff should insert here the appropriate language to clear up the conflicting principles.	A District Plan should be developed for the EGMA to differentiate their concerns.	No Change.

Chapter 2-Land Use: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group / Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	2.1.1, paragraph 3, Page 22 "...adequate <u>public</u> facilities" should read "adequate facilities" because all of the water systems in the Estancia GMA are private or co-op.	Adequate facilities are part of the growth management strategy. There is recognition that all facilities are not publicly owned.	Revise 2.1.1 to "adequate facilities"
EGMA	2.1.1 Page 22, The SLDP decries "population growth and increasing competition for diminishing natural resources" in Santa Fe County. The fact is the entire county encompasses 1909 square miles (each equivalent to 640 acres) with a population density of 67.7 people per square mile (about 9.5 acres per person.) Subtracting out the population and area figures for the town of Santa Fe leaves the rest of the county at 37 people per square mile or about 17 acres per person. Further, the EGMA is projected to add 2,167 people between 2010 and 2030, or an increase of 1.1% or 4.7 additional people per square mile in the EGMA. Stating that this situation is in danger of contributing to global warming is ludicrous.	This is a plan and direction for the County for Growth Management and sustainability for the future. Santa Fe County is not exempt from contributing to global warming.	No Change
EGMA	2.1.1, paragraph 4, Page 22, This paragraph totally opposes large lot development which is the desired development pattern of the Estancia GMA outside of our traditional communities. Suggest we add in the third line after "low density residential development" the word "often."	Reasonable suggestion to add the word "often" to read: Large-lot low-density residential development is <b>often</b> resource intensive...	Revise 2.1.1, paragraph 4, to add the word "often".
EGMA	2.1.2, Page 23, paragraph 1, Encouragement of "green development design," these terms should be clearly defined in the document.	The term green development design should be defined.	Add definition of green development design in Glossary.
EGMA	2.1.2, paragraph 6, page 23, If any part of the Estancia GMA falls under a "priority growth area" then this reference to "compact...development" must be changed to allow our desired flexibility.	These development patterns are a desired development pattern for the County. The EGMA may need to determine the standards through a planning process.	No Change
UNMPRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under section 2.2.3.4 Existing Public, Institutional, and Utilities Land Use and Zoning include language <i>encouraging development of joint use agreements to provide access to school land after hours.</i></li> </ul>	There should be language that states that we want to work towards having public school facilities and school land for after hour access.	Revise 2.2.3.4 first bullet to read: "...to serve as a focal point for the community, afford easy access to residents, and encourage development of joint agreements to provide access to school land and recreational facilities after hours.
EGMA	2.2.4, Page 38 In line 5, after "...such developments are" insert the word "sometimes" before "excessive," and after "do not" insert "always" followed by "position." This eliminates the absolute negative implication of large lot development in <u>all</u> circumstances.	The statement implies that large lots are all excessive. Recommend revision to add can be excessive and may not position the County or its residents to attain sustainability.	Revise 2.2.4 as follows: "...the public and private costs of large lot development <i>can</i> be excessive and <i>may</i> not position the County or its residents to attain sustainability. "
EGMA	2.2.4.1 Page 38 Mixed Uses. In the EGMA, mixed use can mean we raise both horses and goats, work a vegetable garden and tend a few fruit trees. Many of the residents of the EGMA work from their homes, conserve energy, recycle, compost, raise their own meat and vegetables. The SDLP must contain verbiage allowing flexibility in the EGMA to accommodate, not vilify, this lifestyle.	This definition does not preclude the mixed use example. The EGMA should define its preference through the development of a community or district plan.	No Change
UC	2.2.4.4 "The SLDP and the SLDC create the path to develop mixed uses, new urban forms and building design as <b>matter of right</b> in a single concurrent hearing process <u>with adequate time and full opportunity for public review</u> .	The Code will need to establish the procedures. The procedures do not need to be established in the SLDP. Staff suggests removing the last paragraph from Section 2.2.4. If it is not removed, staff concurs with the UC recommendation.	Remove last paragraph in 2.2.4.4
UC	2.2.4.4 "Variances, base district rezoning and conditional use permits are not required to build flexible developments. The specific plan, planned district and opportunity zones allow development to proceed without Euclidean zoning restraints."	This section is confusing and staff recommends removing.	Remove last paragraph in 2.2.4.4
EGMA	2.2.5.1, Page 41, paragraph 4 In seventh line after "clustering may be required," add "( <u>not required in Estancia GMA.</u> )" On 9 <sup>th</sup> line after "map" add "( <u>not required in Estancia GMA.</u> )"	Clustering is a development pattern and may be required for higher density developments. It will not be required for base density.	No Change
EGMA	2.2.5.2, Page 43, paragraph 2 After "wildlife habitat in this area" add the following. "The <u>primary</u> reason that clustering requirements and surface water requirements must be relaxed in the Estancia GMA is that the traditional communities have already incorporated and are supplying most of the space needed in the	Language to recognize the potential for reduced clustering requirements was incorporated in the SLDP Final Draft in Section 2.2.5.2 for the Estancia Basin GMA.	No Change

	foreseeable future for higher density development. The property owners see the traditional larger lot development that has been predominant for the past 50+ years as the ideal growth pattern with the hydrological justifications as the best determinant of lot size. Some clustering should not be ruled out completely as an option where it might become more palatable between Edgewood and Moriarty, but should not be specifically encouraged.”		
EGMA	2.2.5.2 Page 43, Future Land Use Map. The designation of “rural fringe” is incompatible with existing traditional land use patterns in the Estancia Basin GMA is the “ <u>rural</u> ” designation area. This strongly emphasizes the need for a community or district plan for the entire Estancia GMA; until such a plan is completed the current hydrologically determined density requirements should remain in effect.	There is a process for the EGMA to establish a district with specific densities. A District Plan establishes the process to identify future land use for this area.	No Change.
EGMA	2.2.5.3, Page 43, paragraph 1 Fourth line after “...applicable to all base zoning districts,” add “which are encouraged now or in the future to rely eventually on surface water sources.”	Suggested language will be more specific to certain area where conditions may exist.	No Change.
UC	Figure 2-9: Future Land Use Categories: 1) Ag / Ranch / Agricultural, ranch and equestrian uses. Also may include eco-tourism and <u>renewable</u> resource-based activities. Comment: “resource-based activities” should be clarified to avert encouragement of unsustainable extraction of resources. 2) Rural / Agricultural uses, such as the growing of crops and raising of livestock, along with equestrian and very large lot residential uses. Also may include eco-tourism and <u>renewable</u> resource-based activities. 3) Activity Centers: Community Centers / Neighborhood or community scale shopping centers and personal and professional services conveniently located near residential areas. Includes businesses which are agriculture and <u>renewable</u> natural resource-based, Intended to be designed and integrated as part of mixed use / planned development.	Suggested language of “renewable” helps in clarifying resource-based activities. The term of “renewable resource based activities” should be defined and included in the glossary.	Revise Figure 2-9 Future Land Use Categories to add renewable “renewable resource based activities” and include in glossary.
UC	<b>2.2.7 MINING</b> “The County’s existing mining ordinance will be incorporated into the SLDC and will be recognized as a Development of Countywide Impact. The mining ordinance <del>should</del> <u>will</u> be incorporated into the SLDC without substantial changes, although it is expected that some aspects of the oil and gas ordinance may also be made applicable to mining. Sand and gravel mining <del>of an area in excess of 2 acres may</del> <u>will</u> also be recognized as a DCI and subject to the requirements of the existing mining ordinance and SLDC. <del>Sand and gravel mining of an area of 2 acres or less should be regulated in accordance with the existing sand and gravel regulations.</del> ”	2.2.7 Mining section is an important issue for residents and businesses in the County. The SLDP recommendation for mining, including sand and gravel mining, as a DCI is important to clearly define a process for regulation. The acreages identified for sand and gravel mining are not necessary because the DCI process needs to identify the regulations for both small and large scale mining.	Revise 2.2.7: Sand and gravel mining will be recognized as a DCI and subject to the requirements of the existing mining ordinance and SLDC.
Siebert and Associates	One of binding principles is to utilize local building materials and methods of construction for residential and non-residential development. The over-regulation of construction of sand and gravel is a contradiction to the binding principle. Sand and gravel is one of the most local building materials used in the County.	Sand and gravel should be accessible to the construction industry from local sources, however the location and regulation of the extraction sites needs to be considered for environmental and scenic view shed protection.	No Changes.
Siebert and Associates	Add policy: <i>Sand and gravel should continue to be regulated under regulatory standards established for mineral extraction for construction materials.</i>	Regulatory standards for mineral extraction for construction materials under the existing code	No Change
Siebert and Associates	Add policy: <i>Existing approved sand and gravel operations will be recognized in the SLDC.</i>	The SLDP identifies the direction the County for the future. Existing development may be either zoned or non-conforming uses. The Code will establish the mechanism for recognizing existing development.	No Change
Siebert and Associates	Add language: <i>Sand and gravel must be recognized as a local material used in a variety of ways in SF County employing a significant number of workers, generating substantial gross receipts for SF County.</i>	Sand and gravel is a local material and is used in a variety of ways. Consider adding language to recognize this existing local building resource.	Add statement or policy to recognize sand and gravel as a local material which contributes to the local economy.
Siebert and Associates	Add policy: <i>Resource areas for sand and gravel should be identified and protected from inappropriate development.</i>	Property owners may develop their property as resource areas for sand and gravel through the regulatory mechanism. Property owners should be aware of adjacent development to prevent incompatibilities.	No Change
EGMA	Goal 2, Policy 2.8, Page 53, at end of sentence add “where appropriate.” This is not appropriate in the Estancia Valley GMA.	The SLDP is a Countywide Plan. All areas should include “rational development patterns , land use compatibility and adopted levels of service. Suggested language allows for exceptions.	No Change

<b>EGMA</b>	Goal 4, Page 54, the Future Land Use map as shown should not be included in the SLDP. The use categories are not adaptable to District and GMA plans, and community plans which should be crafted by each Planning Area Group. It is implied by the Future Use map that a given category will be assigned a uniform density throughout the county, and this will usurp the authority of all individual District, GMA and community plans to choose their desired density factors.	The future land use map is part of the growth management strategy for the County. It is not a zoning map. Therefore does not assign a uniform density. A major concern from all areas of the County is to maintain the ability to create community plans and to define densities based on the conditions within the planning area.	No Change
<b>UC</b>	Policy 5.1: Ensure that oil and gas, <del>and mining ordinance, and sand and gravel mining regulations</del> are incorporated into SLDP and SLDC.	The language is not clear because it references mining ordinance and sand and gravel mining regulations separately and staff recommendation is to include sand and gravel in mining ordinance as a DCI. Consider adding suggested language to modify existing policy.	Revise Policy 5.1: Ensure that oil and gas and mining ordinance are incorporated into SLDC.
<b>UC</b>	Strategy 5.1.2: Incorporate existing mining ordinance to include sand and gravel mining <del>over two acres</del> into SLDC. [p. 54]	The size of sand and gravel mining operations should be included in the mining ordinance and regulated based on size and intensity.	Revise Strategy 5.1.2 to remove the acreage for sand and gravel mining.
<b>EGMA</b>	Goal 6 Page 55, At end of sentence, add “provided the cost of these techniques does not add an excessive cost to construction.”	The County may not mandate “green” building and development techniques. Consider changing the mandate to a direction.	Revise Goal 6: Promote sustainable new development through “green” building and development techniques.
<b>EGMA</b>	Goal 7, Page 55 Development patterns should be compact to minimize sprawl and land consumption, provide transit options and meet mixed use objectives through the development of appropriate land use tools and land transfer techniques.  Add at end of sentence “in GMA where these patterns are appropriate.”	Compact development patterns are not applicable in all areas of the County.	Revise Goal 7: Development patterns should be compact to minimize sprawl and land consumption, provide transit options and meet mixed use objectives where appropriate through the development of land use tools and land transfer techniques.
<b>EGMA</b>	Goal 7, Policy 7.1, Page 55, In 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence after “balance...,” add “...in GMA where this is appropriate.” The Estancia GMA will be served by jobs in Moriarty, Edgewood, and the Torrance County portion of the Estancia Valley, and will not have to rely simply on proximity to Santa Fe County for employment.	Policy states “development in priority growth areas”. Appropriate jobs/housing balance is an important part of the County’s growth management strategy. Regional jobs are important for future employment but the County’s recommendation is to establish a jobs/housing balance for future development.	No Change.
<b>EGMA</b>	Goal 7, Page 55 Policy 7.4, At end of sentence add “except where appropriate in low density GMA’s.”	The Policy is Countywide. Specific planning for Estancia can be developed through a District Plan to identify areas where development is appropriate.	No Change.
<b>SFRA</b>	The 2010 SLDP Final Draft’s analysis of future growth in the County is based on what appears to be questionable data.	Future growth was determined through a study based on the best available data and was conducted through a specific study for the unincorporated areas of the County and includes the annexation agreement with the City of Santa Fe and the presumptive City limits.	No change. Data is best data available.
<b>Diane Strauss</b>	The lands delineated to the West of La Cienga are in question as to why this is being listed on the current "Proposed Future Land Use Map (2010-2030) as RESIDENTIAL FRINGE ? These lands fall more into the rural character of conservation, agricultural and ranch lands than residential fringe. Please formally note and record for tonight's meeting. This is the appropriate term and falls in line with the long standing ordinance of La Cienega -- as well as the residents of Santa Fe County desire to keep open space.	Santa Fe Canyon Ranch Site: The land uses identified on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), for the Santa Fe Canyon Ranch site reflects the approved development plan when the proposed FLUM was initially prepared. The land uses on the proposed FLUM (“Residential Fringe” on the eastern portion and “Rural” on the western portion) reflects the approved development plan. Since the ultimate use of the site has not been finalized at this point in time, it is recommended that the FLUM on this site not be changed from what has been proposed.	No Change
<b>Pueblo de Cochiti</b>	The property acquired by the County should remain designated as open space. It is our hope and dream that someday we might realize a connectd corridor of open space that would stretch into the Jemez. We feel very strongly that any other designation would be a fundamental departure from our collective ability to protect this critical area from incompatible development.	Santa Fe County is undergoing a process to determine the most appropriate use of this land. This consideration will include the input from the community.	
<b>SF Planning Group</b>	Designation of a property as Rural or Ag/Ranch, when similar property owned by the County across the highway is designated as Residential Fringe and land directly south (in the vicinity of Madrid) is designated as Rural Fringe. The subject property is in close proximity to I-25 and within the “railroad corridor,” which becomes an apparent boundary for future development on the Future Land Use Plan. While we support the long range planning process, we request that this land be further studied and the future land use designation be reconsidered.	La Bajada Site: This area (5,421 acres) has very limited water supply for urban or community development – it is located in the Homestead hydrologic zone. The parcel is located within a major wildlife movement corridor connecting the Sandia and Ortiz Mountains with the Caja del Rio unit of Santa Fe National Forest (based on the wildlife corridor map produced by the New Mexico Game and Fish Department). Allowing urban- or community- intensity development, or even rural fringe development, on this parcel, would compromise the continuity of this wildlife movement corridor.	No Change

## Chapter 3-Economic Development: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	Change 1: Introductory Paragraph, Page 56 Paragraph 1, line 2, add "property rights" as one of the protections before protections of social and cultural resources.	Small correlation between private property rights and economic development opportunities.	No Change
EGMA	Change 2: Line 5, Support for add "private sector" workforce development	workforce development includes both private and public sectors	No Change
EGMA	Change 3: line 6, add "but not limited to" in connection with recruited industries	This element should not preclude industries. Add "...and recruit industries beneficial to the County, including, but not limited to, agriculture, media, clean technology and renewable energy.	Revise line 6 to add <b>including, but not limited to.</b>
EGMA	<b>3.1.1</b> Revise first key issue sentence from "Conventional approaches to economic development have not produced a diversified economy" to say what it really means: "County economic development has been impacted by the downturn in national economy."	It states at the end of the key issue national effects that have contributed to the stagnation (downturn) of the local economy. This language should be sufficient.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 3. deals with impacts and effects of climate change: <b><i>EGMA Concerns/recommendations: There are no resources or strategies significant enough in Santa Fe County to make any impact on climate change. We believe that science supports natural climate changes not created by mankind, and that any effort to address climate change issues would be both futile and financially devastating to the County citizens. Therefore, item 3 above should be deleted as it is far beyond the scope of SLDP.</i></b>	This is the sustainable plan and the vision for the County.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 4. on deficient infrastructure, delete " including ecology-based tourism" as it is not essential.	Language on ecology-based tourism does not fit in with the key issue about infrastructure deficiencies.	Delete "including ecology-based tourism"
EGMA	Item 5. on business services and support, add new sentence at the end of the paragraph, "Currently, there are several major sections of the Southern portion of Santa Fe County that do not have access to high speed internet, or basic phone service making home based businesses a challenge."	This is a specific GMA concern that may be addressed in the Estancia GMA Objectives.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 6. on workforce training, add at the end of the paragraph "Education dollars for most low income individuals in the Estancia Valley are based on WIA funding sources which have identified the following industries for funding: Manufacturing, Renewable Energy, Healthcare, Aviation, Construction."	This is a specific GMA concern that may be addressed in the Estancia GMA Objectives.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 8. on food security, suggested it be deleted or moved to another chapter, as it does not pertain to economic development.	Food security involves relying on the local food economy and does pertain to economic development by supporting local farmer's and growers.	No Change.
EGMA	3.1.2 item 1, delete "cluster", as it does not apply to EGMA.	Cluster industries are not defined. Targeted industries are defined and should be used here.	Change cluster industry to target industry.
EGMA	Item 3. first paragraph on support for small businesses, the elements need to be expanded to include those stipulated in the Workforce Investment Act in Estancia Valley, and suggested wording is: "including but not limited to retail, office, media and film, consulting, finance, arts, manufacturing, green industry, outdoor recreation, technology, aviation, construction, healthcare and ecotourism. Other economic based and service industries should also be supported. "	Good suggestion-plan should include additional economic based industries.	Revise 3.1.2 Item 3 to include <i>technology, aviation, construction, healthcare and ecotourism. Other economic based and service industries should also be supported. "</i>
EGMA	Item 4. on partnerships, line 4, change the word "entities" to communities, counties and organizations ...	Good suggestion – incorporate partnerships.	Language revision to include <i>"communities, government, and organizations and agencies..."</i>
EGMA	Item 5. on preparation for the effects of climate change, recommend deleting this element as out of scope (same as item 3 above).	The County should prepare for economic initiatives for the emerging green economy.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 9. delete word "cluster" for EGMA industries.	There is a need to define cluster industry or change to target industry.	Change cluster industry to target industry.

EGMA	Item 10. on economic development for targeted industries, change "in accordance with principles outlined in SLDP to "in accordance with the State Economic Development Department."	Talking about appropriate development of economic development for County– therefore needs to be in accordance with other sections of SLDP.	No Change.
EGMA	Item 11. "Damage to the natural, scenic ...environment has significant impacts on visual and natural resources which results in reduced real estate values in this market." as worded, is not a "key to sustainability". <b>EGMA concerns:</b> This item implies a “catchall” provision to stop all development which takes place in <u>any</u> natural, cultural and scenic environment, and clearly states that the undefined term “damage” will “reduce real estate values.” Does this mean no roads to subdivisions, no subdivisions, no development anywhere? It promotes a lie about “value,” has no reason to be included in an “Economic Development” chapter, and should be deleted in its entirety.	This is a key issue section because the damage to the natural environment results in not only lower real estate values, but also an impact on our eco-tourism and tourism industry in general. This should be move from keys to sustainability to key issue.	Move to Key Issue
EGMA	<b>3.2 Critical Findings</b> , line 5 delete word "green" before industry, as EGMA believes most all industry should be encouraged.	Green Industry is a target industry. The target industries are those that the County focuses on but does not preclude other industry.	No Change.
EGMA	3.2.1 PARTNERSHIPS -EGMA concerns – there are at least 11 overlapping agencies/ organizations with goals to strengthen economic development. The SLDP should step aside and allow these established agencies to do their job, thus avoiding added expense and conflicts of interest.	That is why we are stressing the importance of partnerships, realizing that other economic development groups, organizations, and agencies with expertise in this field and we would partner with them where appropriate.	No Change
EGMA	<b>3.2.2 LEADING INDUSTRIES</b> EGMA concerns: None of these employment tables on pages 58 & 59 include the workforce from Southern Santa Fe County and the Town of Edgewood that work in Albuquerque or in Torrance County	Estancia Valley Economic Development Association provided additional information from a study by BBER for the Southern Area of the County which should be incorporated since it is not included in the Leading Industries.	Revise to include additional information for Southern area of the County.
EGMA	Line 3: To be more accurate on new jobs, "Two sectors" should be changed to " <i>Three sectors, (State &amp; Local Government [third highest in the nation],</i> " Educational and health services; Leisure and hospitality) added most new jobs ...	Section 3.2.2 indicates that these are the sectors that <b>added</b> the most new jobs, although this section does not indicate the period of time that the jobs were added. County employment on Figure 3-3 does not reflect the jobs added since the County took over operations of the detention facilities. This section needs to be reviewed and revised.	Revise to ensure that employment by industry is County data and not MSA and reflect the county trends and updated employment data.
EGMA	<b>3.2.4 TARGET INDUSTRIES</b> <b>EGMA Concerns / recommendations: EGMA supports industry which creates jobs and shows reasonable respect for the environment. For the most part, SLDP targeted industries in 3.2.4.1 “GREEN” INDUSTRY – ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGY discriminate against EGMA, and the local support for green industries, creation of a Center for Community Sustainability, workforce training, etc. will not help to make a thriving economy in the Estancia Valley.</b>	This is a target industry and does not preclude other types of business or industry. A specific area might have a different approach for economic development. EGMA should determine what is the target for that area.	No Change.
EGMA	Under <b>3.2.4.2 on ARTS AND CULTURE</b> , end first sentence with explosive growth " <i>in and around the city of Santa Fe.</i> "	Arts, culture and tourism are located throughout SF County, not just in and around the City.	No Change.
EGMA	3.2.4.3 Page 61, line 2 - Film/Media – This paragraph states that for every \$1.00 in foregone taxes the county sacrifices to keep film companies coming back, it receives \$0.56 in revenue. EGMA recommends a careful evaluation of the cost benefit ratio of this industry before making it a favored target industry.	Film/Media is a Target Industry for the County and has shown significant impact on the economy. This section needs to be clarified to indicated that the return on investment includes the original investment plus an additional revenue which results in 156% return on investment.	Revise to clarify the return on investment from the film industry.
EGMA	<b>Page 62 - 3.2.4.4 AGRICULTURE EGMA Concerns: This section only concentrates on food supply omitting large farm production that provides feed and also provides a significant job force.</b> Need to define "value added" production or agriculture in this small section.	Define value added product more effectively to explain that it includes taking raw product produced from the land and further enhancing into the marketplace and for distribution – locally and/or regionally.	Add Value Added to glossary
EGMA	In Section 3.2.5 <b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b> , introductory paragraph, recommend deleting the word "renewable" before energy.	Renewable energy is important for future sustainability.	No Change
EGMA	Change 21: 3.2.5.1 <b>BROADBAND</b> changes "the number one" to "an" infrastructure priority.	Broadband infrastructure is important for the County but it has not been identified as the number one priority. Need to reconsider language revision to say, “an infrastructure priority”	Revise
EGMA	<b>3.2.5.2 RENEWABLE ENERGY</b> <b>EGMA concerns / recommendations: In view of the loss of jobs, exorbitant cost and lack of infrastructure (e.g. transmission lines) for renewable energy, EGMA desires to foster maintenance of an efficient traditional energy industry. EGMA welcomes renewable energy as long as the costs of any ventures into renewable or green energy are borne solely by private industry with no subsidies or taxes imposed on county residents.</b>	Renewable energy is important for a sustainable future for the County. Incentives are a mechanism to support renewable energy. There is no current proposal for new taxes to fund.	No Change.

<b>EGMA</b>	<b>Page 64 Item 3.3 Goals, Policies and Strategies</b> Policy 8.2: "Direct economic development to Opportunity Centers and major transit-oriented development sites served by facilities and services through requirements and incentives" would not apply in Estancia Valley and costs would be discriminatory. Suggest deleting or restricting application to higher population areas.	SLDP identified Opportunity Centers for potential economic development. Opportunity Centers should be site specific and may have different needs for infrastructure. An area or district plan might identify the most appropriate economic development mechanism for Estancia Valley.	No Change
<b>EGMA</b>	Policy 8.5: Delete words "require and"	Delete require. Policy 8.5: Coordinate economic development, land use and zoning to address a broad mix of housing types for workforce housing.	Revise Policy 8.5 and delete "require"
<b>EGMA</b>	Soften Policy 8.6: by changing "Require" to "Recommend"	Policy 8.6 is redundant with Policy 8.5. Restate Policy 8.5 and delete Policy 8.6.	Delete Policy 8.6
<b>EGMA</b>	Soften Policy 8.7: by changing "Require" to "Recommend"	Mixed use is a key component of the Growth Management Strategy. Replace "Require" with direct to support recommendation that SLDP change from a mandate to a directive.	Revise Policy 8.7: Direct planned developments in SDA 1 and SDA 2 to include a broad mix of housing types, with a range of housing costs in support of workforce housing needs.
<b>EGMA</b>	Strategy 8.9.1 discriminates against Estancia Valley, and wording should be revised to state workforce training programs " with local public school districts"...and add "the" to National Laboratories... Delete word "renewable" before energy.	Recommend additions. This is a County plan and specific areas should identify the most applicable workforce opportunities throughout the County. The SLDP should include potential workforce training programs and partnerships throughout the County.	Strategy 8.9.1: Support efforts to establish workforce training programs with local school districts, universities and the national laboratories that focus on targeted industries such as media, renewable energy, technology and value-added agriculture.
<b>EGMA</b>	Strategy 8.9.2: change LANL to " the National Laboratories"	Support language revision to address workforce needs countywide.	Strategy 8.9.2: Delete LANL and change to national laboratories.
<b>EGMA</b>	Policy 8.10: Paragraph1, delete words "cluster" and "renewable".	Need to define cluster industry or change to target industry.	Revise Policy 8.10 to change "cluster" to "target" industry.
<b>EGMA</b>	Strategy 8.10.4 - Change wording from "Develop incentives to encourage" to "Welcome self-sufficient" renewable energy	Renewable energy is the direction for the SLDP. Developing incentives to support renewable energy is supported through the SLDP.	No Change.
<b>EGMA</b>	Policy 8.17: Change "Support incentives to" to "Encourage" local businesses to retrofit buildings to achieve code compliance.	Energy efficiency is a direction for the SLDP and is a guide for the County.	No Change.



Chapter 4-Agriculture/Ranching Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	Chapter 4, introductory paragraph, final sentence, pg. 67. This sentence seems to be geared toward other areas of the county <u>not the EGMA</u> . Add El Centro or appropriate GMA to beginning of sentence.	This statement indicates that supporting local agriculture in as many forms as possible is important and does apply to the Southern part of the County as well.	EGMA needs to determine their goals regarding the future of agriculture and ranching for their area.
EBWPC	<b>4.1.1. Key Issue #1- Diminished farm size and profitability:</b> In our view, the Estancia portion of the County is an exception to the statement pertaining to decreased "farm size". While profitability is problematic, it isn't because of the amount of land available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good point. Restate the key issue to identify the source of information.</li> <li>• Regarding profitability – that point is a separate key issue from the issue of diminishing farm size and should be combined in another key issue or on its own.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1.1.1 Revise Key Issue to: <i>Changing characteristics of Farming and Ranching and profitability. "The size of farms and ranching in Santa Fe County has changed and has decreased based on USDA Census of Agriculture data.</i></li> </ul>
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #2- Need for enhanced food security and local food sustainability.</b> This is a nationwide issue and is a national security issue to boot. A question - how would the County encourage farmers and ranchers to continue their lifestyles and businesses?	This is a continuing challenge to come up with mechanisms to incentivize farmers and ranchers to continue this livelihood. We provided some tools and incentives in this chapter, however we are open to other suggestions.	Inquiry - no revision necessary
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #3 - Limited water supply and water quality issues:</b> The Estancia Basin is largely rural in nature and arguably 95% of the water pumped in the Basin every year goes to agricultural and ranching uses. While the water table is dropping (as it is throughout the western United States), it isn't due to development...it is due to agriculture and ranching , which is also creating change to water quality parameters throughout the Basin. We believe that agricultural and ranching uses will diminish for a myriad of reasons, which will reduce the strain on the aquifer, and that some of the land will move into development. With appropriate zoning and development codes with minimum lots sizes in the two to five acre range, the aquifer will benefit from development of those previously irrigated lands.	There are a few sustainable agriculture practices in the Estancia Basin that utilize other methods of irrigation other than the water intensive pivot spray irrigation so it would not be correct to assume they are pumping more water than current and new development. The County is not in any position to dictate the future water budget of the Estancia Basin and the balance between agriculture and development. However, we do agree that with appropriate zoning and development codes, there can be a better mechanism for agriculture and ranching lands that are transitioning to new development.	General Comment-No language revision necessary
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #5. Fragmentation of agricultural land and development pressure:</b> The Estancia region of the county remains an exception to the fragmentation issues, for the most part ... but ranchers and farmers are often in discussion about other uses for their land. Those uses could move toward residential and commercial development in the context of most of the SLDP, or it may not.	Agricultural land use patterns need to be analyzed using GIS mapping to determine the integrity or fragmentation of farmland throughout the County.	No language revision necessary
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #6- Encroachment on agricultural lands.</b> The Estancia region appears to be an exception to this premise.	Land use incompatibilities can involve a number of different scenarios not just development of agriculture land.	No Change
EGMA	4.1.1 paragraph 6, pg 67. After "land use incompatibilities" add "in appropriate GMA's." Add "This type of development may be positive growth in the EGMA..." as it encourages a reduction of aquifer use and adds to sustainability.	Land use incompatibilities can involve a number of different scenarios not just development of agriculture land.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #7. Lack of recognition of acequia governance</b> The acequia issues in this discussion are not applicable in the Estancia region of the county. The same is true for #8.	This is a county-wide plan therefore there may be key issues that may not be applicable to certain GMAs.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>4.1.2 Keys to Sustainability #2 - Maintain agricultural operations.</b> Please provide a definition of ' traditional', as used herein. County assistance to farmers may come under the constitutional issue of anti-donation.	Take out word "traditional" before agriculture to be more inclusive of agricultural practices.  Providing tools and resources or possibly leads to state and federal funding sources is not an anti-donation issue. Key to Sustainability #2 language however does need to be reworked.	Revise 4.1.2 bullet #2 to read: <i>Limited development of farm and ranch land can help maintain agricultural operations. Agriculture can be protected and supported through technical assistance, preferential taxation, protection of water resources, local capacity building and other support.</i>
EGMA	4.1.2 paragraph 2, pg 68. Define <u>traditional agriculture</u> , and in 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence after "be preserved," add "(in appropriate GMA's.)"	Take out "traditional" before agriculture to be more inclusive of agricultural practices.	Revise Key to Sustainability #2: See revision above.

EGMA	4.1.2 paragraph 4, pg 68. After the end of the paragraph add “The definition of a compact area may vary in growth management areas where tradition and local determination of lot sizes should prevail if sustainable.”	This is not a mandate, but an important option to give for these scenarios where a critical mass of agricultural land could be maintained.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>Key to Sustainability #4. Promote the use of clustered lots...</b> Agreed, under the assumption that large tracts of open space are associated with philosophy, with the focus on waste treatment challenges and water availability for dense development.	No evaluation necessary - EBWPC agrees with Key #4	No revision necessary
EBWPC	<b>Key to Sustainability #6- Protection of water availability for agriculture.</b> In the Estancia region of the County, increased initiatives for domestic conservation will be fruitless unless accompanied by increased initiatives in the agricultural realm.  Please define 'community-based' agriculture.	Propose rewording the text under this Key to Sustainability. Reword #5 header to read: <b>Conservation of water by all users increases water availability for agriculture.</b> <b>Community-based agriculture</b> is defined in Section 4.2.1.4: <i>A local food network that provides a locally based, self-reliant food economy – one in which sustainable food production, processing distribution and consumption is integrated to enhance economic, environmental and social health.</i>	Reword #5 header to read: <i>Conservation of water by all users increases water availability for agriculture.</i>
EGMA	4.1.2 paragraph 6, pg 68. Paragraph does not mesh with EGMA’s agriculture operations which use 95% of the area’s water, exclusively from groundwater sources. Rain collection is not a viable option for EGMA farmers. Add “In the EGMA, residential and commercial water user conservation methods have not affected the area’s water supply to any significant degree and such proposals should always be analyzed on a cost/benefit basis as they pertain to housing.”	Referring to community-based agriculture – the Southern part of the County may have a different method to look at sustaining their water supply long term, although any area has the viable option of utilizing rain collection or other methods of irrigation that are less water intensive. Specific needs should be addressed in a District Plan.	An EGMA District Plan should identify the specific EGMA needs.
EGMA	<b>4.2.1.3 Farm Characteristics.</b> In the second paragraph, can you break out farm size by region?	The Census of Agriculture does not break down the farm sizes by region, just provides the total counts and associations with acreages.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>4.2.1 Farms and Ranches</b> - please define "contemporary agriculture", as used in the second paragraph. For the census information in this paragraph, can you break out farm acreage by county region?	Use of the word contemporary is confusing. Take out the word 'contemporary' and replace language with: “among <b>today's</b> agricultural and ranching communities in Santa Fe County.” This sentence doesn’t make sense where it is currently located – move to the beginning of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph of this section.  The Census of Agriculture does not break down the farm sizes by region, just provides the total counts and associations with acreages.	Revise 4.2.1 – 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence and move revised sentence to beginning of third paragraph to read: <i>Traditional methods, customs, and indigenous seeds are still being used among <b>today's</b> agricultural and ranching communities in <b>Santa Fe County</b>. Acequias support agro-economic systems and have been the key to survival of local communities....”</i>
EBWPC	<b>4.2.1.2 Agricultural Production.</b> The last two sentences seem to comingle 'farming' and 'ranching' - they aren't the same - for example - corn, and livestock. What is the source of data for the top crop information?	Last sentence is disconnected from the second to last sentence.	Need to rework language to be stated more clearly and locate source of information.
EGMA	<b>4.2.1.4 Community Based Agriculture, Page 71, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.</b> Doing the math presented here, \$2,000,000 gross sales divided by 150 member families yields a gross annual family income of \$13,333. Most farm net income would average around 20% of gross or \$2,666.60 annual net income, belying the statement that this is realistically a “viable means of making a living.” Suggest statement be changed to reflect the reality that this source of income may supplement but never supplant the revenue necessary to sustain a family.	We are not suggesting that direct sales of produce and products are the only viable option in agriculture to make a living, although it is possible.	Revise 4.2.1.1: 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence to read: <i>“... giving smaller scale agricultural producers a viable venue in which to sell their produce and products to make a living.”</i>
EGMA	4.2.2 Page 72, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, Eliminate the first paragraph as it is full of irrelevant and untrue statements which could lead to misleading or damaging interpretations, such as “Just and Healthy Systems,” “...locally produced food is <u>key to food safety</u> ...”, “multiculturalism,” “social justice...” Also the SLDP as written will ensure soaring land prices; it then is contradictory to pretend that county actions will make food cheaper and that “low global food prices” are bad for poor county residents This paragraph is the type of drivel that weakens and raises opposition to the SLDP.	These comments are subjective, there is no data or findings to support EGMA comments on this section.	No Change
	<b>4.2.3 Existing County Agricultural Policies.</b> Are the policies discussed in this section permanent and irrevocable?	These resolutions are meant to support and encourage agricultural and ranching related lifestyles. They are subject to modifications at the discretion of the BCC.	Inquiry - No revision necessary

EBWPC	<b>4.2.4.2 Conservation easements.</b> What happens to the water rights associated with former agricultural land placed in conservation easements?	It depends on the language in the conservation easement document, itself. Conservation easements will often address water rights specifically, the agreement will specify if water rights 'run with the land' and can't be severed, or not. If water rights are tied to the land through a conservation easement they must remain with the land even agriculture ceases, thus preserving the opportunity for agriculture."	Inquiry - No revision necessary
EBWPC	<b>4.2.4.5 Agricultural Protection.</b> Define 'too small' as used in this paragraph. Figure 4.2, Irrigated Agriculture. The Figure doesn't seem to contain any information on the Estancia Region, with over 10,000 acres of irrigated land (in 2005).	"too small" as written needs to be defined in terms of acres or area, or perhaps reworded for clarification. Figure 4 reflects data from SEO' office regarding surface irrigation. The 10,000 acres of irrigated land are likely irrigated with center pivot systems.	Rewrite 4.2.4.5 – Combine and revise first and second sentence to read: <i>Agricultural protection policies may be created to protect high-quality soils, and separate conflicting agriculture and residential land uses, and Agricultural protection policies can be created to support agricultural uses to slow the conversion of farmland to other uses and prevent fragmentation of the farmland base into parcels too small to farm, specifically for the acequia based farming.</i>
EGMA	<b>4.2.4.5, Page 79, Bullet 1,</b> After "accommodate," strike "appropriate" and add after "development" "...if appropriate for specific GMA's." Rationale: The <u>preservation</u> of all existing farms in the Estancia GMA is not appropriate. EVBWPC is currently promoting conversion of some water rights from farming to domestic use to ease pressure on the aquifer (an immediate reduction of 50% allowable usage) and the SLDP must recognize this highly beneficial sustainability measure as it pertains to underground agricultural water sources.	The EGMA district plan should address the standards for their area.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>4.3.2 Water Rights.</b> This provides some background on water rights in general, but with a focus on surface diversions. A brief blurb on ground water rights, particularly as they apply to spray irrigators in the Estancia region, would be helpful, as well as a blurb as to the 'property right ' that applies to owners of water rights for irrigation.	It may be appropriate to include a short section on ground water rights and property rights.	Revise or remove
EGMA	4.4 Strategy 9.1.1 Page 79, Replace "Require" with "As appropriate per individual growth management area, suggest . . ." 4.4 Page 79, Goal 9, Policy 9.1, strategy 9.1.1, Omit in total.	Not all areas will be able to provide buffers because of particular landscapes.	Revise Strategy 9.1.1 New development in rural or agricultural areas should provide open space buffers adjacent to agricultural uses and scenic roads <i>where appropriate.</i>
EGMA	4.4, Goal 9, Policy 9.2, Strategy 9.2.1, Page 79, 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentences, after "districts," strike "development impact fees and..." Rationale: The state impact fee laws rightly prohibit collection of such fees for any reason other than long life <u>capital improvements</u> . There is no conceivable excuse to charge such fees in support of existing agriculture, and this inclusion is <u>not</u> justified.	This strategy is a potential tool. It is not a mandate.	No Change
EGMA	4.4, Page 79, goal 10, Policy 10.2.1, strike "organic."	Re-word this strategy so it supports local farming rather than just stating organic.	Revise Strategy 10.2.1: Support opportunities for local farming.
EGMA	Goal 11, Page 81, Strategy 11.2.2, add "In appropriate GMA's..."	States "where water is collected" which already indicates that this is not every place in the County. Estancia GMA should identify standards through district planning process.	No change.
EGMA	Add strategy 11.2.3, at end of sentence add "support water rights banking where these methods might cause a reduction in legal water rights."	We can add language saying the County is in support of water banking programs and initiatives.	Add new strategy 11.2.4: Support water banking programs and initiatives.
EGMA	4.4, Page 79, Goal 9, Policy 9.1.2 Change "standards" to "methods."	Good suggestion.	Revise Policy 9.1.2 to change standards to "methods"
EGMA	4.4, Page 79, Goal 9. Policy 9.1.5, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence after "agricultural land," add "with their legal existing water rights."	This strategy is to identify and create an inventory of agricultural lands. It will be difficult to identify legal existing water rights.	No Change.
EGMA	4.4, Page 79, Goal 9, Policy 9.2, strategy 9.2.1 Define "beneficial taxation" or strike it.	Beneficial taxation is not defined.	Remove "beneficial taxation" from Strategy 9.2.1.

Chapter 5-Resource Conservation: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	<p><i>Section 5.5 (p. 99) – Goals, Policies and Strategies</i>                      Add an additional policy promoting District Plans                      Policy xx.x.1: Support the Estancia Growth Management Area and any other area in Santa Fe County that wishes to develop its own District Plan. District Plans must be prepared with broad community input and may depart from the County SLDP where justified by the specific characteristics of that area.</p>	<p>Similar intent is already stated in the Plan –Chapter 2 Goal 3, Policies 3.2 and 3.3; and n Chapter 14 Governance – Goal 46, Policies 46.1 and 46.2, and Strategies 46.1.1., 46.2.1, and 46.3.1.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>5.1.2 Item 13 (p. 84)</i>  <b>“The SLDP will require the use of Environmental Impact Studies for all new or expanding development in extraction of resources ...”</b>                      Delete. County cannot afford to subsidize the activist-litigation complex.</p>	<p>The studies are expected to be paid for by the applicant and allow the potential impacts of the project to be evaluated. The County will not pay for the studies or subsidize.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>5.1.2 Item 14 (p. 84)</i>  <b>“Pursue financing of resource conservation through payment of ecosystem services.”</b>                      Clarify. Any additional taxes &amp; fees must be clearly specified in the SLDP. Implementation of those taxes &amp; fees must require voter approval, complete transparency in the disposition of collected funds, and have sunset provisions.</p>	<p>Need to define and clarify how a Payment for Ecosystem Services would function. This key to sustainability was meant as a concept and potential tool but is not well defined. Should be revised or deleted.</p>	Delete 5.1.2 # 14.
EGMA	<p><i>Strategy 12.7.1 (p. 99)</i>  <b>“Create development standards for the siting and installation of renewable energy production facilities.”</b>                      Clarify that this should be done to benefit the County as a whole. There is concern in EGMA that this will be done only for the benefit of the central and Northern portions of the County.</p>	<p>The standards to be incorporated in the land development code are intended to benefit the county as a whole and not for a specific area.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>Policy 13.3 (p. 99)</i>  <b>“Require use of native vegetation, southwestern plants and draught [sic] tolerant natural landscaping materials in the landscaping of public and private development, including roadway and right-of-way landscaping.”</b>                      Delete “Require”. Change to “Encourage”.</p>	<p>SLDP language is consistent with current terrain management and is a guide for the County.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>Policy 15.1 (p. 100)</i>  <b>“The spread of noxious and invasive species should be prevented and native species should be protected and restored.”</b>                      Change to – Santa Fe County should encourage actions to prevent the spread of noxious species. Santa Fe County may also choose to cooperate with individuals and agencies to encourage the preservation of selected “native” species, recognizing that today’s “native” species was yesterday’s invader.</p>	<p>SLDP language is consistent with current standards and is a guide for the County. SLDP language to protect native species is not a mandate but rather encourages.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>Policy 15.3 (p. 100)  <b>“Wildlife habitat, migration corridors, riparian areas and surface water resources that support wildlife health should be preserved and protected.”</b>                      Change to – Santa Fe County may choose to encourage the maintenance of wildlife habitat, migration corridors, etc.</p>	<p>SLDP language affirms commitment to maintain and support wildlife habitat. This is the County’s vision and should not be weakened.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>Policy 15.4 (p. 100)</i>                      Delete. Endangered species are already protected by State &amp; Federal governments. Any County function would be an unsustainably-expensive redundancy.</p>	<p>SLDP language affirms that this is important for the County and confirms commitment to support and preserve wildlife habitat and corridors.</p>	No Change

EGMA	<p>Goal 16 (p. 100)</p> <p><b>“Scenic viewsheds should be preserved and protected as an important resource.”</b></p> <p>Goal should be reworded to emphasize that the community will not turn the desirable goal of viewshed preservation into an unsustainable &amp; unconstitutional economic burden on private property owners. Replace with -- Santa Fe County, with voter approval, should have the authority to purchase private property at market value where necessary to preserve &amp; protect scenic viewsheds.</p>	<p>This is an important vision for the County. Scenic view sheds represent an important common community value that needs protection and support from local government. The County has already used the voter approval process for funding for acquisition of open space.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>Policies 16.1-16.4 (p. 100)</p> <p>Policies on siting of developments should be change to delete language on “Require”, “Prohibit”, “Limit”. Instead, the policies should have Santa Fe County “Encourage” sensitive development, while retaining the right to use the power of Eminent Domain to purchase key properties from the owners at market value to preserve them. Such purchases must require explicit voter approval.</p>	<p>The SLDP should be a guide, not a mandate. Changing the wording from Require or Prohibit is a feasible option. The SLDC will provide the requirements. Recommend change to Policy 16.1 and 16.2 to create standards. There is currently a process to acquire open space through voter approved bond funding through the COLTPA C process.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 16.1 to delete “require” and add “create standards for”: Create standards for sensitive siting, design and screening of new development to minimize visual and physical impacts to the land where other more appropriate building sites exist.</p>
EGMA	<p>Policy 16.2 – Page 100</p> <p><b>“Prohibit development on steep slopes, visible ridges and peaks.”</b></p> <p>Policy 16.2 would prevent almost all wind power development in Santa Fe County, which the SLDP wants to promote. We need to make choices between worthy but incompatible goals.</p>	<p>SLDP is a guide, not a mandate. Prohibited types of development need to be stated. Specific regulatory mechanisms to prohibit development will be identified in the Code. Standards need to be developed for wind and solar projects and use of hilltops and ridges for feasibility of wind projects should be evaluated on a case by case basis to avoid impacts on neighboring communities.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 16.2 to delete “Prohibit” and replace with “Limit”: Limit development on steep slopes, visible ridges and peaks.</p>
WHNM	<p>Policy 15.3: <del>Wildlife Preserve and protect wildlife</del> habitat, migration corridors, riparian areas and surface water resources that support wildlife health <del>should be preserved and protected.</del></p>	<p>Suggested language changes are appropriate in clarifying policy 15.3, wording is rearranged to provide emphasis on preservation and protection of wildlife</p>	<p>Revise Policy 15.3: Preserve and protect wildlife habitat, migration corridors, riparian areas and surface water resources that support wildlife health.</p>
WHNM	<p>Add Strategy 15.3.2: New development must submit a Natural Resource Assessment (NRA) with data that can be used in Santa Fe County's Wildlife and Habitat Management Program.</p>	<p>The proposed new strategy supports Policy 15.3 by developing a Natural Resource Assessment process. This process could be incorporated into the environmental assessment. The County currently does not have a Wildlife and Habitat Management Program. This would need to be defined.</p>	No Change
WHNM	<p>Policy 15.5: Coordinate with environmental NGOs (non-governmental organizations) such as the Galisteo Watershed <del>Planning</del> Partnership to protect and rehabilitate local creeks, wildlife <del>habitat, wildlife</del> corridors and other environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>Suggested language changes are appropriate in clarifying policy 15.5. The Galisteo Watershed Partnership does not include “Planning” in its title. The addition of habitat refers to wildlife while the addition of wildlife is specific to corridors.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 15.5: Coordinate with environmental NGOs (non-governmental organizations) such as the Galisteo Watershed Partnership to protect and rehabilitate local creeks, wildlife habitat, wildlife corridors and other environmentally sensitive areas.</p>
WHNM	<p><del>Strategy 15.5.1: Coordinate with wildlife conservation organizations to identify crucial focal and indicator species and establish and preserve crucial wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.</del></p>	<p>Suggested language changes are appropriate in clarifying Strategy 15.5.1 Rewording helps to support the need for coordination with conservation organizations.</p>	<p>Revise Strategy 15.5.1: <i>Coordinate with wildlife conservation organizations to identify and preserve crucial wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.</i></p>
WHNM	<p><del>Strategy 15.5.2: Develop Integrate data from wildlife conservation organizations and from required Natural Resource Assessments to develop an inventory of local wildlife and to further the County's Wildlife and Habitat M-and-wildlife habitat areas, a wildlife management and protection pProgram and a wildlife corridor study that promotes humane wildlife practices and prohibits inhuman handling or trapping of wildlife on public lands within Santa Fe County.</del></p>	<p>Suggested language changes are appropriate in clarifying and strengthening Strategy 15.5.2 by integrating data from conservation organizations into the process of wildlife inventory. The Natural Resource Assessment has not been defined. The inclusion of humane wildlife practices further supports the protection of wildlife species. Santa Fe County does not have jurisdiction over public lands other than those owned by the County.</p>	<p>Revise Strategy 15.5.2: <i>Integrate data from wildlife conservation organizations to develop an inventory of local wildlife and to establish a County Wildlife and Habitat Management Program that promotes humane wildlife practices.</i></p>
WHNM	<p><del>Add Strategy 15.5.3: Coordinate with conservation organizations and state agencies to develop wildlife corridors and the ongoing monitoring of those corridors.</del></p>	<p>Proposed new strategy 15.3.3 helps to support Policy 15.5 by developing and monitoring wild life corridors.</p>	<p>Add proposed new strategy 15.5.3: <i>Coordinate with conservation organizations and state agencies to develop wildlife corridors and the ongoing monitoring of those corridors.</i></p>

Chapter 7-Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
LWVSFC	7.2.2. Renewable Energy Resources. The use of biofuels should be considered only when they are energy efficient, environmentally appropriate and cost effective.	Renewable energy resources include biodiesel and biomass. These biofuels are a component of renewable energy resources and should be considered.	No Change
LWVSFC	A green building code should not only recognize energy conservation achieved through quality of building components and construction methods, but should also tie the amount of energy conservation required to the building size.	A green building code is being considered as Strategy 18.2.1 but the County does need to assess the practicality of establishing this program and the requirements therein.	No Change.
LWVSFC	Local governments should develop methods to reduce the burden of energy costs for local residents by making it easier for them to increase the energy efficiency of existing houses.	This is an important issue for the County to address energy efficiency.	Consider adding more energy efficiency methods to this section.
EGMA	As a new Binding Principle: <i>Santa Fe County recognizes that the key to sustainability is a robust economy which supports jobs and generates tax revenue. Historical and modern evidence proves incontrovertibly that a robust economy depends on a plentiful reliable affordable supply of energy in a number of different forms. Accordingly, Santa Fe County will facilitate the sensitive development of all forms of energy.</i>	This chapter discusses Renewable Energy and Energy efficiency. Renewable energy may be more affordable in the long term. This suggested language change is not supported by the direction established for renewable energy in the SLDP.	No Change.
EGMA	<b>7.1.2 – Keys to Sustainability</b> <i>The foundation for sustainability is a robust local economy which provides jobs for County residents and tax revenue for the County. That robust local economy requires plentiful affordable energy in a variety of forms. The key to sustainability for the County is to make sure that energy is available.</i>	This chapter discusses Renewable Energy and Energy efficiency. This suggested language change is not supported by the direction established for renewable energy in the SLDP.	No Change
EGMA	<b>7.2 – Critical Findings</b> 7.2.1 – Conventional Energy. Add 7.2.1.5: Transportation Energy: The continued availability of affordable gasoline & diesel supplies for transportation energy is very important, particularly in the rural EGMA.	Transportation Element is an important component of the SLDP . Conventional fuels for transportation may be subject to volatile price changes as fossil fuel access and availability lessen.	No Change
EGMA	7.2.2 – Renewable Energy Resources. Add a paragraph to the beginning of 7.2.2: Santa Fe County recognizes that alternate energy sources need to demonstrate they are economically competitive with existing sources.	Renewable energy resources are an important element for sustainability. This section outlines what existing renewable energy resources there are in the County.	No Change.
EGMA	<b>7.3 Goals, Policies, and Strategies</b> Goal 18 – Reduce greenhouse gas and non-renewable energies. Eliminate existing language. Replace with – Ensure that plentiful affordable energy supplies are available in a variety of forms.	Reduction of Greenhouse gas is key and overarching goal for the County. Reducing dependence on non-renewable energy is the direction for the SLDP.	No Change.
EGMA	Policy 18.6 to 18.7 – Support generation of renewable energy. Replace with – Support all forms of energy supplies by ensuring there are no unnecessary regulatory barriers.	This chapter focuses on renewable energy.	No Change
EGMA	Add Policy 18.8 – Get explicit citizen support for any proposed subsidies. All costs of subsidizing any energy source that may be passed on to Santa Fe County taxpayers should be put to a vote of the citizens in a referendum.	The SLDP is a guide for the County. The determination to create a referendum should not be in the policy section.	No Change
EGMA	Goal 19 – Promote solar and wind. Replace with – Support solar and wind by ensuring there are no unnecessary regulatory barriers.	The SLDP is a guide for the County. Regulations and guidelines for establishing solar and wind facilities will need to be established.	No Change.

Chapter 8-Sustainable Green Design and Development Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
LWVSFC	There should be more emphasis on energy-efficient building in order to take advantage of New Mexico's conditions as well as an increased focus on the appropriate use of new technologies and alternative energy sources. Passive solar should be required of all new construction as the first line because it is economically feasible and has little environmental downside; active technologies must be adapted and used in accordance with environmental concerns.	Energy efficiency and sustainable green design and development is the direction established in the SLDP. The language to require passive solar is more of a mandate than a guide.	No Change
EGMA	Page 121, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2nd sentence after "the county will," strike "regulate" and replace it with "...encourage building techniques through incentives related to the... design and construction..." and in the 5 <sup>th</sup> line after "flexibility" add "to merge local traditional and contemporary architectural design,...and permit the use...."	The County regulates development through the Land Development Code. 5 <sup>th</sup> line –suggestion for language additions can be supported but does not clearly state the need for addition language in this section.	No Change
EGMA	Page 121, 8.1.1, paragraph 6, After "responsible" add "economically viable."	The issue is that there is a need for environmentally responsible development. "Responsible" indicates it should be economically viable.	No Change
EGMA	Page 121, 8.1.1 Add #9 as follows: "Huge extra costs are added to commercial and residential construction because of a cumbersome and ineffective permitting process. Need to streamline systems, and deadlines (failure of county to meet a deadline would mean approval is automatic), and create and supply to applicants simple charts of the "critical path" of the permit process and <u>all</u> requirements.	Staff concurs that there is a need to streamline the process. This is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 14.	No Change.
EGMA	Page 121, 8.1.2, paragraph 2, After "require" add "economically viable." Rationale: Many green products and development techniques are too expensive for the often <u>slight</u> benefit they produce and the county must analyze this advantage over cost for any mandated regulation.	Staff concurs with rationale and this key does not state how this will be done. Recommend changing require to Encourage.	Change require to encourage.
EGMA	Page 122, 8.1.2, paragraph 7, After "building materials," add "where cost effective" and at end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence add "The county must approve economical methods of quarrying local stone, pumice, plus areas to harvest wood and adobe-making dirt or this "local materials" provision will not be possible. Also on paragraph 8 after "evaluated for" add "initial cost...," and after "impact on the environment," add "low maintenance..."	Key to sustainability is not a mandate it is a suggestion.	No Change
EGMA	Page 123, 8.2.1.1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraphs, These are full of contradictions and misguided statements which would lead one to believe non-industrialized local building materials such as stone, earth and wood are obtainable at minimal cost. Nothing could be further from the truth. The quarries from which stone must be obtained, the pits for adobe-appropriate mud, and the trees sufficient in size for building generally do not exist in Santa Fe County, either because of little to no available harvestable forest land, or government controls barring quarries and large slash pits (a type of mining.)	EVGMA comments as outlined are subjective. This section is informational only supported by historical precedents in the county.	No change
EGMA	Page 124, 8.2.1.1, 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraphs, at top of page, The narrative describes a use of dome construction, which cannot be financed, also underground housing with passive solar assisting cannot be financed nor can buildings made of tires, steel cans etc. be financed. The whole section should be eliminated and replaced with a pledge from the county to promote financing sources for economically feasible alternative construction methods.	This section is informational only. Dome construction can be financed when supported by architect/engineer designs. Financing of recycled houses may not be necessary and may be owner built and affordable. Existing language is inclusive of alternate construction materials and methods providing a diversity and options to conventional construction. The county does not finance alternative construction methods.	No Change
EGMA	Page 124, 8.2.1.2 So many wonderful traditional styles of architecture are left out....	The existing ones are the more common types, we agree that there are more styles that could be considered. Suggest more research be conducted on other styles.	No Change
EGMA	Page 125, 8.2.1.3, Minimum Standards...LEED standards are hideously expensive and fail miserably in the embodied energy test, and are unaffordable for most housing and most families in our county. <u>Federal</u> E-star standards work much better as they are cost effective and have the most	LEED Standards are meant for public buildings and are an option for the client/builder. Agree with Federal E-Star standards, should be encouraged.	No Change

	benefit. Suggest the SLDP encourage the Federal standards only.		
EGMA	Page 125, 8.2.1.4 Energy Efficiency... paragraph 3, This paragraph should be eliminated in its entirety.	This section states that the “County may require compliance with energy efficiency standards” but is not a mandate. More specifics can be addressed in Code.	No Change
EGMA	Page 125, 8.2.1.4 Rainwater Harvesting. This is a particularly <u>bad</u> requirement and should not be required of all homes.	County has a rainwater harvesting ordinance currently.	No Change
EGMA	Page 128, 8.3 Goal 21, at end of sentence, after “plan” add “or any subsequent community or district GMA plan.”	A subsequent community or district plan will review standards for their area.	No Change
EGMA	Page 128, Policy 21.1, Delete after “attain,” “leadership in energy and environmental design (LEED) standards.” Insert after “attain,” “federal Energy Star standards.”	Option for LEED should be left for owners/ buildings that may wish to apply. Other options should also be considered.	Revise Policy 21.1: Encourage new public and private development to attain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or similar standards such as State or Federal Energy Star standards.
EGMA	Page 128, Policy 21.3 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence, After “water quality,” add “when appropriate in the GMA.”	This is a guide-not a mandate.	No Change
EGMA	Page 128, Policy 22.1, After “environmentally responsible,” add “economically viable...”	This Policy states “promote”. It is not a mandate. Economics is a part of the equation.	No Change.
EGMA	Page 128, Policy 22.2, Strategy 22.2.1, This entire strategy is <u>not</u> a county function and best be tied to <u>Tested and Established Federal Standards</u> . It encourages the “good old boy” creation of standards and specifications which often inure to the benefit of a few privileged suppliers or contractors and encourages corruption.	Existing language is broad and not confined to just Federal Standards. The creation of the standards and specifications will be based on extensive research and review of the best available models that are appropriate and economically viable. Leave existing language in place.	No Change



## Chapter 9-Public Safety Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
UNMPRC	<p><i>Recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change Chapter 9 title to "Public Health and Safety Element" and provide inclusive language with public health complimentary to public safety (but not one-in-the-same).</li> </ul>	<p>This chapter addresses law enforcement, fire and emergency services and public safety issues. The inclusion of "Health" to the title of chapter 9 will make this section more inclusive of public health issues and the need to address them aside from public safety. If the title of Chapter 9 read: Public Health and Safety, this would require adding a public health element to this chapter. Another option is to include health initiatives in the Strategic Plan to address the issues for public health.</p>	No Change
UNMPRC	<p><i>Recommendations:</i></p> <p>The Santa Fe County SLDP Executive Summary Draft-August, 2010 (p.3) states in the first bullet point : "Preserve and protect public health, safety, welfare and property through adequate provision of law enforcement, fire and emergency response, and emergency h communication services." This sentence is the only place in this chapter where the term public health is used in general terms. It appears that public health (prevention) is only considered with regard to emergency preparedness planning and not in relation to public health defined more broadly.</p>	<p>This chapter addresses law enforcement, fire and emergency services and public safety issues. This includes the health, safety and welfare for County residents. This term is used several times in the SLDP. There is minimal to no mention of public health/prevention in Chapter 9 aside from the connection to emergency preparedness planning.. An option is to change or modify Chapter 9 to include language (critical findings) on the role and importance of public health to the county and communities well being. Along with language changes add goals, policies and strategies to support critical findings</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>SLDP proposes adopting the International Fire Code and requiring fire sprinklers and on-site water storage in rural areas. The requirement to provide sufficient water flow would be prohibitively expensive (\$12,000 to \$14,000 for a 2500 square foot home) for single dwellings. This would severely limit the availability of affordable housing, hurt the economy in EGMA, and negatively impact the area's sustainability.</p>	<p>Policy 24.2: Adopt and support expanded public safety standards related to fire protection, such as: adopt the International Fire Code; require fire sprinklers and on-site water storage in rural areas without water access; require new development to have appropriate fire flows and hydrants; prohibit the stockpiling of flammable materials in a dangerous manner; prohibit combustible designs and materials such as untreated wood siding, wood shake roofs, and wooden enclosed decks in wildland areas; and encourage the use of non-combustible building materials such as stucco, gypsum, masonry, adobe, concrete siding, and fire resistant roofing material.</p>	Fire needs to review.
EGMA	<p>The Plan proposes the use of non-combustible building materials, but this could conflict with other Plan elements requiring the use of local natural resources and local building materials.</p>	<p>Most "local natural resources are non-combustible, such as adobe, stone, pumice</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>9.1.1 Key Issues</b>  <i>Item 1 (p. 130) "Several residential areas in the County have insufficient water to provide adequate fire flows."</i>                      Add: County Fire Department management have repeatedly failed to spend State funds earmarked to correct such problems in a specific locality. Those failures have not yet been properly investigated by the BCC.</p>	<p>A Key Issue is defined as a statement of a problem. This key issue states that there is insufficient water to provide adequate fire flows in areas of the County. The focus is on availability of water supply not funding issues.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>Key Issue # 4. (p. 130) "The current emergency response system is not sufficient to service our population today."</i>                      Delete. Replace with: <i>The management of the current emergency response system should be restructured to make more effective use of volunteers and community resources in preparation for handling the low probability event of a large scale emergency.</i></p>	<p>Once again, a Key Issue is defined as a statement of a problem. The statement proposed is a potential solution to a problem but does not state the problem.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><i>Item 5. (p.130) "... ensure that adequate financial resources are provided ..."</i>                      Delete. Replace with: <i>The management of County emergency services should be restructured as necessary to ensure that competent administrators provide an adequate level of service using the current level of taxes and fees.</i></p>	<p>Large scale developments do impact the ability of the County to provide emergency services. This is a concern for the County.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>9.1.2 Keys to Sustainability</b>  <i>Item 1. (p. 130) "The County should continue to support the development of a professional Fire Department that combines the dedicated service of volunteers and career staff."</i>                      Delete sentence. Replace with: <i>Sustainability requires that the County make extensive use of well-trained, motivated, experienced volunteers, backed up by a small core of career staff who are thoroughly integrated into the volunteer force.</i></p>	<p>Volunteers are an important component for the County Fire Department. That is addressed in this Key to sustainability. Key to sustainability item 2 also clearly addresses this issue: Keys to sustainability Item 2. Volunteer recruitment and retention are critical to the continuing success of the Fire Department. Sufficient attention and resources as well as cultivating</p>	No Change

	<i>Overhead and administrative staff must be reduced to an absolute minimum.</i>	community cooperation and goodwill are essential to this end.	
EGMA	<b>9.2 Critical Findings</b> Add to paragraph on coordination of County Departments – Coordination must be extended beyond County Departments to neighboring bodies, particularly in EGMA where services should be coordinated with the Cities of Moriarty & Edgewood and the Counties of Bernalillo & Tarrant. Job performance of County Department Heads in accomplishing this coordination must be reported frequently and closely monitored.	County currently coordinates with multiple entities through several mechanisms including the Regional Emergency Communications Center and through Joint Powers Agreements (JPA).	No Change
EGMA	<b>9.4.4.1 Funding</b> <i>First non-indented paragraph on p. 134 “Existing County general funds for personnel are considered insufficient to meet the demand of services expected from the Fire Department by the public.”</i> Delete. Replace with –Existing plans to increase paid Fire Department staffing are unaffordable and unsustainable. Those plans will have to be modified to live within available funding, including the costs of making full current provision for benefits and eventual pensions. County Fire Department will have to be restructured to make much more effective use of well-trained, motivated volunteer responders. Existing paid responders will have to be integrated much more effectively with the volunteers. Administrative staff will have to be reduced.	Section 9.4.1.1 Funding identifies the current funding issues from the County perspective. This is an important health, safety and welfare issue for the County.	No Change
EGMA	<b>9.4.1.4 Levels of Service</b> <i>Third paragraph (p. 135) – “The Department has been working to increase the number of career staff to overcome the difficulties of recruiting and retaining volunteers ...”</i> Delete. Replace with – Budget realities will restrict most growth in career staff. The County Fire Department has in the past suffered from organizational and leadership deficiencies which have impeded the recruiting and retention of volunteers. A thorough study of the Department is required to identify and correct those problems, and provide a framework for a more efficient sustainable Fire Department which makes more effective use of volunteers backed up by a core of career responders.	<b>9.4.1.4 Levels of Service</b> – this section outlines the existing conditions and deficiencies based on levels of service per thousand residents in the unincorporated County.	No Change
EGMA	<b>9.5.3 RECC Funding</b> <i>Second paragraph in section (p. 138) – “Significant challenges are presented by ever-increasing operational costs to run the RECC.”</i> Add: Because ever-increasing RECC costs are unsustainable, Santa Fe County must consider all options to reduce costs to the budgeted level. Santa Fe County is currently spending over \$3.6 Million per year for the RECC. Santa Fe County’s commitment is to balance the RECC’s budget by reducing costs, not by increasing taxes.	RECC is a regional facility and includes government entities such as the City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Town of Edgewood to allow a regionalization of emergency response services within the County.	No Change
EGMA	<b>9.6 Goals, Policies and Strategies</b> <i>Goal 24 (p. 140) – “Preserve and protect public health, safety, welfare and property through adequate provision of law enforcement, fire and emergency response, and emergency communication services.”</i> Add at end of goal – “at affordable cost”.	This is a goal for the County without regard to cost. It is an essential element of government.	No Change
EGMA	<b>Strategy 24.1.1</b> <i>(p. 140) – “Identify and support additional funding sources for public safety agencies ...”</i> Delete. Replace with – Santa Fe County makes a commitment to keep the budget for Public Safety within existing available funds, and not to impose any additional tax burdens or fees on County residents.	This strategy ensures that the County has appropriate infrastructure and capital to support emergency service throughout the County. Health, Safety and Welfare is an important part of core government services.	No Change
EGMA	<b>Add Strategy 24.1.1.a –</b> Santa Fe County requires Public Safety departments to disseminate a public statement each year of updated long term goals along with their estimated costs; said costs to include the full current burden of meeting all eventual pension and benefit obligations for County employees. The public report will include a progress report on previous goals, and a prioritized schedule for future goals consistent with available funds, making proper provision for contingencies.	Transparency is one of the goals of the County. The County also submits an updated Fire Plan. However, this proposed strategy to state the “eventual pension and benefit obligations for County employees should not be in the Public Safety Element of the SLDP at the Board’s discretion.	No Change
EGMA	<b>Add Strategy 24.1.1.b –</b> Any failures by County Fire Department personnel to spend allocated Capital Outlay funds resulting in loss of those funds must be reported to the BCC, to allow the BCC to take appropriate action. Any such failures must be notified to County tax payers, with the costs of notification coming out of the existing County Fire Department budget.	Any reporting and policy decisions are at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners.	

EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.2</b>  <p>(p. 140) – “Adopt and support expanded public safety standards related to fire protection..... adopt the International Fire Code; require fire sprinklers and on-site water storage in rural areas ...”</p> <p>After “fire protection,...” strike “adopt the International Fire Code; require fire sprinklers and on-site water storage in rural areas without water access;” Do not require sprinklers in housing in rural areas. Rationale: The International Fire Code which requires sprinklers and on-site water storage in rural areas would be devastating to affordable housing in the EGMA. The estimated cost of such a system on a 2500 square foot house would add a minimum of \$4.50 to \$5.50 per square foot for sprinkler heads, and in-house plumbing or \$11,250 to \$13,750 or 9% to 10% added to each new home. If back-up power is required, additional plumbing and electrical equipment could add an additional \$3000 to \$4500. Smoke alarms are quite sufficient in rural areas. Since one urban area advantage of sprinklers is to stop a fire from spreading to nearby homes and our homes are usually on 2.5 acres up to 40 acres, our homes are usually a minimum of 300 feet apart. Insurance savings on this sprinkler system will not exceed \$4.00 per month given our level of use of volunteer fire fighters.</p> </p>	Fire needs to review.	Fire needs to review.
EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.3</b>  <p>(p. 140) – “Support training for volunteer firefighters in an effort to enhance recruitment and retention efforts ...”</p> <p>Add Strategy 24.3.2 –  Santa Fe County places priority on the development of an efficient, cost-effective Fire Department which relies heavily on the use of well-trained volunteers.</p> </p>	This is already addressed in Strategy 24.3.1: Identify funding and resources to provide training opportunities for career and volunteer personnel to meet or exceed local, state, and federal requirements.	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>Add Strategy 24.3.3 –</b>  Santa Fe County commits to organize an external study into the failure of the County Fire Department to attract &amp; retain a sufficient pool of volunteers. This study will compare the performance of the County Fire Department with “best in class” volunteer and combination volunteer/paid fire services in New Mexico and other States, and provide recommendations directly to the BCC. Costs of this study will be paid from the existing County Fire Department budget.</p>	This strategy is negatively stated and does not accurately reflect the excellent services and reputation of the County Fire Department.	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.4</b>  <b>Strategy 24.4.1 (p. 140)</b> “Develop and enforce design standards to require that new developments eliminate emergency access barriers such as ... long driveways ...”</p> <p>First sentence after “standards”, strike “to require” and add “so” and after “new developments” strike “eliminate” and add “consider...” Rationale: In the EGMA, the preferred large lot developments require long driveways and one-way out access. Emergency vehicles turn-arounds at reasonable intervals along excessively long roadways or drives would be a reasonable alternative to eliminating our required access driveways or roads.</p>	Fire needs to Review	Fire needs to Review
EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.4</b>  <b>Strategy 24.4.2 (p. 140)</b> “Require an access management plan for all new roadways.”</p> <p>After “plan...all new,” add “public roadways.” Rationale: Private drives for small, large-lot subdivisions should not require including this type of plan.</p>	Fire needs to Review	Fire needs to Review
EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.6</b>  <b>Strategy 24.6.1 (p. 140)</b> “Identify areas with speeding problems ...”</p> <p>Modify –Identify urban and suburban areas with speeding problems ...</p>	Speeding problems are Countywide.	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>Add Strategy 24.6.2 –</b>  To reduce the burden on County Sheriffs and to improve relations with the tax-paying public, Santa Fe County commits to raising speed limits on rural roads where practicable and reasonable.</p>	Speeding problems are Countywide. Speed limits are determined based on a number of factors. The County Sheriff is an elected position and determines what is reasonable enforcement.	No Change
EGMA	<p><b>Policy 24.10</b>  <p>(p. 141) “Limit threats from wildfires and other natural disasters.”</p> <p>Add Strategy 24.10.3 In grassland areas of Santa Fe County, such as EGMA, Santa Fe County will not adopt inappropriate Wildland Urban Interface fire codes, since these are geared towards very different forested areas. Instead, Santa Fe County will develop techniques appropriate to the real threat of fast-moving grass fires, and will ensure the availability of equipment tailored for this purpose.</p> </p>	This policy is a Health, Safety and Welfare issue which is an important part of core government services.	

**Chapter 10-Transportation Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary**

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
WHNM	Add new Strategy: <b>Strategy 33.4.2: Coordinate with wildlife conservation organizations, state and federal agencies to determine high frequency wildlife crossing areas within Santa Fe County and to sign such areas with caution signs and other measures (reduced speed zones, flashing lights, rumble strips) to alert motorists to the potential presence of wildlife on the road.</b>	Proposed Strategy 33.4.2 supports Policy 33.4	Add new proposed Strategy 33.4.2 in support of Policy 33.4: Coordinate with wildlife conservation organizations, state and federal agencies to determine high frequency wildlife crossing areas within Santa Fe County and to sign such areas with caution signs and other measures (reduced speed zones, flashing lights, rumble strips) to alert motorists to the potential presence of wildlife on the road.
EGMA	SLDP should require a District Plan for EGMA which would allow residents to come up with an efficient transportation plan for this area. The District plan should be coordinated with the overall Santa Fe County plan.	SLDP allows a process for to establish a District Plan for the EGMA. A District Plan should explore transportation both within Santa Fe County as well as outside Santa Fe County to reflect commuter patterns.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	It is very important that the County follow through on the transportation element of the SLDP. The Working Group supports the objective of safety for pedestrians, bicycles, motor-cycles and vehicular transport.	Implementation of the SLDP is an important part of the plan.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	Expenditures on roads, trails, and transportation improvements must be fairly distributed throughout the County, not simply focused around Santa Fe. Even though population density is lower in EGMA, roads through this area are essential to support life in the more densely populated parts of the County. EGMA roads are also often used for recreation by residents of other parts of the County, e.g. for bike runs. The need for improved transportation must be balanced against the need to avoid unsustainable tax burdens. Long-term affordability is the corner stone of sustainability.	The SLDP enumerates multiple criteria for evaluating future road projects including but not limited to population served.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	The main priority for transportation in EGMA is good maintenance of the existing road network. When resources allow, the network of paved, fenced, all-weather roads in EGMA should be expanded.	The SLDP addresses the importance of coordinated road operations and maintenance in the Keys to Sustainability and addresses maintenance in Policy 28.1, Strategy 28.2.1, and Policy 28.3. As, this comment points out, resources for road improvements are limited. Road improvement projects and new road construction should be evaluated and prioritized based on the need for a higher level of service, character of roadway, environmental suitability, and connectivity. (10.2.2.3)	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	Scarce tax-payer resources should not be diverted into unsustainable public transit schemes which would require perpetual subsidy. Sustainable public transportation is a particularly challenge in EGMA because of the low population density.	The County is continuing to explore an effective and economically efficient way of providing transit service to the EGMA. Section 10.2.3.3 states that the County’s policies regarding expansion of transit services, “may weigh issues of social equity over cost-efficiency even where there may be indication of low ridership.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	Santa Fe County should ensure there are no County-level barriers to innovative economically self-supporting public transit schemes.	The SLDP supports all innovative economically self-supporting public transit schemes which may include but are not limited to park-and-ride, commuter express, demand response, vanpools, employer-based transportation demand management, etc (10.2.3.3)	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	SLDP is based on outdated information. Public transportation (i.e., bus) has already been withdrawn from EGMA. The highway maintenance plans are 2 years out of date and have not been followed. The maps in the SLDP should be updated and corrected, so that the BCC can use them to make informed decisions	Language in Section 10.2.3.1 Existing Transit Service <b>should be amended</b> to reflect recent changes in transit service. Specifically the statement, “There is limited morning and evening service from Edgewood to Santa Fe via Moriarity, Stanley, Galisteo and Eldorado” should be taken out as this service was recently discontinued due to high cost and ridership.	Revise Section 10.2.3 and delete the statement “There is limited morning and evening service from Edgewood to Santa Fe via Moriarity, Stanley, Galisteo and Eldorado”

EGMA	SLDP ignores costs. There are no estimates for the capital costs of the many individually-worthy improvements suggested in the SLDP. Worse, there are no estimates for the continuing essential costs for ongoing required maintenance.	Maintenance of existing County roads continues to be the County's highest priority. Cost is not reflected in the SLDP as individual project costs vary. Projects may be funded through a variety of mechanisms including Developer fees, Transportation Improvement Project Funds (Federal), GRIP II and general obligation bonds.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	SLDP acknowledges in 10.2.2.1 that Santa Fe County has been able to afford only about half of the road improvements planned in 2005. However, the SLDP does not address this inability to afford even existing plans for road improvement. Instead, the SLDP adds many other additional expensive goals.	As growth occurs more in certain areas than in others, road priority projects also change. There is an important distinction between "planned" projects where funding has not yet been identified and "programmed" projects where funding has been identified. While maintenance continues to be a significant portion of the road budget, due to limited resources, only the highest priority projects are constructed. The County CIP and the MPO Transportation Improvement Plan are coordinated to obtain necessary funding for publicly lead road projects.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	SLDP's Transportation Element ignores the situation in low population density areas like EGMA. Instead, the SLDP is focused on the problems & opportunities in high population density urban and suburban areas of the County.	The June SLDP Draft Future Road Recommendations emphasizes roads in the County's Primary Growth Areas which will best serve the County's growing population. Historically, the County has implemented road improvements projects in many of the more rural areas of the County which help to improve the County's Road Network. The SLDP could add an additional consideration to the County's Future Road System 10.2.2.3 to state that in addition to improvements to the road network in the County's Primary Growth Areas, future road projects in the County's rural areas will also be evaluated.	General Comment - No Recommendation
EGMA	<b>10.2.2.5 – Future Roadway Recommendations</b> Insert in future roadway recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pave White Lakes Road.</li> <li>• Pave Simmons Road.</li> </ul>	These road projects have not been identified in the Road Improvement Plan or the CIP. All County road projects will be evaluated and prioritized based on defined criteria to serve both rural and urbanizing areas in the County as part of the County's Roads Advisory Task Force. The EGMA may also consider the need for roads through a District Planning process.	No Change
EGMA	<b>10.2.3 – Transit</b> Insert at beginning: Public transit is a worthy goal, but one which many localities are finding to be unsustainably expensive. Santa Fe County will demonstrate leadership by making public a stringent cost/benefit analysis of all proposed public transit expenditures prior to making any commitments.	The County continues to explore options to extend public transit to areas currently under-served both in the urbanizing as well as rural areas. Routes for public transit are evaluated on cost effectiveness as well as need. The County and its transit partners may continue to operate routes in rural areas due to the needs of residents even where these routes are more costly than routes in urbanizing areas. The majority of funding for transit in the County comes from the Transit GRT which all County and City residents contribute to. Allocation of the Transit GRT is determined by the Santa Fe Regional Planning Authority.	No Change
EGMA	<b>10.2.5.5 Roundabouts</b> Delete section. Santa Fe County should demonstrate leadership by not falling for an awkward European fashion.	Roundabouts have shown to be a safe traffic device with numerous studies showing a 90% reduction in fatalities, 76% reduction in injuries and an over 39% reduction in crashes at locations where roundabouts replaced traffic signal or stop sign control at intersections. Roundabouts also reduce points of conflict between pedestrians and motor vehicles.	No Change
EGMA	Insert as first Goal, ahead of Goal 28: Santa Fe County is required to establish a multi-year plan for proper maintenance of existing roads and for expansion of the existing all-weather, fenced, paved road network. Said plan shall have committed financial support, and shall be fully funded each year before any other transportation expenditures may be considered.	Santa Fe Roads Plan is establish by the County through the Public Works Department and the Roads Advisory Task Force. The road maintenance plan is funded through a variety of sources which include Developer fees, Transportation Improvement Project Funds (Federal), GRIP II, LGRF and general obligation bonds.	No Change
EGMA	<b>Policy 29.1: Support an efficient and cost effective multi-modal transportation system ...</b> Replace with: Encourage at low cost to the taxpayer an efficient and cost effective multi-modal transportation system ...	Santa Fe County ,in partnership with the City of Santa Fe and the North Central Regional Transit District aims to provide the highest level of transit services at the lowest possible cost to tax payers. In November '08, Santa Fe County residents along with residents of Rio Arriba, Los Alamos, and Taos Counties passed a 1/8 cent Gross Receipts Tax to increase funding for regional transit services.	No Change

Chapter 11-Water, Wastewater and Stormwater Management Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
LWVSFC	The League continues to be concerned about the relationship between water supply and development, which is not sufficiently addressed in the SLDP. We believe water is a supremely important issue in Santa Fe County and sustainability of supply into the future must be an integral factor in the amount and type of development that is allowed.	The SLDP recognizes the importance between water supply and development and identifies conservation of water for present and future generations as one of the 8 purposes for creating the plan. Another purpose for creating the plan is to direct the location and character of future growth to appropriate and designated areas to be serviced by adequate facilities and services.	No change
LWVSFC	Requirements for new developments to include community water systems and conservation should not be limited to only a portion of the county but to the county as a whole. See elimination or changes of water policies to 34.6,34. 7, 35.7, 35.8, 36. 1, and 36.4.	There are no policies as cited in the comments	No change
EBWPC	Include language that acknowledges more clearly that the Estancia Basin is a closed basin, with no surface water supply, but with relatively large groundwater sources, large tracts of land with significant agricultural and ranching interests.	Language to recognize that the Estancia Basin is a closed basin is important for this area of the County. The fact that it is a closed basin may result in limited recharge which may impact long-term water availability. Incorporate language into narrative stating that Estancia Basin is a closed basin. Incorporate language from the Estancia Basin Regional Water Plan.	Revise to incorporate language from the Estancia Basin Regional Water Plan.
EBWPC	The chapter is focused largely on the county water utility, not water issues in general. There is a lot of information on the Buckman Well Field, but not other (private) water producing areas, nor is there any substantive information on water resources south of Galisteo.	SLDP emphasizes county utility water supply systems with little or no mention of other water sources in the county. Expand narrative to include mention of other water sources	Revise to expand narrative of other water sources
EBWPC	<b>Map 10, on page 174</b> , illustrates water and wastewater systems throughout the County, except for the Estancia region - it shows three wastewater systems near Edgewood, and one near Golden, but none of the community water systems. As a note - the county water system has 1700 accounts (page 173), and the three major water systems near Edgewood have a cumulative 3300 accounts without a mention in the discussion.	Data on community water systems for southern Santa Fe County may have not been available during the preparation of the map. Staff will check with GIS office for data availability to update Map 10. If data is available on SSFC community systems, update map.	Revise to include updated data.
EBWPC	<b>11.1 1 Key Issues #2. The current reliance on groundwater .. is unsustainable.</b> The Estancia Basin relies on groundwater exclusively, it does not have access to surface water supplies, and there are not any proposals for access to the Buckman source.	Key issue focuses on groundwater with reference to Buckman Diversion Project. Language needs to be modified to reflect that other areas are reliant on ground water and may have to be sustainable through conservation and other methods to extend aquifer supply.	Revise to include areas reliant on groundwater.
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #3- Conserve water ....</b> We agree that conservation must factor into development, it isn't clear how that would be done in the Estancia region, especially since agriculture and ranching receives arguably 95% of the groundwater drawn from the Basin annually.	Water conservation practices are not limited to the built environment, such as slowing the movement of water for increased infiltration	Revise to expand options for water conservation practices that are appropriate for all regions of the county
EBWPC	<b>Key Issue #5 - Expand centralized water and wastewater.</b> Centralized water systems do NOT ensure per capita consumption is reasonable, but they DO apply a cost to that consumption that often results in conservation behaviors. This Issue may not be appropriate in many parts of the Estancia region where growth could be accommodated by use of domestic wells, and in which construction and creation of centralized systems could be cost prohibitive. The Issue does not acknowledge that any coordination of utilities in the Estancia region will be between private entities since the County does not have a presence there.	Key issue addresses "Primary Growth Areas" which do not include the Estancia Basin rural areas therefore the stipulations of this issues are not relevant.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>#7. Equitably finance water, wastewater ... improvements.</b> This issue does not address the reality of the Estancia region. The Town of Edgewood has a sewer that is available to a very small section of the town, and there isn't a county or municipal water system. Private for-profit and private non-profit entities have access to low interest funding through the revolving loan fund administered by the NM Finance Authority, and in some cases the Rural Development arm of the Department of Agriculture. Otherwise, as presently enacted, they would not have access to a ' user fee'	This issue needs clarification or rewording stating that equitable financing may only apply to primary growth areas that are served by the county. Private water users have access to other forms of financing. In the past the County has been involved with water funding to assist water systems by creating partnerships to strengthening the funding application. <b>Clarify this section regarding equitable financing for specific areas, and mention options for private funding.</b>	Revise

	administered through the County.		
EBWPC	<b>11.1.2 Keys to Sustainability #2 - Discontinue reliance on groundwater as a primary water source where surface water is available.</b> We agree!	There is agreement with Key 11.1.2 #2	No change
EBWPC	<b>Keys to Sustainability #3 - Conservation is a key to sustainable water supply.</b> The 'county' and the ' county utility' are used interchangeably in this Issue. Initiatives to increase the aggressiveness of current County efforts will translate into costs for affordable housing.	Clarification is needed to explain that water conservation efforts need not increase the cost of affordable housing. <b>Change language to accurately reflect the meaning of the County or County Utility.</b>	Revise for clarification
EBWPC	<b>Key Sustain #9 - Provide back up for small systems.</b> Again - the reality in the Estancia region is for isn't addressed in this Issue. There are mixed issues in this paragraph as well- water quality testing and assistance are two separate issues and to our knowledge, neither have occurred in the Estancia region. Having said that, local systems do help one another with material, skills, and knowledge.	Supporting narrative for this issue need to include a mention the types of back –up that is provided to small systems within Santa Fe County. However as mentioned below the private systems in the Estancia region are larger systems. <b>Include information on water systems in SSFC and others that may need coordination with Santa Fe County.</b>	Revise to include additional information.
EBWPC	<b>11.3.1 - Water Overview</b> While most residents not served by the county utility rely on domestic wells , it must be acknowledged that there at least 33 community water systems in the county and three large ones in the Estancia region. The blurb addresses the county utility, almost exclusively.	Water overview should expand the narrative on existing domestic well uses and larger utility systems in southern Santa Fe County. <b>Obtain data on existing domestic well users from OSE and other water utility systems in SSFC.</b>	Revise to reflect both domestic well and other systems.
EBWPC	<b>11.3.3 The Buckman Direct Diversion</b> We suggest an acknowledgement that the BDD is not a viable source of surface water to assist in the Estancia region, and only really applies to a discussion of the county utility.	Clarification is needed to state that the Buckman Diversion will only apply to a geographic area on the county that is feasible to be served by a centralized utility water system.	Revise to clarify that Buckman Diversion only applies to a certain geographic area
EBWPC	<b>11.3.4 The Back Up Well System.</b> Just a comment - this isn't really relevant to a countywide land use development plan – belongs in the county 40-year plan.	Narrative in this section supports back up for the proposed major water utility system addressing the need to strategically have supplementary sources of water for the diversion project.	No Change
EBWPC	<b>11.3.8 Community Water Systems</b> There isn't a discussion of community water systems in the Estancia region, and their associated withdrawals.	Research and data on Estancia water systems and withdrawals need to be incorporated into this section. Incorporate language from the Estancia Basin Regional Water Plan on water withdrawals.	Revise to include data on Estancia Basin Water Systems
EBWPC	<b>11 .3.9 Conjunctive Management Plan for the Santa Fe Basin</b> This is useful background information, particularly in a 40-year plan, but only addresses the county utility. There is not a corresponding blurb on the Sangre y Jemez or the Estancia Basin Plan.	Additional language on Jemez y Sangreand Estancia Basin Plans are only recommendations and should be included if appropriate to the Conjunctive Management Plan	Determine if appropriate language should be included on water plans in Conjunctive Management Plan
EBWPC	<b>11.3.11 Conservation and Sustainability</b> The specificity of "direct storage" appears to be very prescriptive, while there are other alternatives for uses of harvested rain water, i.e for toilet flushing. Our experience with hotwater recirculation is that most of our household leaks occur in hot water recirculation systems within 5' of the recirc pump. The submetering issue needs to be clarified . Having said all that – there isn' t anything here that is contrary to the EBWP and is consistent with the kinds of things we'd advocate.	Expand on the ways rainwater harvesting can be used (not just limited to landscaping). Staff concurs that there are many other ways to use rainwater. <b>Consider alternative rainwater harvesting uses that may be used to amend existing water conservation requirements for new construction.</b>	Revise
EBWPC	<b>11.3.11.2 Rainwater Capture, Treatment, and Use.</b> We need a definition of a 'non-recharging basin ' to fit the requirement for "All development within non-recharging basins will provide full rainwater capture without density bonuses ..." Where are these basins? What is the authority for the county to require retro fits? It is our understanding that the County currently requires rainwater capture, but it has not been enforced in the past - so does it make sense to require it in the future?	This section requires existing homes in non-recharging basins to add rainwater caption within 5 years. It also creates policies for 'non-recharging basins' that are different from other areas. Staff recommends revising this section to remove the requirement for non-recharging basins to add rainwater capture and density bonuses.	Revise
EBWPC	<b>11.3.11.3 Graywater Reuse.</b> We agree with the premise of using water as many times as we can - the challenge for this requirement is construction cost, the loss of possible recharge credits for the water system, etc.	Requirement should be changed to be a guide rather than a mandate.	Revise 11.13.11.3 to replace require with support.
EBWPC	<b>11.5.1.3 Stormwater Master Plan.</b> We suggest that the Soil and Water Conservation Districts be included in this area.	Soil and Water Conservation Districts should be mapped on Stormwater Master Plan. <b>Locate data on Soil and Water Conservation Districts and include in Stormwater Master Plan</b>	Incorporate soil and water conservation districts in appropriate map.

Chapter 12-Adequate Public Facilities and Financing Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	12.1.1, Page 195, Switch Issue #4 to #1, and #1 to #2, then add to the end of this new #2, "...however large lot development in the EGMA does not require extension of county –provided infrastructure or public services other than those paid for by additional gross receipts taxes."	A principal purpose of the SLDP is to develop policies for the County that will bring the County, its residents and businesses financial stability for the future. New development necessitates public facilities and services. The SLDP needs to establish tools for equitably funding facilities and services.	No Change
EGMA	12.1.2, Page 195, paragraph 4, Add at the beginning of the sentence, "In those GMA's which have no other options..."	Additional suggested language does not address the needs for adequate levels of service.	No Change
EGMA	12.1.2, Page 195, paragraph 5, after "...Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) to..." add "attract economic development..."	Attract economic development is already in the sentence.	No Change
EGMA	12.2.2, Page 196, Start the sentence with the phrase "Except in the EGMA where the County is not called upon to provide these services..."	Costs of Sprawl include costs other than those provided by the developer. Emergency Services, Public Safety, Roads are all costs to the County.	No change
EGMA	12.2.6, Page 197, The grammar of this sentence should be corrected to make the verbs match the fact that "the existence" is a singular noun.	Review this section. Needs edits.	Revise 12.2.6 Edits
EGMA	12.2.6, Page 197, end of section, add Item 4 as follows: "Recognize that the EGMA has sources other than Santa Fe County providing all of the above mentioned services, and this fact will not adversely affect the approval and timing of new development in this GMA."	Additional suggested language needs more research and evaluation. EGMA objectives could include this language. Emergency Services, Public Safety and Roads are all costs to the County.	No change
EGMA	12.3.2.1, page 200, End the first sentence with "...as well as many other sources of these services."	EGMA statement is unclear. Not sure which sources for services are being implied. County does need to maintain its services.	No Change
EGMA	12.3.4.4, page 202, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, The numbers do not compute as presented but the same statement on the next page, while apparently also transposing one of the addends and the sum, does at least add up. Notwithstanding the math error, the entire concept of "costs of sprawl" in this section and in the following 6 sections does not take into account that the EGMA receives its services from many sources other than Santa Fe County, thus the stipulated negative impact on County funds of growth in the EGMA is vastly overstated. Some statement be added here that the results of the analysis do not necessarily apply to all parts of the County which prefer large lot development.	Additional suggested language needs more research and evaluation. A fiscal impact analysis and cost of sprawl analysis formulate the data for this section.	No Change
EGMA	12.3.5.3, Page 205, entire section – Not a single one of the wells or septic systems in the EGMA has <u>cost</u> the county a dime, and therefore a reduction in their development will not <u>save</u> the county a dime. Suggest this be clearly stated at either the very beginning or the very end of this section.	County does <b>not</b> provide water and sewer service to the EGMA. The County has contributed funding to the Edgewood wastewater system. This section should clearly state that the County does not provide these services.	Revise 12.3.6: Add language indicating that the County does not provide water and wastewater service to all areas of the County.
EGMA	12.3.6, Page 206, Delete the word "public" throughout this section or add "or private" in each instance it appears. "Adequate public facilities" do not and will not ever exist in the EGMA from Santa Fe County as a source, therefore this paragraph would essentially allow the county to deny <u>all</u> development applications presented to the county from the EGMA!	Some areas of the County do not have public water and sewer services. The county has an interest and investment over many other public facilities throughout most of the county. Additional review of this section by county is suggested.	Revise 12.3.6 to remove "public"
EGMA	Page 210, entire section, Adding in all unincorporated residents to a formula intended to meet an international standard of water/sewer state employees per 1000 residents should not be allowed. The County will never be responsible for providing water and sewer to the residents in the EGMA, and thus it will be over-employing state workers for the level of service truly required at the expense of residents county-wide.	This section includes Transportation and Roads; Law Enforcement; Fire and Emergency Response; Parks and Open Space; stormwater management; in addition to water and sewer. Need to determine how to address services that the County does not provide in certain areas.	Revise this Section to address this issue.



EGMA	12.4, Page 218, Goal 39, Policies 39.1 to 39.11 Either delete the word “public” in front of facilities or add “or private” in each instance the phrase “public facilities” is used, otherwise all development in the EGMA is effectively prohibited.	All services that are required may not be public services. Water and wastewater may be private facilities. Policies 39.1, 39.4, 39.5, 39.7, 39.8, 39.9 and 39.11 all have “public” facilities and services. An option to address this might be to remove the word public or add “or private”. A definition of Adequate “Public or Private” Facilities should be included in the glossary.	Revise to remove Public. Statements should state Adequate Facilities and Services.
EGMA	12.4, Page 218 and 219, Goal 40. Same as Change 12.	Same as above.	Revise to remove Public.
EGMA	12.4, Goal 41, Page 218, Same as Change 12.	Goal 41: Equitably finance facilities and services. Public is not in this goal.	No Change.
SFRA	One problem with this chapter is that it is disorganized and poorly written. There are several sections that appear to be largely redundant of one another. The 2010 SLDP Final Draft does not provide sufficient recognition and explanation of how these multiple regulatory tools will be coordinated in addressing the APF financing. The 2010 SLDP Final Draft lacks sufficient explanation of how all of the regulatory tools proposed under the <i>Adequate Public Facilities and Financing Element</i> will be coordinated to ensure that they are fairly applied <b>Recommendation:</b> The Association requests that the entire Chapter 12 be revised to make it more concise and comprehensible. The Fiscal Impact Analysis and Costs of Sprawl sections should be revised to add better supporting data and documentation (in the form of footnotes or in a references section7) and to better integrate them with the rest of the chapter. The discussion of the regulatory tools for APF planning and financing, and the accompanying policies and strategies, should all be revised to demonstrate a more coordinated and integrated approach to APF financing that will ensure that APF financing requirements will be applied equitably to new development in the County.	This chapter is comprehensive and should be understandable. The Fiscal Impact Analysis and Costs of Sprawl sections should be revised to add better supporting data and documentation (in the form of footnotes or in a references section).	Revise chapter 12 so that it is both comprehensive and understandable to the general public.
SFRA	Policy 40.6 requiring that the APF assessment “ensure that the cumulative impacts of development are measured and considered,” is undefined as to scope and the 2010 SLDP Final Draft does not provide any guidance as to how “cumulative impacts of development” are to be “measured and considered.” The SLDP does not contain any limitations on the evaluation of these impacts, nor does it provide any guidance on how they are to be measured and considered. <b>Recommendation:</b> The Association requests that the requirement to measure and consider the “cumulative impacts of development” be eliminated from the 2010 SLDP Final Draft.	A requirement to measure and consider the “cumulative impacts of development” needs to be better defined and should be reviewed to determine whether this is appropriate and feasible. Policy 40.6: Change Require to Consider and change cumulative to direct.	Revise Policy to read: Policy 40.6: Consider the adequate public facility assessment for facilities and services to confirm that the direct impacts of development are measured and considered.
SFRA	Policy 41.1 requires that new development provide for and finance improvements consistent with the degree of impact to public services and/or infrastructure <i>indirectly</i> attributed to the project, may not be authorized under the New Mexico statutes. The 2010 SLDP Final Draft provides no additional description of how to assess indirect impacts of a development project or how the cost of such impacts would be calculated. <b>Recommendation:</b> The Association requests that the requirement that a developer address impacts that are “indirectly” attributed to a project be removed from Policy 41.1.	The requirement that a developer address impacts that are “indirectly” attributed to a project should be reviewed to determine whether this is appropriate and feasible. Indirect impacts from development may be difficult for a developer to address. Remove indirect.	Revise Policy 41.1 to remove “indirectly”
SFRA	<b>The 2010 SLDP Final Draft’s explanation of levels of service for the Adequate Public Facilities program is inadequate and confusing.</b>	Adequate Facilities is an important aspect of the SLDP. Review section on levels of service to address shortcomings, clarify analysis process incorporated in the narrative. Correlate information with existing levels of service and relate discussion to outcome of future levels of services to be incorporated as per implementation of the SLDP.	Revised Chapter 12.

**Chapter 13-Housing Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary**

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
EGMA	<p>13.1.1 Key Issues Page 220 # 1 Santa Fe County must assess existing inventory of affordable homes, assess county and city absorption rates of affordable housing, special needs and rental opportunities provided to our workforce population.</p> <p><b>After “inventory of” add “all housing including</b></p>	<p>The addition does not take away from the intent of the Key Issue</p>	<p>Revise 13.1.1 Key Issue # 1 to add “all housing”</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.1 # 2 Support and provide as deemed necessary affordable housing programs that address the spectrum of housing needs such as homelessness, affordable rental, down payment assistance for homeownership, developer subsidy for affordable homes built, foreclosure prevention, rehabilitation of existing housing, energy retrofitting.</p> <p><b>Eliminate in its entirety and replace with “Needs for affordable housing can best be met by eliminating government interference in the free housing market which causes a false scarcity of useable land (through strict growth management.)</b></p>	<p>Intent of County SLDP is to support and provide as deemed necessary, affordable housing programs that address the spectrum of housing, this should not be viewed upon as “government interference”. Santa Fe County will support and provide programs and services as directed.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.1 #3 Affordable housing needs to remain affordable through energy efficient design.</p> <p><b>After “remain affordable through” add “economically practical and after the word “design” add “and streamlining the development process”</b></p>	<p>Encouraging energy efficient design is possible promising to streamline the development process is not applicable in this section. Staff recommends a rewrite as follows; Affordable housing needs to remain affordable and economically practical through energy efficient design.</p>	<p>Revise 13.1.1 # 3: Affordable housing needs to remain affordable and economically practical through energy efficient design.</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.1 # 4 Affordable housing strategies in the County need to be developed within appropriate SDAs</p> <p><b>Eliminate</b></p>	<p>Affordable Housing strategies in the County need to be developed within appropriate SDA’s. Staff highly recommends this particular issue remain in place.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.1 # 5 The County will evaluate the current affordable housing initiatives and develop a systematic approach to address service gaps and leveraging external funding sources.</p> <p><b>Eliminate # 4 and 5 are areas which county policy cannot help, and if the blockades to affordable housing as set out in the overview are eliminated, the market, as always, will supply housing as needed.</b></p>	<p>Study’s provided over the past several years have proven that the market has driven prices upward while income levels for workforce population have not kept current with the demands. The county’s position is to address the housing issues as new development and existing stock prove to be out of the reach and make a commitment to adapt policy and regulation with current market conditions. SLDP supports initiatives and leveraging of external funding to promote affordable housing in targeted SDA’s.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.2 # 6 Rationale: The outrageous expense of land created by our poor growth management policies results in trying to obtain “affordability” by every-increasing densities. This philosophy places the poorer families into tiny lot developments and eventually in high-rise dwellings (Portland, Oregon experience), similar to the “projects” of the East coast and Midwest cities. Since land is “not scarce” in Santa Fe County, especially in the EGMA, freeing county land for development will prove the best strategy for housing “affordability”.</p> <p><b>Eliminate paragraphs 1 and 2</b></p>	<p>At present paragraphs 1 and 2 read as follows;</p> <p># 1 Affordable housing should be required for new development within the appropriate SD’s that have services available such as water, sewer, roads infrastructure, and should be supported through developer incentives and direct assistance to qualified households.</p> <p>#2 Affordable housing should be integrated into mixed-income neighborhoods whenever possible and deemed necessary.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.2 paragraph 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence; Energy and water efficiency will be considered as integral components for all affordable housing projects. Green building standards will be promoted to reduce the impacts of development on the environment and encourage healthy living conditions. <b>After “projects” and before “green” add practical and after “will be” strike “required” and add encouraged”</b></p>	<p>SLDP direction is to continue to promote and encourage “green building standards” when possible. The SLDP is a guide and not a mandate so staff recommends the deleting required from that sentence.</p>	<p>Revise 13.1.2 # 3: 3. Energy and water efficiency will be considered as integral for all affordable housing projects. Green building standards will reduce the impacts of development on the environment and encourage healthy living conditions.</p>
EGMA	<p>13.1.2 paragraph; Affordable housing initiatives in the county should compliment and assist other social, environmental and land use strategies and be supported by specific policies.</p> <p><b>Eliminate; Rationale Affordability will not come from increased regulation!</b></p>	<p>Santa Fe County encourages the support of affordable housing to compliment social environmental and land use strategies via policy this is a very reasonable approach. Staff recommends the initiative remain in place.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

EGMA	<p>13.1.2 Paragraph 5 A needs based approach should be used for regulation and provision of affordable housing in appropriate SDA's of the County. Housing should be directed to areas served efficiently by adequate facilities and services.</p> <p><b>Eliminate; Rationale The EGMA is currently supplying the most affordable housing in all of Santa Fe County by action of a freer market with few needed government facilities. Why mess it up with directives which are bound to fail.</b></p>	<p>Higher density development in areas with infrastructure and services is an efficient use of resources and funding to provide greater opportunities for the community. Staff recommends the statement remain in place.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.1.2 Develop and support programs with private sector partners by outsourcing or collaborating with community groups and non-profits that have internal capacity and existing housing programs in order to be more efficient, cost effective, and maximize leverage of County funding.</p> <p><b>Eliminate "non-government organizations" to achieve sustainability. Rationale; they only add a non-elected group of special interest factions into the housing mix which uses our tax dollars through government grants and special treatment to further their own agendas.</b></p>	<p>The use of services and funding to promote, sustain and retain affordable housing is essential to our community. All sources should be explored and utilized whenever possible.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.2.4.7 Low interest loans and/or grants for Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation for Affordable Housing Residents. Intends to help offset high energy costs in the occupancy of affordable units and to offer education and outreach of Energy and Water Efficiency and Conservation efforts. This will affect the long-term affordability of these affordable units as operating and maintaining a home continues to escalate in the region. Santa Fe County has adopted water conservation policies for development and residential units; this will be a vital partnership with the Affordable Housing Program in meeting these measures.</p> <p><b>After "residential units and this" add "concept should be reevaluated as to the tremendous cost it adds to housing with little or no reasonable return on investment to the homeowner."</b></p>	<p>Energy efficiency and water conservation are both necessary to retain affordability of homes. The two programs will have to work together to retain affordability for the homeowner. This statement demonstrates the need to collaborate with other county initiatives.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.3 Goal Strategy 42.1.3. Support development of affordable housing that considers the lifecycle costs of ownership and maintenance.</p> <p><b>Add: balanced with keeping original construction costs to a minimum</b></p>	<p>Balanced with keeping original construction costs to a minimum is a fair statement. However, this Strategy is a direction for the County to support the consideration of lifecycle costs and should remain.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.3 Goal 42 Strategies 42.1.5, Continue to support public-private partnerships for the provision of affordable housing</p> <p>42.16, Leverage affordable housing efforts and minimize costs by utilizing existing housing expertise and programs. 42.1.7 Establish clear, measurable performance goals for all projects and programs supported by the Santa Fe County and hold all partners accountable for results.</p> <p><b>Eliminate. Rationale; what do these mean?</b></p>	<p>Goal to support public-private partnerships is recommended to continue to explore all opportunities of funding, projects and services to the county residents to leverage resources. Goal to leverage affordable housing efforts and minimize costs is created to allow for successful partnerships to be established and maintained to expand and support services needed in the county. Goal to establish clear measurable performance is to hold partners accountable for funding and projects to be completed in a timely manner.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.3 Goal 43 Strategy 43.4 Encourage all affordable units shall be designed and located so as to be integrated with market units in the development in terms of location, architecture and landscaping.</p> <p><b>Eliminate Rationale; it would be impossible, i.e. mobile homes are desirably "affordable" even in the SLDP, but cannot meet the requirement of "integrated... architecture." Also landscaping is a definite personal preference item not subject to county requirement.</b></p>	<p>The intent of the goal is to have affordable housing that is compatible with the landscape of the development and does not stand out as "Affordable Housing" with a stigma attached.</p>	No Change
EGMA	<p>13.3 Add Goal 45 "Attain a reasonable value for all housing in the county by streamlining the development and permitting process"</p> <p>Strategy 45.1.1 Streamline and simplify the platting process for each zone classification.</p> <p>Strategy 45.1.2 Eliminate all uncertainty in the platting process through simple, sustainable regulations and requirements applicable to District Plans.</p> <p>Strategy 45.1.3 Eliminate the false scarcity of developable land by making all zoned land available for the development it is zoned for and remove the "preferred area" designation on land.</p> <p>Strategy 45.1.4 Support all effective policies and regulations which help steer the prices of some of the county's housing stock towards the national norm of 2.5 to 3.5 times the existing local median income.</p>	<p>The Goals and Strategies listed here may have a relationship to housing but these are more procedural directives which could be considered in the Land Use Element or Governance Element of the SLDP. Goal 48 is to "Ensure clear, consistent and efficient development regulation and review. Proposed Strategy 45.1.1 could be added to Goal 48. Other strategies could be reviewed for appropriateness to the SLDP and Goals.</p>	<p>Add a New Strategy to Goal 48 in Chapter 14:  <b>New Proposed Strategy:</b>  Streamline and simplify the development review and platting process.</p>

Chapter 14-Governance Element: SLDP Final Recommendations Summary

Group/ Affiliation	Public Comment	Staff Evaluation	Staff Recommendation
UC	14.2.1.2 COMMUNITY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEES "Existing community plans will undergo a review and revision process within 3 years <a href="#">after adoption of the SLDC</a> [Code, rather than the Plan] in coordination with the Community Planning Committees."	Sections 14.4.5.1 COMMUNITY PLANS and 14.4.5.2 OTHER PLANS make reference to the completion of the SLDC before proceeding with revising plans. Need consistent language. Staff recommends that "after adoption of the SLDC" language be incorporated into section 14.2.1.2. This inclusion will help in specifying a benchmark to reference the revision of the community plans	Revise sentence in section 14.2.1.2. to include "after adoption of the SLDC"
UC	14.3 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION "Consistency and predictability - of plans, development regulations, policies, implementation actions and development <del>approvals</del> <a href="#">applications</a> between service providers and among neighboring jurisdictions, for residents, businesses and developers that establishes a framework of reasonable expectations and decision-making in the development process."	This section needs to clarify that development applications are not the same as development approvals. The public has voiced concern over the implications of "approvals" with reference to the pending review of applications for consistency. This has been changed in other sections of the plan and applications should be replaced with approvals.	Revise 14.3 section to replace approvals with applications"
UC	14.4.3.3 TYPES OF APPLICATIONS [p. 240] Legislative Development Application - ". . . Legislative development <del>approval</del> <a href="#">applications</a> should be required for the following: . . ." <u>Comment</u> : We wish to make sure if what is meant is either, 1) applications are intended for the following.... Or that <i>approved</i> applications are necessary for the following.... Clarification of language needed.	Same as above for consistency	Revise 14.4.3.3section to replace approvals with applications"
UC	Quasi-Judicial Development Application [p. 240] "Such applications should require a public hearings <a href="#">process</a> providing procedural due process."	A public hearing does refer to a process. Staff recommends legal review of this section for concurrence and clarification.	No Change
UC	Ministerial Application A public hearing should not be required for any ministerial development application. Examples include: -Issuance of building permits, grading permits, minor land use disturbance permits, <a href="#">private</a> road construction and driveway permits.	These are examples and are not the definitive list of ministerial development applications.	No Change
UC	<u>Item nine</u> : We've noticed that the word "will" has been repeatedly removed and replaced with the word "may" throughout the "final" redlined SLDP draft. We request that members of the CDRC view the read-lined Final draft SLDP to help assess the degree to which these changes might challenge the sustainability of the SLDP as intended.	Will has been changed in the SLDP because there is no certainty on whether the County "will" require or direct an action. "may" is used to allow the County to achieve a specific item without mandating that it occur. Planning recognizes that the mandated direction in previous drafts may not be implementable or desirable for the County to pursue.	No Change
LWVSFC	Strategy 47.1.6, Create an Estancia Basin Area Task Force..... <i>does not define what will be the assignment of the Task Force and how the public will be informed of Task Force activities and recommendations.</i>	Need clarification language. Suggestion: <i>Create an Estancia Basin Area Task Force in order to better coordinate the Towns of Edgewood and Moriarty, and the Counties of Tarrant, Bernalillo, and Santa Fe on land use related issues and or initiatives.</i>	Revise Strategy 47.1.6- <i>Create an Estancia Basin Area Task Force in order to better coordinate the Towns of Edgewood and Moriarty, and the Counties of Tarrant, Bernalillo, and Santa Fe on land use related issues and or initiatives.</i>
LWVSFC	Annual reports [should be given] by the County staff to the governing bodies and the public on the progress in implementing the general plan.	This comment refers to Implementation Element. The Strategic Plan is the implementing document of the Plan. Implementation Strategy 1.2.1 is to Ensure that the Strategic Plan is updated annually.	Add new strategy to Implementation Element under Policy 1.3, Strategy 1.3.2: Establish an annual review of the progress in implementing the SLDP to the Board of County Commissioners.
LWVSFC	<i>A method to include notification of those who might want to participate in meetings to discuss a proposed development application or proposed changes in the land use plan needs to be evident and available in the plan, not just notification of those who have registered as CO's and RO'S. Strategy 46.4.2 addresses this " The pre-application process to allow the public....to be informed about the proposed development projects." It is important that the "process" be clear in the SLDC.</i>	Strategy 46.4.2 recognizes that there is a need for the public to be notified about projects or changes to the plan. Section 14.2 recognizes this and outlines a process for General Public Participation to include notification of planning and development issues using a number of different mechanisms.	No Change