



# Agenda

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE HEARING

THURSDAY, August 6, 2020, at 3:30 PM

ATTEND VIRTUALLY

### SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

In response to the State's declaration of a Public Health Emergency, the Mayor's Proclamation of Emergency, and the ban on public gatherings of more than five (5) people, this meeting will be conducted virtually using Zoom.

**Viewing on YouTube:** Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCuW5Fb7iWuKpTdsWYNDurgA>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most computers, mobile devices, and smartphones.

**Attending on Zoom:** Members of the public may attend the Zoom meeting on a computer, mobile device, or phone. The video conference link and teleconference number are as follows:

- Zoom link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88957806046?pwd=OFQ0MVNKanIvb1lwTDVWRUR2UGk1Zz09>  
(Passcode: 697123)
- Phone numbers: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 (Webinar ID: 889 5780 6046)

This information will also be posted on the City of Santa Fe's Calendar of Events website at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting: <https://www.santafenm.gov/events>.

### Public Comment:

- **By internet:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conference (using a computer, mobile device, or smart phone) may provide public comment during the meeting. Attendees should use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized by the chair to speak at the appropriate time.
- **By phone:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by phone may provide public comment during the meeting but **must** provide advance notice to City staff. Please contact Lani McCulley (505-365-3055, [lmcculley@santafenm.gov](mailto:lmcculley@santafenm.gov)) no later than Monday, August 3, 2020, and provide your **full name, address, and the phone number** you will be using to call in to the teleconference. Without your phone number, the chair will not be able to recognize you to speak at the meeting.
- **In writing:** A person may submit written public comments in advance of the meeting by email ([LandUsePublicComment@santafenm.gov](mailto:LandUsePublicComment@santafenm.gov)) or U.S. Postal Service (City of Santa Fe, ATTN: Lani McCulley, PO Box 909, Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909). Please include your full name and address, and identify the specific agenda item you are commenting on. To be included in the official record and considered at the hearing, written public comment **must** be received no later than Monday, August 3, 2020.

### A. CALL TO ORDER

### B. ROLL CALL

### C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 9, 2020

### E. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

### F. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case #2020-001864-ARC.** Ron Winters, agent for Blue Buffalo LLC, requests approval of an archaeological data recovery plan, or alternatively, a construction monitoring plan, for LA129249 at 2725 Agua Fria Street in the River and Trails Archaeological Review District. (POSTPONED FROM 7/9/2020) (Lisa Roach, [lroach@santafenm.gov](mailto:lroach@santafenm.gov), 955-6577)
2. **Case #2020-002406-ARC.** Ron Winters, agent for Kelly Cable, requests approval of an archaeological monitoring report for the Centurylink project on Rufina Street and Clark Road in the Suburban Archaeological Review District. (Lisa Roach)

3. Case #2020-002407-ARC. Ron Winters, agent for Homewise, owner, requests approval of an archaeological reconnaissance report in advance of development at 4193 B Fairly Road and 6450 Camino Rojo in the Suburban Archaeological Review District. (Lisa Roach)
4. Case #2020-002408-ARC. Office of Archaeological Studies, agent for High 5 Networks/Comcast, requests approval of an archaeological monitoring plan for the installation of conduit on Guadalupe, Agua Fria, and Romero Streets in the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. (Lisa Roach)

**G. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to date.

**RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE**

**DATE: July 29, 2020**

**TIME: 3:18 PM**

**SUMMARY INDEX  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
August 6, 2020**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JULY 9, 2020	Approved [amended]	2
MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR	None	2
 <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>		
<b>CASE #2020-001864-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR BLUE BUFFALO, LLC, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY PLAN, OR ALTERNATIVELY, A CONSTRUCTION MONITORING PLAN FOR LA 139249 AT 2715 AGUA FRIA STREET IN THE RIVER AND TRAILS ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT</b>	Approved Monitoring Plan w/ Corrections and stipulations	3-19
<b>CASE #2020-002406-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR KELLY CABLE, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING REPORT FOR THE CENTURYLINK PROJECT ON RUFINA STREET AND CLARK ROAD IN THE SUBURBAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT</b>	Approved w/editorial corrections	20-22
<b>CASE #2020-002407-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR HOMEWISE, OWNER, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE REPORT IN ADVANCE OF DEVELOPMENT AT 4193 B FAIRLY ROAD AND 6450 CAMINO ROJO IN THE SUBURBAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT</b>	Approved w/specific corrections	22-26

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CASE #2020-002408-ARC. OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, AGENT FOR HIGH 5 NETWORKS/COMCAST, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING PLAN FOR THE INSTALLATION OF CONDUIT ON GUADALUPE, AGUA FRIA AND ROMERO STREETS IN THE HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT	Approved w/ Applicants corrections	26-28
DISCUSSION ITEMS	None	28
MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE	None	28
ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS	None	28
ADJOURNMENT		29

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF SANTA FE  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE HEARING  
Via Virtual Attendance on Zoom  
streaming live on  
the City of Santa Fe's YouTube Channel  
August 6, 2020**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The Archaeological Review Committee Hearing was called to order by David Eck, Chair, at approximately 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, August 6, 2020, via virtual attendance on Zoom, streaming live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube Channel at [https://www.youtube.com/user/city\\_of\\_santa\\_fe](https://www.youtube.com/user/city_of_santa_fe), City of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present**

David Eck, Chair  
Derek Pierce  
James Edward Ivey  
Cortney Anne Wands  
Dale F. Zinn

**City Personnel Present**

Lisa Roach, Manager, Historic Preservation Division – Committee Liaison  
Sally A. Paez, Assistant City Attorney  
Melessia Helberg, Stenographer

There was a quorum of the membership in attendance for the conducting of official business.

**NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith to these minutes by reference, and the original Committee packet is on file in, and may be obtained from, the City of Santa Fe Historic Preservation Division.**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, to approve the Agenda, as presented.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JULY 9, 2020**

The following corrections were made to the minutes:

Page 2, under corrections to minutes, correct as follows: "...Page 14 #6(4) “,,at the mechanical data lever level form.”

Page 2, under corrections to minutes, correct as follows: "...Page 15 #6(4) “,,at the mechanical data lever level form.”

Page 2, under Matters from the Floor, paragraph 3, correct as follows: "...~~Sherry Schick's~~ Cherie Scheick's...”

Page 3, paragraph 2, line 2, correct as follows: "...~~a ramp~~ [inaudible]...”

Page 18, paragraph 6, line 5, correct as follows: "...[inaudible] the State law on unmarked burials..”

Page 23, paragraph 6, line 2, correct as follows: "...[inaudible] unexpected discovery for the....”

**MOTION:** Dale Zinn moved, seconded by Derek Pierce, to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 9, 2020, as amended.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

**E. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no matters from the floor.

## F. ACTION ITEMS

1. **CASE #2020-001864-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR BLUE BUFFALO, LLC, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY PLAN, OR ALTERNATIVELY, A CONSTRUCTION MONITORING PLAN FOR LA 139249 AT 2715 AGUA FRIA STREET IN THE RIVER AND TRAILS ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. (POSTPONED FROM 07/09/2020) (LISA ROACH, STAFF LIAISON, [lxroach@santafenm.gov](mailto:lxroach@santafenm.gov). 955-6657)**

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

Ron Winters presents two options for treatment of LA 129249 at 2715 Agua Fria Road in the River and Trails Archaeological Review District. The first, a Revised Archaeological Data Recovery Plan is presented at the request of the ARC in response to discussions of the case at their hearings on April 28<sup>th</sup>, June 4<sup>th</sup> and July 9<sup>th</sup> of this year, and in an effort to incorporate suggested amendments from both the ARC and the State Cultural Properties Review Committee (CPRC). Following consultation with Blue Buffalo, LLC, and City staff with regards to the funding limit, per §14-3.13(c)(5)(e), and possible treatment alternatives that would result in greater time and funding efficiencies, Mr. Winters now also presents a plan for construction monitoring for LA 129249 for the consideration of the committee. Additionally, proposals are presented for both alternatives for the Committee to consider a recommendation or allocation from the Archaeological Fund to defray the costs of treatment for the site

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff defers to the Committee as to whether the archaeological data recovery plan or the archaeological monitoring plan meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

Chair Eck noted the staff report in the packet. He thanked Ms. Roach and asked if she has anything to add.

Ms. Roach said although there was a recommendation by the Committee on the option at the previous meeting, she would like to have a recommendation on the record. She said, "After having discussed the matter at length with the City Attorney's Office and the Land Use Director, I would like to strongly recommend that the Committee consider the Construction Monitoring Plan for this particular case. And that has to do with the unambiguous language about the funding limit in the Code. And the reality is that data recovery take place on the site or it will cause substantial construction delays which costs additional expense for the Applicant. So I would like for the Committee to consider approval of the Construction Monitoring option for this site. I also would like to mention that there has been a request for an allocation from the Archaeological Fund to defray the cost of the treatment of the site, and that is mentioned in the report. Should the Committee determine that it looks like it is of City-wide significance, it would qualify for an allocation from the Archaeological Fund for treatment."

Mr. Zinn asked Ms. Paez if the determination of eligibility and allocation from the Archaeological Fund should be a separate action item.

Ms. Roach said she does not believe it would require two separate action items if the recommendation for funding is included in the motion. She said, "The Code specifies that the Committee should make the recommendation for allocation from the Archaeological Fund. So, if you make that recommendation along with the motion to approve one of the two options, then you would proceed from there." She asked Ms. Paez if she concurs.

Ms. Paez said, "Yes. I think that's fine, Lisa. Thanks."

Chair Eck asked, in the event the Committee votes for action, the Committee would be making a recommendation based on no knowledge of the cost associated. "So how would we come up with an amount."

Mr. Roach said she has requested an estimate for both options, and she has those amounts up to a certain amount, noting those amounts are not included in the packet, and she can provide those on request.

Ms. Wands said she had asked for a full budget of how the funds would be spent and if that was provided.

Ms. Roach said it was provided to her by Mr. Winters, but she didn't want to put it in the packet.

Chair Eck said he finds it difficult to consider this without the full details of the proposed expenditures.

Ms. Roach said she was unsure if it was to be in the packet or not, and she erred on the side of caution there.

Chair Eck agreed that those figures should not be in the packet for public consumption, but said that the Committee needs the information to deliberate on this issue.

Ms. Roach said, as she recalls, the data recovery was approximately \$25,000 to \$30,000 and the construction was \$17,000 to \$18,000.

Mr. Zinn asked if it is the intent for this Committee to have a detailed oversight of the budget or just the bottom line number, and is it possible for this Committee to have a non-public administrative session to discuss that.

Ms. Roach said it is up to the Committee to approve up to a certain dollar amount, and then it becomes the City's responsibility to manage the bid process and procurement for the services.

Ms. Paez said we can't do a separate session with the full Committee. She said she is trying to think of means of distribution of the information outside of the public meeting packet. She asked if there is a specific provision of State law that makes these documents confidential and clearly protected by the law. If so, then she would recommend something in writing saying why it is confidential, and making that super-clear – citing a clear provision of law saying this is not public information. She then could provide that confidential information by email. She said outside of that, it is very tricky. She said she then could redact the document after the fact, so she could provide the information that had not been redacted out of the documents to the public in response to a public records request.

Ms. Roach said in situations like this, she believes that it does require a degree of confidence in her as staff to procure the services. She will follow the procurement process according to law, and said that it is important to consider that to minimize delays on this project, noting the procurement process would proceed according to the amount being bid. She said to procure services as fast as possible, it is important to stay below \$20,000. She said above that amount they have to go through the full bid process which could take 3-6 months.

Ms. Roach continued, saying she had a lengthy conversation with Eric Faust, the Owner and Developer, and he expressed that the bottom line he has in mind is to proceed with the most expedient path forward.

Chair Eck said we now will move forward and hear from Mr. Winters, and asked that Mr. Winters be sworn.

**Ron Winters, Archaeologist, 109 Calle Paula, Santa Fe, NM 87505, Agent for Blue Buffalo, LLC, was sworn.** Responding to the Chair, Mr. Winters said he doesn't have a lot to say at this point. He said he would hope, as much time as we've all spent on this, that we will be able to move forward after today. He said he has no further remarks at this time.

**Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said he has no questions.

**Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey said he has no comment.

**Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce said Mr. Winters indicated he will go with Ground Penetrating Radar ["GPR"] and then adapt the Data Recovery Plan according to the results. He said on packet page 28, Figure 8, there are 5

trenches outlined there, and asked Mr. Winters if he followed-up to excavate those trenches, and if not, if the GPR on that is negative.

Mr. Winters said what he said was, “that certainly if the GPR indicated features, that I would modify that trench and try to address anomalies. And if not, it would still mean trenching down to then establish the integrity of the site for features that might not have shown up with the GPR.”

Mr. Pierce asked Mr. Winters, “In the event that the GPR does not show any evidence, then your trenching plan would be consistent with what is here on Figure 8.”

Mr. Winters said yes.

Mr. Pierce said, “And I also wanted to ask, you know, sometimes, based on conditions, GPR is very good, and sometimes it doesn’t return anything at all, and sometimes, often, it is inconclusive. So, what is your plan if it is inclusive. If you see the fuzzy outlines of maybe something, but nothing positive.”

Mr. Winters said, “I will explore if there is any anomaly. And I think I said that. That any anomaly found that would also be able to be interpreted as a pit house and a field house.... if there was something that showed up that wasn’t *[inaudible]*.”

Mr. Pierce said this is all he has for now, “for the first half.”

### **Cortney Wands**

Mr. Winters, responding to a question from Ms. Wands, said the difference in the color doesn’t necessarily mean a difference in stratigraphy, it has to do with the moisture in the soil.

Ms. Wands said, “No, it’s not just the difference between stratigraphy.” She said you have loam, you have some *[inaudible because of background noise]*. You’re saying that the soil across the site is completely homogeneous.”

Mr. Winters asked Ms. Wands, to make her point and “let’s move on.”

Ms. Wands said her point is that he needs to change the site description.

*[STENOGRAPHER’S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION: Ms. Helberg asked for clarity on Mr. Winters’ response to Ms. Wands, and asked if it was that he needs to change the site description.]*

Chair Eck said Ms. Wands called out the difference in the soil, and Mr. Winters responded that he has more information available from the other archaeologist who was assisting him.

Ms. Wands asked who will be doing the GPR, and what kinds of method and equipment will be used, saying none of this has been addressed.

Mr. Winters said he obtained the information on GPR from Emily Brown, and asked if they would like to have her address that, saying he is happy to do that.

Ms. Wands said that information needs to be included in the Plan. She asked how he will be “tying everything in after.” She asked how he will excavate and if he intends to expand the area if he hits features.

Mr. Winters said that is included in his Report – how features would be addressed.

Ms. Wands said Mr. Winters said he would open a 1 x 1 in the small features and a 4 x 4 for the larger, but he didn't say anything else about what he would do – expand the area, noting there is a standard for a 5 gallon bucket on something like that. She asked how big each pass of the backhoe will be.

Mr. Winters said that would depend on the feature.

Ms. Wands said that should be addressed in the methodology in the Data Recovery Plan. She asked if he hits a feature if he will be going to a hand excavation.

Mr. Winters said of course.

Ms. Wands asked how far he would go.

Mr. Winters said it depends on the feature.

Ms. Wands noted that his process includes a proposed map, noting there were 2 trenches on the map that went to the CPRC.

Mr. Winters said the CPRC didn't see the map in the packet. The map now has 2 trenches. However, because he had to submit a request to them to get on the agenda, they never saw this map.

Ms. Wands said Mr. Winters indicates he will apply GPS to the entire site, and then he says the total is 63 meters. She asked him what is the entire site.

Chair Eck said it is 1,500 sq. meters, and Mr. Winters said that is correct.

Chair Eck said Mr. Winters can make an editorial change in the Table to that effect, and Mr. Winters said he will do so.

Mrs. Wands said Mr. Winters has listed 180 person hours, then GPR, the report, the backhoe and an office and asked if that will be a total cost of \$25,000 to \$30,000.

Mr. Winters said, “Easily.”

Ms. Wands said that is all she has for now.

### **Chair Eck**

Chair Eck noted the following:

1. Packet page 6, paragraph 2, is an interpretation and oversimplification of what the Committee actually said. He said, Mr. Post's hypothesizing that the depression might be a pit structure had nothing to do with our proceeding to recommend further testing which will now follow in data recovery for this site. The reason we recommended that is because we observed that the testing that had been done was quite sufficient to demonstrate the presence of some archaeological deposits, but was inadequate for the demonstration of the nature and *[inaudible]*. This is the reason we recommend it for the Data Recovery Plan.
2. Packet page 20, regarding stratigraphy, there is a discussion of stratigraphy, and the fact that you are basing your *[inaudible]* is made up in general observations in the profile discussion. It would have been beneficial for clarification purposes that actually can *[audible]* depict, if that was the explanation for the location of the artifacts in the report.

Mr. Winters said he can provide the site form to demonstrate that, saying most every unit has that sort of information.

Chair Eck said that needs to be done.

3. Packet page 26, regarding the GPR, we definitely will want to know how and why he is using only certain methodology, deployment, technique, interpretation, analysis and such. He said not only will we want to hear that, but the CPRC will want to hear that as well. They probably also will have similar things to say about 1/4 screen versus 1/8 inch screen, and will want you to specify how that sample screening will be applied.
4. Packet page 27, indicates that "*The trenching and scraping will employ a backhoe.*" He said it is important that, before trenching and scraping a site blindly where there could be valuable artifacts, he would urge him to first do scraping and then trenching of any site for which he hasn't demonstrated a full definition of depth – scraping, then trenching in that order.

Mr. Winters said he will do so.

5. Packet page 27. Concern about the section on the depth of trenches at 1.52 m/5 feet and more shallow if nothing is found, because we are searching for the bottom, and making observations about stratigraphy while we do that. All trenches to a depth of 5 ft. in all likelihood will not indicate we have reached substrate *[Inaudible because of other voice overlay on Zoom]*. He said he thinks, and the CPRC might feel it necessary, Mr. Winters should excavate all trenches to the level of 5 feet, with observations made of what is found and what is sited, and then follow up with the

scraping recommended by the CPRC, so a deeper trench can be dug if necessary that can be entered without stepping the trenches. This way you will know what you are doing before you take the next step.

Mr. Winters said this is a good idea.

Chair Eck asked if members have further commentary.

**Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said he had no questions.

**Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey said he had no questions.

**Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce he had no comment at this time.

**Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands said she had no comment at this time.

**Chair Eck**

Chair Eck said he had no further questions at this time.

**General Discussion by the Committee**

Chair Eck asked Mr. Winters if he would like to comment.

Mr. Winters said he would just like to comment that some good points were made, and some constructive criticism was made that he will address. He said, "I appreciate the input."

Chair Eck asked if the Committee feels it was provided with sufficient information to consider motions made in this Case.

Mr. Pierce asked how we are handling the alternative as the Monitoring Plan, and asked if the Chair would like to address that separately after a motion, or go through comments with that as well and then weigh the merits of both.

Chair Eck said it is an “either/or” case before us.

Ms. Roach said she won't recommend that the Committee decide which path they are willing to support before talking about the methods, because the motion will dictate what happens next. There has been no discussion of the merits or which option is the most feasible or appropriate. She said the Applicant has submitted two options for consideration by the Committee, and she believes there should be some discussion as to which option is more appropriate for this case before a motion is made.

Chair Eck said if the Committee would like to move forward and consider the second option on the table, he is happy to have that happen.

Mr. Zinn said he strongly suggests that we do that, and Mr. Pierce, Mr. Ivey and Ms. Wands agreed.

### **Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said he feels that there has to be a way that the data we're hoping to find there will also move this project forward and it's for the good of the public. He said as the one that “has our cake and eat it too,” flavor to it, he would strongly recommend going with the Monitoring Plan.

Chair Eck said he has seen no “cake or ice cream” in this part.

### **Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey said he has no comment.

### **Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce said he would like for Mr. Winters to clarify the Monitoring Plan for him, by laying out the sequence of events as he sees them. He said, “I understand the steps, but not the order of the steps.”

Mr. Winters said, initially he is taking off the top, to remove the surface dust and whatever else. He said, “The next application would go a little deeper, depending on the equipment they are using. They can set the depth depending on what I was able to observe as we pass across this area. So I can say how deep they go, each path through the site. I was told it is just a matter of a few centimeters, and that's just whatever is at the surface, and whatever is in that first couple of inches. So that would occur first. And I think the process to the client will be that I will then dictate how deep the path would go, and on what is

seen and I would move cautiously so as not to remove too much in order to preserve any features that might be present. And then I would say down to the depth where I could do no trenching that was deeper than what would be permitted by OSHA, do that after we have scraped the surfaced.”

Mr. Winters continued, “The utility line will pass on the west side of this site, that will be monitored and be subject to... it is a combination of both scraping and excavating. And then if any features of any sort were found, that process would stop immediately and those would be addressed.”

Mr. Pierce said it is important to hear this, because if you refer to Mr. Winters’ packet page 65, paragraph 3, he says, “,,*Mechanical excavation by the contractor will proceed in 20 cm levels...*” Mr. Pierce said these are pretty big levels and you can find a whole lot without knowing it.”

Mr. Winters said that is true and apologized and said, “I will correct that.”

Mr. Pierce said, in terms of trenching, Mr. Winters mentioned there would be a utility trench with a natural opportunity. He asked if any other trenching will be done just for the sake of defining stratigraphy.”

Mr. Winters said absolutely. He said after the scraping is done, he definitely would trench to establish the stratigraphy below what they found in the testing, that’s if there were no features.

Mr. Pierce asked Mr. Winters if that trenching will be of a length and placement consistent with his Figure 8.

Mr. Winters said yes.

Mr. Pierce said this is all he has for the moment.

### **Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands referred to packet page 65, where Mr. Winters says the monitoring at the site is geared toward monitoring for utility lines, to the point where he suggests giving LA numbers to any features encountered in trenches, and that CenturyLink will stop excavation if he hits features.

Ms. Wands referred to packet page 67, where Mr. Winters discusses that any remains will be reburied on the site. She said, “This is a construction site, you can’t re-bury human remains where you pulled them out of.”

Ms. Wands said so if you are monitoring and you hit features, you would only partially excavate all of them and there would be no extending because you are *[inaudible]*.

Mr. Winters said, “I guess it would depend on what the feature was.”

Ms. Wands said in his report Mr. Winters is saying if he hits things, then “we’ll have to reconsider what we are doing from there.”

Mr. Winters said yes, and that’s what he meant about assessing the feature and the importance of it. He said he does not think that every feature has equal importance. He also is trying to take into account the time constraints and the level of effort to put into a particular feature.

Ms. Wands said, “This is part of what I’m trying to get at.”

Mr. Winters said he understands.

Ms. Wands said, “That’s supposed to be addressed in the document.”

Ms. Wands said, “That’s it for now.”

### **Chair Eck**

Chair Eck noted the following:

1. Packet page 45, Figure 3 is “absolutely upside down, compared to Figure 2 on the facing page.

Mr. Winters apologized saying that “slipped by me, but I’m not responsible for that one.”

Chair Eck said he understands that both he and Mr. Winters have to cope with the making of the passage as presented.

Mr. Winters said, right. He said he also would apologize for any mis-steps, or with the field methods, saying, “I had to turn this around rather quickly to get it submitted in conjunction with the Data Recovery Plan.”

2. Packet page 65, paragraph 2, line 3 “...*the site boundaries will be plotted on the project map...*” Is Mr. Winters thinking of modifying the project or the site boundaries in some way before ground disturbance begins.

Mr. Winters said probably not before, but if something was discovered in the perimeter beyond what the known site boundaries are, “potentially we could expand.”

Chair Eck referred to Mr. Pierce’s request for clarification earlier. He said, “So you are going to go out and skim the surface of this whole place and you are going to monitor all of that.”

Mr. Winters said yes.

Chair Eck said, “Okay. That’s an important distinction.”

Mr. Winters said, "Any ground disturbance, not just within the site boundaries, but in the buffer beyond, I will be there, being present."

Chair Eck asked if he is going to monitor the breaking of the surface of this entire project area.

Mr. Winters said no.

Chair Eck asked what would be an acceptable buffer.

Mr. Winters said it would be 15 meters.

Chair Eck said he would argue for 30 meters.

Mr. Winters said he can do that.

Chair Eck said this is because lots of times things are not always where we expect they should be, and Mr. Winters said that is true.

3. Packet page 65, paragraph 2, line 3, says, "...*This alignment is expected to follow the route shown on the project graphics...*" He asked what alignment Mr. Winters is talking about and where is it shown on the project graphics.

Mr. Winters said, "You are talking about CenturyLink."

Chair Eck said yes.

Mr. Winters responded, "That was one of the mis-steps that I told you about. Yes, this is referring to monitoring."

Chair Eck said one thing Mr. Winters might do would be to take both figures on packet pages 65 and 66 and excise them from this document and then refer to a discussion of all those things on the following pages, such as on packet page 69, where he talks about scraping.

4. Chair Eck thanked Ms. Wands for bringing up her concerns about proper procedure regarding burials/human remains.
5. The CPRC, in its comments to the Committee, did say they want to hear much more about artifact analysis, as far as your mechanical excavation permit. Mr. Winters actually can do that in his Data Recovery Plan, and he did that in the Monitoring Plan, and he thanked him for that. He said the more information they have, the better – more explanation about what you intend to do and how you intend to do it.

Chair Eck said this is all he has to say at the moment.

## General Discussion

Mr. Pierce said it occurs to him that there really isn't all that much difference between the Data Recovery Plan and the Monitoring Plan. He said scraping off the first 2-3 cms. to expose features is an acceptable data recovery practice and happens all the time. He is wondering if we should look more closely at the differences between the two, exactly where they diverge, because it is difficult to evaluate which is the better plan without getting down to what is different about the two. Even during monitoring, Mr. Winters will be doing trenches, and excavate any features that are exposed. Mr. Pierce said he is kind of at a loss to differentiate between the two.

Mr. Zinn said to him the most difference is the monitoring of the crews during that time, which is much more expedient and placates the public.

Ms. Wands said her concern is about excavation of features, noting in the Monitor Plan it looks as if samples will be taken from only portions of features excavated and only three of the larger features will be excavated.

Mr. Pierce asked Mr. Winters to address this.

Mr. Winters said what Ms. Wands says is correct.

Mr. Ivey said he had no comment.

Chair Eck asked if anyone is willing to "take a stab" at a motion and then we can have further discussion.

**MOTION:** Dale Zinn moved with respect to Case #2020-001864-ARC, to accept the Monitoring Plan presented here today, with the corrections made by several members of the Committee, and that this Committee finds that this site has the potential for significance to the entire Santa Fe area, that it eligible to participate in the Archaeological Fund to do the additional testing and data recovery. **THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

## Continuation of Discussion by the Committee

Chair Eck said he believes we need to have further discussion. He said the thought that comes to him is that we should consider the Data Recovery Plan, then move on to the alternative. He said we have talked about the issue, a motion that died for lack of a second, so we have not made much progress. He asked if someone wants to try again with a different motion.

Ms. Roach asked if there are specific corrections or enhancements to the Monitoring Plan that would make it more palatable to members of the Committee. She said she takes from the lack of a Second to the Motion, that members feel that the Monitoring Plan as it exists is insufficient, so she believes the Applicant would be open to amending the Monitoring Plan, such as with a specific directive from the Committee. She asked if this might be possible.

Mr. Pierce said he believes Ms. Roach is headed in the right direction, saying he finds himself stuck between the two plans because what he really wants is a fusion of the two. He said, "Actually, I don't think the GPR is going to... it's a risk. It may prove ineffective and be a waste of time and a waste of resources. I think scraping the top couple of centimeters actually is a better alternative for trying to do what we are trying to do. But the stumbling block, as member Wands pointed out, to accepting the Monitoring Plan, is the really small sample size if features are discovered. So perhaps we can reach some compromise there on that point."

Ms. Roach said she believes that might be a good path forward, and asked if the Committee wishes to discuss what level of investigation would be a comfort level for procedures if features are discovered.

Chair Eck asked for a second round of commentary from the members of the Committee.

#### **Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said he doesn't think he has anything to offer.

#### **Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey said he doesn't have much to contribute to that either.

#### **Derek Pierce**

Chair Eck asked Mr. Pierce what he thinks might be taken from Plan A and put into Plan B.

Mr. Pierce said, "Let's look at small features. I think Ron defined a limit of 1 meter or less, so I would think that a feature of that size, regardless of the number of them, should be bisected at 50% sample. Of course, with the caveat that if they are unwilling to accept it, or if there are multiple...a dozen of identical features, it's not necessary to test every one of them."

Mr. Pierce continued, "And in terms of larger features, say something like a pit house, I would think it needs a 2 x 2 unit somewhere that exposes at least part of the wall, and part of a good chunk of the interior."

Mr. Pierce continued, "Apart from that, it's difficult to arbitrarily say certain percentages of a feature when we don't know what we're in for, but it's a start."

### **Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands said first of all, regarding removing the caveat of only 3 large features. She said, "[inaudible] I've got to think that gives you a [inaudible] that is a risk no matter what. Certainly, there is no description on enough of the thing itself, however it be done. In terms of a combination of the Monitoring Plan, if we had a.... I'm sure you're aware that if there are multiple rooms, so that each room counts as a single feature, and then only three rooms would be excavated. And then if there is another [inaudible] with 4 rooms, will this be ignored. How does this work. Because I looked at each [inaudible]...."

Mr. Winters said he would ask the Committee "how you would go about... you know, we're speculating a lot.... how you would go about....submitting a proposal for the funds based on the unknown."

Ms. Roach said she was thinking of suggesting that the Committee add an item for a contingency, that should more investigation be required, the Applicant could dip into that contingency line item.

Chair Eck said he is trying to figure out how we plan to do this.

Ms. Roach said she and Mr. Winters need to hash-out how the budget falls out during a procurement process, if the Committee goes in the direction of allocating funds from the Archaeological Fund, if it pleases the Committee as appropriate.

Mr. Pierce said he would like to revisit Ms. Wands question about the cap of 3 large features. He asked, "Would that be 3 features of the same type, or any 3 large features."

Mr. Winters said it probably would depend on the type, if there are similarities. He asked Mr. Pierce when he says large, if he is speaking about structures – a field house, a pit house...

Mr. Pierce said, "Yes. Yes, so we are talking about structures. For instance if... granted we're straying into the unlikely here.... but if there were half dozen field houses within the site boundary, yes, I would be comfortable with only doing 3 of them. Or if it were a room block of 10 rooms, perhaps 3 of those 10 rooms, that's fine. But if you have all of those different feature types, simply doing one of each may not be okay."

Mr. Winters said it is tough situation in terms of cost.

Mr. Pierce said, "Well, you'll have to forgive me this idea of excavating only up to a certain number of features when we don't know how many there are. It's a new concept to me. Right. I haven't seen that before."

Mr. Winters said he understands.

Ms. Roach said she would suggest that one idea would be to limit the cap altogether, and if the site warrants additional investigation that exceeds the scope of what has been budgeted for and approved through the City, then the Applicant comes back and makes another application for funds. The Committee then reviews an additional request for an allocation of funding, or an extension... an addendum to the Monitoring Plan... or something to that effect.

Chair Eck said that sounds like a workable solution as well. He said if we had 2-3 discussions, based on these expectations, that if it is short of the reality to *[inaudible]* and speak to you, about the variations and the reason the project needs to be handled in a different way.... sort of a contingency plan."

Mr. Pierce said he likes this, commenting, "We are straying into the absurd here a little bit. I mean, we have one depression that may be a pit house. That's all we know of... But if that should happen, I want to say that is where you come back to the Committee and ask for additional funding, or additional time. But I don't want to hold up the project for that half percent chance that there might be a full blown village there, because it seems a pretty remote possibility."

Ms. Roach said perhaps there could be an agreement to remove the cap and include a contingency plan description into the Monitoring Plan.

Chair Eck said yes. He said our philosophy of doing these things still would be possible without being *[inaudible]* or condition things that we would only get involved if these are the things that are discovered.

Mr. Pierce said it sounds good because it means that if there were a discovery of that magnitude, it would not have to stop all construction and then wait for months for us to take some sort of action.

Ms. Roach agreed.

Chair Eck said this means scraping the 2 centimeters of the ground cover, and if we find that there may even be a 3 room structure out there, that is the important change from what we need to do. If it was a depression and not a pit structure, well that's a good thing, and that effort *[inaudible]* and cover those small features from *[inaudible]*. So there's a lot of wiggle room in here that I think we could personally enjoy having. But increases on variations and the nature of unexpected finds, I think we need to hear about.

Mr. Pierce said at the beginning of the discussion, Ms. Roach said the most expeditious way to get this moving forward was to limit the withdrawal from the fund to \$20,000.

Ms. Roach said that is correct, to request \$20,000, although it is less than what Mr. Winters said was needed. We then have the ability to move forward with a purchase order, rather than going through a lengthy procurement process.

**MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, with respect to Case #2020-001864-ARC, to approve the Monitoring Plan for LA129249, with the changes in methodology that we discussed today, and to approve an application to the Archaeological Fund not to exceed \$20,000 to do the additional testing and data recovery, with the contingency that the Applicant can come back and request additional funding if the unexpected discoveries drive the cost above \$20,000.

**SECOND:** Dale Zinn said that he would second the motion with an amendment that it is the finding of this Committee that we believe this site is of potential significance to the City of Santa Fe so that the Applicant is eligible to participate in the Archaeological Fund. **The maker agreed to the amendment to the motion.**

**RESTATED MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, with respect to Case #2020-001864-ARC, to approve the Monitoring Plan for LA129249, with the changes in methodology that we discussed today, and to approve an application to the Archaeological Fund not to exceed \$20,000 to do the additional testing and data recovery, with the contingency that the Applicant can come back and request additional funding if the unexpected discoveries drive the cost above \$20,000, and that it is the finding of this Committee that we believe this site is of potential significance to the City of Santa Fe so that the Applicant is eligible to participate in the Archaeological Fund.

**AMENDMENT AND CLARIFICATION TO THE FINDING IN THE MOTION:** Ms. Roach said, as specified by Mr. Zinn in discussion, the finding would be that this site has the potential for City-wide significance and is eligible for an allocation from the Archaeological Fund. **The maker and second agreed to the amendment to the motion.**

**RESTATED AMENDED MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, with respect to Case #2020-001864-ARC, to approve the Monitoring Plan for LA129249, with the changes in methodology that we discussed today, and to approve an application to the Archaeological Fund not to exceed \$20,000 to do the additional testing and data recovery, with the contingency that the Applicant can come back and request additional funding if the unexpected discoveries drive the cost above \$20,000, and that it is the finding of this Committee that this site has the potential for City-wide significance and is eligible for an allocation from the Archaeological Fund.

**REQUEST BY STAFF:** Ms. Roach asked that the revised Monitoring Plan, with the changes specified by the Committee, be submitted to the staff.

Chair Eck said just know that every time we vote on a change, we trust that that is exactly what will happen.

Ms. Roach said, "Yes. Just so that the City has a record of that amended final document."

*Chair Eck's remarks here are inaudible*

## **PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE RESTATED AMENDED MOTION**

There was no public comment.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** Cortney Wands.

**Explaining her vote:** Ms. Wands said, "I would split my vote. I vote no on accepting the report, but yes on using the fund. I don't think this report is up to any form of standard. I know this needs to move forward, but I think by accepting this, it is the threshold *[inaudible]*."

*[Ms. Helberg asked the City how to do that splitting of the vote]* **Ms. Paez** said, "Thank you Melessia. I think it's perfectly appropriate to do that, but only if we withdraw the motion and break it in half. So if Member Pierce would be kind enough to maybe withdraw the motion. It's fine. I think it's totally fine, because I think we should go ahead and have two separate motions. And technically, if we're going to follow the rules, I think we're supposed to vote on withdrawing the motion and then start over."

Mr. Zinn said, "I would like to thank Ms. Paez for doing that, but unless you think there is a legal reason why... let's just see how it comes out."

Ms. Paez said, "Okay. I think, since we do have a pending motion, if Mr. Pierce doesn't want to withdraw the motion and hope there is a vote to withdraw, it is still on the table, technically. Melessia, correct me if I'm wrong, because you have experience in these things, but Member Wands, you can either say no, with the comment that you would be okay with part of it, but you can't approve the full motion. And I think that would be all right, too."

Ms. Helberg said, "Okay. So I ask her [Ms. Wands] for her vote again."

Ms. Paez said, "Yes. If Member Wands could repeat it as a yes or no, and if you would like to add a clarifying comment for the record, I'm certain it will be reflected in the minutes."

**Explaining her vote:** Ms. Wands said, "Okay. No, with the caveat that I approve the funding."

**Explaining his vote:** Mr. Pierce said, "I vote yes, but I would like to add the comment for the record that we are only approving the Plan because of the improvements that were made in the last hour or so. As it was submitted, it was not, probably, a passable plan. So we're relying on Ron to get an amended plan to Lisa Roach and to follow the discussion."

2. **CASE #2020-002406-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR KELLY CABLE, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING REPORT FOR THE CENTURYLINK PROJECT ON RUFINA STREET AND CLARK ROAD IN THE SUBURBAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. (LISA ROACH, STAFF LIAISON)**

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

Archaeologist Ron Winters presents an archaeological monitoring report for the installation of new subsurface fiber optic cable at Rufina Street and 1291 Clark Road in the Suburban Archaeological Review District. No cultural resources were recovered from the bore pits and trench backdirt. As a result of these findings, the archaeologist recommends that there is no cultural significance and no further work needed for archaeological clearance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the monitoring report, finding that it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

Chair Eck noted the staff report in the packet. He thanked Ms. Roach and asked if she has anything to add.

Ms. Roach said she has nothing to add.

Chair Eck asked Mr. Winters if he has additional remarks, reminding him that he is still under oath.

Mr. Winters said he did the survey as Mr. Pierce requested, and it was highly disturbed in that area, "but I did do that and I did not find anything. In fact in the bore pit and the trench at the east end, all I uncovered that was exposed was modern trash. So, from there, I moved forward in the area and that I didn't survey on the ground."

**Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey had no comment.

**Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn had no comment.

### **Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands had no comment.

### **Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce said he didn't remember the monitoring plan that we approved. "So, for future monitoring reports where you [Mr. Winters] have also done a plan, could you just state explicitly that the monitoring plan was approved by the Committee on such and such a meeting, because that helps us to remember when and where we talked about it."

Ms. Roach said she can do that in her report as well.

Chair Eck said, "Thank you. That would be very nice and helpful. Thank you."

Mr. Pierce said his other remark is that Mr. Winters has the usual problem with tenses, for example on packet page 7, paragraph 4. He is sure this is not the only occurrence, but in paragraph 4, Mr. Winters mixes tense, "*The project began..*," but in the next sentence, reads, "*The manhole project will bore,*" not "did bore." He reiterated that he thinks this is what we have come to see in Mr. Winters' other monitoring reports – not updating the tenses to show that this is actually something that has been done.

### **Chair David Eck**

Chair Eck said he also was going to talk about the tenses, noting he has 8 "sticky notes" in the report, all having to do with tenses. Responding to Mr. Winters, he said these are located in the Report: packet page 7, paragraphs 4 and 5; packet page 22, paragraph 4; and packet page 23, paragraph 4.

Ms. Roach noted there is a tense error as well in paragraph 3 on packet page 23.

Chair Eck asked Mr. Winters if it is possible for him to find someone with "a fresh pair of eyes," to proofread his reports before submitting them. He said his question is, "What will it take to get this to not happen again."

Mr. Winters said, "I've got it. I've got it. I will definitely get somebody to proofread..... so, I will definitely get a proofreader."

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, with respect to Case #2020-002406-ARC, to approve the Archaeological Monitoring Report, with the stipulated editorial corrections specified, for the Centurylink project on Rufina Street and Clark Road in the Suburban Archaeological District, as requested by Ron Winters, Agent for Kelly Cable, finding that it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

3. **CASE #2020-002407-ARC. RON WINTERS, AGENT FOR HOMEWISE, OWNER, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE REPORT IN ADVANCE OF DEVELOPMENT AT 4193 B FAIRLY ROAD AND 6450 CAMINO ROJO IN THE SUBURBAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. (LISA ROACH, STAFF LIAISON)**

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

Archaeologist Ron Winters with Aspen CRM Solutions, presents an archaeological reconnaissance report in advance of development by Homewise of two lots at 4193-B Fairly Road and 6450 Camino Rojo in the Suburban Archaeological Review District. The archaeologist inventory resulted in the identification and documentation of an earthen ditch (HCPI 48004), and a series of isolated occurrences indicating evidence of historic homesteading in the 1930s as well as pre-Columbian, ancestral Puebloan use of the area. No archaeological sites were identified on the property, and the historic cultural property documented (HCPI 48004) is not recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. No further investigation is recommended.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the reconnaissance report, finding it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

Chair Eck noted the staff report in the packet. He thanked Ms. Roach and asked if she has anything to add.

Ms. Roach said she had nothing to add.

**Dr. Emily Brown, Archaeologist, 6 Herrada Way, Eldorado, New Mexico 87508, part owner of Aspen CRM Solutions, was sworn.** *[NOTE: There was difficulty with the communication with Dr. Brown, and she kept coming in and out of Zoom, but finally was able to make her statement after several tries]*

Chair Eck asked Mr. Winters if he has additional remarks, reminding him that he is still under oath.

Mr. Winters said he was the lead on this, and they didn't find much on the survey, although there was a ditch that was a segment that was strictly on the property. There was no evidence of it on either side, and neither side was developed, so it wasn't like it had been destroyed. It probably had something to do with irrigating this particular property. He did some background research on the work done on other acequias in the area, because he had recorded one that was documented a little further north and east, and it appears to be in line with that, or a part of that. Again, there was just a small, small amount of artifacts and nothing substantial.

Dr. Brown said this was surveyed in advance of a proposed housing development. They surveyed the area, which was disturbed. She could find no record of the acequia being on file with the Office of the State Engineer. She looked at various aerials to see if it extended beyond the property and extended elsewhere, and could find no evidence of that. Lastly she did find on some maps some records that the property was irrigated by effluent.

**Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey said he had no comment.

**Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said he had no comment.

**Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands said she had no comment.

**Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce said on packet page 5, Figure 1 Project Location, a dot over Santa Fe on a statewide map doesn't really help us much, is not very informative. He had to go back to the NIAF form to figure out where this project was, noting there is a good map in the NIAF. He said we know it's in Santa Fe, otherwise we wouldn't be talking about it. So a different scale for the project location map would be warranted.

Mr. Winters said he would make that change.

Mr. Pierce said on packet page 23, paragraph 1, line 4 reads, “...*Because the ditch does not appear to be a Spanish Colonial-era acequia, it is recommended as not eligible for listing in the NRHP.*” He said this statement by itself, that it’s not Spanish Colonial, doesn’t really get you to not eligible. He said later on in the HCPI form, packet page 47, either Mr. Winters or Dr. Brown makes that argument pretty well there, but it’s just not in the Report. The HCPI form says, “...*it is not associated with a historically significant event or person, exhibits no distinctive features of construction or design, and contains no information beyond that obtained during the current documentation effort.*” He said, “Which is, basically what I’m saying is that they addressed all the criteria, a-b-c-d. That should have been in the report somewhere. I’m just making the point that if it’s not Spanish Colonial so it’s not eligible, that just doesn’t really work.”

Mr. Winters said he said he will make this correction.

### **Chair David Eck**

Chair Eck said the Report mentions reference to aerial photos, without being specific as to which ones to reference necessarily. A useful series of aerial imagery which is good for every project in Santa Fe would be Google Imagery, a series of field imagery which is tied to *[inaudible]*. “So it is a nice way of putting bookends on the appearance and disappearance of things. The routine thing that I do on every review in Santa Fe.....are the early 1930s Soil Conservation Service photos which can be useful. But for recent things that have affected the environment and appearance of a significant project area, I find Google to be almost invaluable.”

Chair Eck continued, “So, in this case, I offer the opinion that there is an archaeological site which could be documented, granted less than the threshold for the City of Santa Fe definition of what has to be documented. But, depending on the time of the homestead, and the erection of the structures, there is a lot of information available from Google Imagery that show where the structures were, how they were laid out, the outbuildings associated and most importantly a context for the ditch. The ditch does appear on that map and the State Engineer says, yes, this is an irrigation ditch, but it’s not recognized because of the source of the water. The source of the water and the deployment of effluent from the City treatment facility could be very interesting, and, a historical note, if not today, possibly tomorrow. And how the water got there would be interesting. Maybe it came from the golf course.... that would be the simplest connection. And what was done with it after it got there would be very interesting and in these images you can actually see elements of how it was used. There appears to be a fence line that might also be similar to the one that was measured on the ACPI form, going all the way from north to south and discharging into the arroyo at the south edge of the property.”

Chair Eck continued, “Within the property and beginning just south of the area that was leveled in the course of taking down all the buildings, you can see a pattern of ditches or terraces or field spreaders or other agricultural features that moved the water across this landscape, or least have the potential to have had that purpose. There are other arcane purposes..... but they’re there and you can see them. And

I think you can see them on the ground if you stand in the right place and look down the alignment. There is also a rather large earthen feature in the southernmost portion of the project area, south of the fence and south of the [inaudible]. It's rather large, an east-west berm on the south of....what is now populated by a whole bunch of [inaudible] and then a small, potential berm on the north side of that. What is that. I don't know. There's a lot of stuff there, and as seen from a country boy perspective, what we have is an archaeological site, historic, definitely not old enough to be significant from Santa Fe City... it is interesting, insignificant possibly from the State's perspective, that consists of this piece of property, the homestead and the agricultural features that are still manifest in one form or another out there."

Chair Eck continued, "Not that it will change anything, but I will offer the opinion that the HCPI.... the ditch could actually more properly be incorporated as a feature in an archaeological site, and all these other agricultural features, and really some documentation of what was there, more details about the homestead even, if it's available. And it could be kind of interesting. What could people do with effluent water in Santa Fe. God forbid, they were trying to grow things. Who knows."

Mr. Zinn said, "Adobe-making comes to mind."

Chair Eck said, "Okay. That's another good possibility. So I think there's more information to be had. Whether the Committee, as a group, feels that should be pursued, is not up to me. I'm done."

Chair Eck asked if anybody would like to provide feedback to what he just said, before he calls for a Motion.

#### **Commentary from Dr. Emily Brown**

Dr. Brown said, "I'll just add then, a few of the things you can see in the aerials are actually modern erosion control features, though I'm not disputing that this another underlying agriculture or other kind of landscape feature there. I will say that some of those were clearly modern features/landscapes."

Chair Eck thanked Dr. Brown, saying this is important information. He said they appear on 1996 aerial photos, commenting he didn't have access to anything earlier to see how far back they go.

Dr. Brown said she thinks they probably were following the demolition of the buildings, but she would have to go back and check the years, but there are likely other landscape features out there.

#### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**MOTION:** Derek Pierce moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, with respect to Case #2020-002407-ARC, to approve the Archaeological Reconnaissance Report in advance of a development at 4193-B Fairly Road and 6450 Camino Rojo in the Suburban Archaeological Review District, with the specific corrections, as requested by Ron Winters, agent for Homewise, owner, finding that it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

4. **CASE #2020-002408-ARC. OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, AGENT FOR HIGH 5 NETWORKS/COMCAST, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING PLAN FOR THE INSTALLATION OF CONDUIT ON GUADALUPE, AGUA FRIA AND ROMERO STREETS IN THE HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW DISTRICT. (LISA ROACH, STAFF LIAISON)**

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

The Office of Archaeological Studies presents an archaeological monitoring plan in advance of the subsurface installation of Comcast cable along Guadalupe, Agua Fria and Romero Streets in the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. Installation will take place in two sections, each with new vaults (total of four new vaults). The easternmost section is on Guadalupe and Agua Fria Streets and will entail 440 linear feet of conduit installation. Conduit installation will be accomplished entirely by trenching in both locations. Any cultural features and deposits encountered will be thoroughly documented and a report provided at the conclusion of the project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the monitoring plan, finding that it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

Chair Eck noted the staff report in the packet. He thanked Ms. Roach and asked if she has anything to add.

Ms. Roach said she has nothing to add.

**Karen Wening, Archaeologist, 93 Apache Plume Drive, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87508, was sworn.**

Ms. Wening offered the following corrections to the report:

Page 17, NMCRIS 59699, line 2, delete “by.”

Page 17, NMCRIS 61142, line 2, add a period after the NMCRIS number.

Page 18, NMCRIS 70831, line 2, add “that” between “Builders” and “resulted.”

Page 19, NMCRIS 103205, correct spelling to “Parsons Brinckerhoff.”

Page 20, NMCRIS 135192, correct “identified” to “identification.”

Page 20, NMCRIS 144352, line 3, remove space in “materials.”

Page 21, LA20195, line 8, correct “office” to “offices.”

Page 21, LA46174, line 11, correct “..west wing ~~and~~ of the adobe house...”

Page 21, LA65040, line 7, insert “with” between “along” and “domestic.”

Page 26, Santa Fe Builders’ Supply, add sentence at the end, “That building currently is occupied by the New Mexico School for the Arts.”

Page 26, Jose Rafael Roybal House, line 6, correct “...~~have been~~ were replaced in 1980...”

Page 31, line 1, correct “...There are ~~little~~ few changes...”

Page 38, line 1, correct “...The urbanization of ~~both project areas~~ continues..”

Page 43 correct misspelling of “South.”

### **Dale Zinn**

Mr. Zinn said in one of the maps, Guadalupe is running beside the Church and “Agua Fria is way the heck up there,” on the Gilmer [?] map. He said the identification of the streets “seemed weird.”

Ms. Wening said there is a letter on stories that dispute the accuracy of the Gilmer Maps.

Mr. Zinn asked to add him in dispute as well.

Ms. Wening said the location of Agua Fria should be clarified as probably not being “Agua Fria,” and she will make that correction.

Mr. Zinn said she probably shouldn’t use the map.

Ms. Wening said, “There you go. I’ll make a correction to that.”

### **Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey had no comment.

### **Cortney Wands**

Ms. Wands had no comment.

**Derek Pierce**

Mr. Pierce had no comment.

**Chair David Eck**

Chair Eck thanked Ms. Wening for the wonderful presentation of the maps, noting they are very very clear, and Ms. Wands said she would echo his remarks.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**MOTION:** Dale Zinn moved, seconded by Derek Pierce, with respect to Case #2020-002408-ARC, to approve the Archaeological Monitoring Plan, with the Applicant's own corrections, for the installation of conduit on Guadalupe, Agua Fria and Romero Streets in the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District, as requested by the Office of Archaeological Studies, Agent for High 5 Networks/Comcast, finding that it meets the intent of the City of Santa Fe Archaeological Review District Ordinance (14-5.3) and the requirements of Archaeological Clearance Permits (14-3.13).

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

**G. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

There were no Discussion Items.

**H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

There were no Matters from the Committee.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no Administrative Matters and Communications

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

There was no further business to come before the Archaeological Review Committee.

**MOTION:** Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Dale Zinn, to adjourn the meeting.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Derek Pierce, Jake Ivey, Cortney Wands and Dale Zinn.

**Against:** None.

The Committee Hearing was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

---

David Eck, Chair

  
Melissia Helberg, Stenographer