



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 7/14/10 TIME 2:00p

STYLED [Signature]  
RECEIVED BY [Signature]

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**August 5, 2010 – 6:00 P.M.**  
**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

- A. ROLL CALL**
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**

**MINUTES: July 1, 2010**

**FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**

**Case #2010-75. Chaparral Compound Development Plan.**

**Case #2010-77. Padilla Center Preliminary Subdivision Plat.**

**Case #2010-87. Padilla Center General Plan Amendment.**

**Case #2010-76. Padilla Center Rezoning.**

**E. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

- 1. Chair
- 2. Vice-Chair
- 3. Secretary
- 4. Summary Committee (Three members, including committee chair and secretary)
- 5. Long Range Planning Subcommittee (Three members)

**F. OLD BUSINESS**

**G. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. **Case #2010-81. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park General Plan Amendments.** James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests General Plan Future Land Use map amendments to change the designation of .84± acres of land from Community Commercial to Medium Density Residential; 2.10± acres of land from Mixed Use Transitional to Medium Density Residential; and 4.68± acres of land from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina St. and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)
- 2. **Case #2010-82. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park Rezoning.** James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests rezoning of 7.62± acres of land from R-3 (Residential, Single Family) to MHP (Mobile Home Park). The application includes a development plan for 46 modular home spaces. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina St. and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)

**H. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

**I. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

**J. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION**

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

**NOTES:**

- 1) Procedures in front of the Planning Commission are governed by the City of Santa Fe Rules & Procedures for City Committees, adopted by resolution of the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, as the same may be amended from time to time (Committee Rules), and by Roberts Rules of Order (Roberts Rules). In the event of a conflict between the Committee Rules and Roberts Rules, the Committee Rules control.
- 2) New Mexico law requires the following administrative procedures to be followed by zoning boards conducting "quasi-judicial" hearings. By law, any contact of Planning Commission members by applicants, interested parties or the general public concerning any development review application pending before the Commission, except by public testimony at Planning Commission meetings, is generally prohibited. In "quasi-judicial" hearings before zoning boards, all witnesses must be sworn in, under oath, prior to testimony and will be subject to reasonable cross examination. Witnesses have the right to have an attorney present at the hearing.
- 3) The agenda is subject to change at the discretion of the Planning Commission.  
**\*Persons with disabilities in need of special accommodations or the hearing impaired needing an interpreter please contact the City Clerk's Office (955-6520) 5 days prior to the hearing date.**

**Index Summary of Minutes  
Santa Fe Planning Commission  
August 5, 2010**

<b>INDEX</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<b>Call to Order</b>	Signe Lindell, Vice Chair called meeting to order at 6:15 pm, City Council Chambers, Santa Fe, NM	1
<b>Roll Call</b>	A quorum was declared by roll call, 1 excused absence	1
<b>Pledge of Allegiance</b>	Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Hughes.	1
<b>Approval of Agenda</b>  <b>No changes from Staff.</b> <b>No changes from the Commission.</b>	Commissioner Mier moved to approved the agenda as presented, second by Commissioner Spray, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.	1
<b>Approval of Minutes</b> <b>Minutes: July 1, 2010</b>  Page 7: Big Bog – should be Big Box Page 12, 6 <sup>th</sup> paragraph: acceptance by the County Commission – should be Planning Commission Page 15 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – 200 feet – should be 300 feet Page 17, last paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Commissioner Dominguez should be Councilor Dominguez	Commissioner Mier moved to approve the minutes as amended, second by Commissioner Hughes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.	1-2
<b>Finding and Conclusions</b>	<b><u>Case #2010-75. Chaparral Compound Development Plan</u></b>  <i>Commissioner Hughes moved for approval, second by Commissioner Bordegaray, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i>  <b><u>Case #2010-77. Padilla Center Preliminary Subdivision Plat</u></b>  <i>Commissioner Bordegaray moved to approve, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous</i>	2

**Index Summary of Minutes  
Santa Fe Planning Commission  
August 5, 2010**

	<p><i>voice vote.</i></p> <p><b><u>Case #2010-87. Padilla</u></b> <b>General Plan Amendment</b></p> <p><i>Commissioner Bordegaray moved to approved, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote</i></p> <p><b><u>Case #2010-76. Padilla</u></b> <b>Center Rezoning</b></p> <p><i>Commissioner Montes moved for approval, second by Commissioner Bordegaray, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p>	
<b>Election of Officers</b>	<p><b>Chair</b> <i>Commissioner Hughes moved to approve the nomination of Signe Lindell as the Chair for the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p> <p><b>Vice-Chair</b> <i>Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Hughes as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p> <p><b>Secretary</b> <i>Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Bordegaray as Secretary for the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p>	2-3

**Index Summary of Minutes  
Santa Fe Planning Commission  
August 5, 2010**

	<p><b>Summary Committee – (Three members, including committee chair and secretary)</b></p> <p><i>Commissioner Hughes moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Vigil to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p> <p><i>Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Mier to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p> <p><i>Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Spray to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Summary Committee will elect officers at a later date.</i></p>	
<b>Old Business</b>	None	3
<p><b><u>New Business</u></b>  <b><u>Case #2010-81. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park General Plan Amendments.</u></b>  James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests General Plan Future Land Use map amendments to change the designation of .84± acres of land from Community Commercial to Medium Density Residential; 2.10± acres of land from Mixed Use</p>	<p><i>Commissioner Mier: I would move that we postpone this matter to a date specific in October and it come back to the Planning Commission, and that the applicant work with staff, second by Commissioner Vigil, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p>	4-19

**Index Summary of Minutes  
Santa Fe Planning Commission  
August 5, 2010**

<p>Transitional to Medium Density Residential; and 4.68± acres of land from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina Street, and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)</p> <p><b>Case #2010-82. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park Rezoning.</b> James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests rezoning of 7.62± acres of land from R-3 (Residential, Single Family) to MHP (Mobile Home Park). The application includes a development plan for 46 modular home spaces. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina Street, and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)</p>	<p><i>Commissioner Mier moved that Case #2010-82 be postponed until a date specific in October, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i></p>	
<b>Business From the Floor</b>	None	19
<b>Staff Communications</b>	Informational	19
<b>Matters from the Commission</b>	Informational	19
<b>Adjournment and Signature Page</b>	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commissioner Hughes moved to adjourn at 8:00 pm, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.	20

## **PLANNING COMMISSION**

**August 5, 2010**

**6:00 pm – pm**

**City Council Chambers**

### **MINUTES**

The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Signe Lindell, Vice-Chair for the Planning Commission at 6:00 pm on August 5, 2010 in the City Council Chambers, Santa Fe, New Mexico. A quorum was declared by roll call vote.

#### **A. Roll Call**

##### **In Attendance:**

Signe Lindell, Vice Chair

Ken Hughes

Mike Mier

Angela Schackel Bordegaray

Tom Spray

Ruben Montes

Dolores Vigil

##### **Excused:**

Estevan Gonzales

It was announced that John Salazar has resigned from the Planning Commission.

##### **Staff Present:**

Tamara Baer

Dan Esquibel

##### **Others Present:**

Fran Lucero, Stenographer

#### **B. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Hughes led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **C. Approval of Agenda**

**No changes from Staff or from the Commission.**

*Commissioner Mier moved to accept the agenda as presented, second by Mr. Spray, motion passed by unanimous voice vote.*

#### **D. Approval of Minutes and Findings/Conclusions**

Minutes: July 1, 2010

Page 7: Big Beg – should be Big Box

Page 12, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph: acceptance by the ~~County Commission~~ – should be Planning Commission

Page 15 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph – 200 feet – should be 300 feet

Page 17, last paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: ~~Commissioner~~ Dominguez should be Councilor Dominguez

*Commissioner Mier moved to approve the minutes of July 1, 2010 as amended, second by Commissioner Hughes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

#### **Findings and Conclusions**

##### **Case #2010-75. Chaparral Compound Development Plan**

*Commissioner Hughes moved for approval, second by Commissioner Bordegaray, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

##### **Case #2010-77. Padilla Center Preliminary Subdivision Plat**

*Commissioner Bordegaray moved to approve, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

##### **Case #2010-87. Padilla General Plan Amendment**

*Commissioner Bordegaray moved to approved, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote*

##### **Case #2010-76. Padilla Center Rezoning**

*Commissioner Montes moved for approval, second by Commissioner Bordegaray, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

#### **E. Election of Officers**

- **Chair**

*Commissioner Hughes moved to approve the nomination of Signe Lindell as the Chair for the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

- **Vice-Chair**

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Hughes as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

- **Secretary**

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Bordegaray as Secretary for the Planning Commission, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*



- **Summary Committee – (Three members, including committee chair and secretary)**

*Commissioner Hughes moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Vigil to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Mier to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Spray to serve on the Summary Committee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

*Note: Summary Committee will elect officers at a later date.*

- **Long Range Planning Subcommittee (Three members)**

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Hughes to serve on the Long Range Planning Subcommittee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Bordegaray to serve on the Long Range Planning Subcommittee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Montes to serve on the Long Range Planning Subcommittee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

#### **Chapter 14 Committee**

**Chair Lindell expressed her interest to have additional members on the Chapter 14 committee.**

*Chair Lindell moved to approve the nomination of Commissioner Bordegaray to serve on the Chapter 14 Committee, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

**The Planning Commissioners were all in agreement to fill other committee positions once the vacant slots on the commission are filled.**

#### **4. Old Business**

**None**

## **5. New Business**

- a. Case #2010-81. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park General Plan Amendments.** James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests General Plan Future Land Use map amendments to change the designation of .84± acres of land from Community Commercial to Medium Density Residential; 2.10± acres of land from Mixed Use Transitional to Medium Density Residential; and 4.68± acres of land from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina Street, and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)

### **Dan Esquibel:**

These two cases are being combined for the purpose of the staff report but each is a separate application and should be reviewed and voted on individually.

The recommendations for this project are for approval of the general plan amendment and the re-zoning. Staff does not support the development plan at this time as a result of some issues that should be resolved prior. It should be noted that within the general plan some of the densities that would be allowed for the mobile home park currently allow its existence now. The C-2 district allows for the number of spaces allowed or requested, the transitional mixed use will allow the number of spaces requested and low density residential which goes from 07 also allow the density requested. Staff, with regard to the general plan amendment and the applicant addressing the issues felt that the applicant met the general plan requirements for the southwest area master plan and recommended approval. The re-zoning was also part of that review and the applicant did address the issues relevant to the zoning standards within Chapter 14. Some of the issues that staff has with the development plan deal with the sizes of the spaces themselves, how some of the modular homes are to be set up in the spaces with a separation between the structures, 20' requirement of Chapter 14 and there are concerns from the DRT that John Romero will address regarding access and the road that goes between Rufina Street and Cerrillos Road. [Mr. Esquibel made reference to a set of pictures he distributed to the Commissioners.]

The applicant has been working with the City Traffic Engineer to come up with some alternative road designs for the mobile home park. A copy of the change that came in a few days ago includes a 4 to 6 sub collector with parking on one side. That would be built from Rufina Street to the end of the pond and there is a right-of-way reservation that the applicant proposes for connectivity to both sides of the property on either side of the streets. The balance of the mobile home park is proposed at a 30' right-of-way with a 26' driving surfaces and 5' sidewalks and that would go in to the 96' cul-de-sac. Standards for mobile home parks are kind of unique in that it identifies a driving surface and calls it a sub-collector and there are two types of driving surfaces depending on how many homes that road is going to service. In this case they need a minimum of 14' driving surface according to Chapter 14, they are providing 26'. Previously they described 3' walkways they now proposed 5' walkways. They are going to have emergency access of 20' from the cul-de-sac to Cerrillos Road where Cerrillos Road has a right in and out

right of way. With regards to some of the issues on the development itself, if you look at the pictures those are some of the typical designs that modular homes comes with. Some of them come with access in the front and the back, some of them have access on the long side of the mobile home park, with the axle and the state requirements you are looking at a 12" or 18" above ground meaning that the stairs will have to be developed to the threshold of the mobile home. Code requires that these would have to be attached to the mobile home and depending on the design of that attachment would create the question of them meeting the 20' separation based on the size of those spaces that are being designed. Mr. Esquibel said he has spoken with Antonio from the Water perspective, he is ok with easement sides for emergency access since sewer is not going to be added in to that emergency access and a 20' easement will be acceptable.

**Swearing in: Mr. Jim Siebert, 915 Mercer Street, Santa Fe, NM**

**[Mr. Siebert provided a power point presentation to the Commission outlining the location and some of the traffic issues that have been brought forth.]**

To the east there are two vacant parcels owned by two brothers and are the only vacant parcels between this development and Home Depot. To the west there is some vacant land – he also referred to the storage area for Trailer Ranch. There is some development on the property right now, they are self storage units that will actually be torn down; there is one manufactured unit on the property right now that will remain. He made reference to what the general plan says and this is coming out of the foundation of the southwest area master plan.

What it recommends is community commercial closest to Cerrillos Road, mixed use and on the north end low density residential being 3-7 units per acre. If you were to develop this property as shown in the city general plan, what could you do? Community commercial will allow for RM-2, 29 units per acre, he referred to one area where 24 units would fit in one area, on mixed use you can only half of it, residential would be half and commercial would only allow 12 units per acre. On the remainder you would get the additional units, 32 which would overall allow for a total of 68 units, and they are proposing 45. The density for that is a little less than 6 units per acre and actually falls in the category of lower density residential 3 units per acre. Examples of some of the uses in mixed use district, you can have discount stores, you can have gymnasiums, and there is a variety of uses. When they developed the southwest area master plan, it was an interesting concept from a land planning stand point. The idea is that you would go, right adjacent to Cerrillos Road, is community commercial, you would extend that back for some distance and then you do this transition from lower density mixed use to lower density residential. The problem in actual implementation of this is the fact that most of these parcels do not have access to Cerrillos Road and in this case Victor Montano, the owner, was able to acquire a 20' access easement that can be used for emergency utility purposes. What happens if you don't have access and visibility from Cerrillos Road, community commercial is not a viable use? If that is not a viable use than mixed use is not a viable use because your only access comes from Rufina Street.

A little history gets back to some of the issues regarding the position that traffic engineering is taking; there was originally a plan developed in 1980 the southwest sector plan, the interesting thing about this plan – he referenced Rufina Street – the idea was

that you have all these linear tracks that are going north and south which are very difficult to develop. The idea was to create east – west roads that would facilitate the development of these properties, so you would have one south of Rufina Street, one north of Rufina Street, and they called one Power Line Road. What happened then in 1980 – in 1992 southwest area master plan resulted in Rufina Street. You do have north-south streets but no east-west roads. There is a pending transportation plan which is moving forward and probably will be adopted in 3 to 6 months, same thing you are down to one north-south road.

Ms. Siebert referred to the schematic and layout of the Purple Horizon Park. There is a road from Rufina St. comes down to a cul-de-sac, there is 96' cul-de-sac street and an emergency access should something happen that you have ability to not only exit off of Rufina Street but to exit on to Cerrillos Road and one of the requirements of the fire department is that it would have to be a gate that can be operated digitally from inside the property.

There was an issue or a question if they were in compliance with the fire chiefs requirements. There was an approval by the fire chief which he directed the commission to.

Mr. Siebert said that what they were proposing is the concern on the part of the traffic engineers is that there is some connection to the east. They have proposed a 46' sub-collector to go from Rufina Street. They propose to leave the spaces on the plat which also accompanies this application lot line adjustment plat, should the city ever needs this connection, and those spaces would be eliminated to the curb. Mr. Siebert said the reason he went through the history and planning of this area is that even on the city's transportation plan it was not the idea that there would be connections east – west. There has not been any planning for this to take place. From that point on they would have a 36' roadway, actually 26' of asphalt and a 5' sidewalk on either side.

One of the reasons he would like to reserve the spaces on the plat, and he referred to a roadway, half a road way, behind Vegas Verdes Manufactured home community. At the time that they develop there was actually the southwest sector plan that showed the east-west road and they had to reserve half the right of way and half the road way, and this is what happens. What you now have is half a road that people are using for storage. A typical road way (Atocha Manufactured Home Community) is 15' of asphalt and a 3' concrete ribbon, the difference is that they are proposing a 5' sidewalk, there would be a 6" elevation difference and part of the reason for that is to discourage the people from parking on the street, there would be no parking signs on the street except for areas designated for parking. There is also a difference of opinion of what they are proposing and what the Traffic Engineer would like. Traffic Engineering would like a top line which the collector is a 50' right of way and they are proposing a 46' right of way – the difference is that they have parking on one side and the collector is parking two sides which in terms of capacity of the road way it doesn't add to the capacity of the road way. The other factor is that the majority of the area they have is a collector on one side, there is no driveway access so they can utilize all the area designated for parking. If you put parking on the other side then what you are doing is running in to a whole series of

driveways which substantially decreases the amount of parking spaces you can get on the other side of the street.

### **Public Hearing - Open**

*Swearing in done with the complete group at one time.*

#### **Doug Auterberg 2442 Cerrillos Rd #318, Santa Fe, NM**

I am here representing myself and my family as Owners of Manufactured Home Community for over 16 years in Santa Fe. We are also licensed mobile home dealers in the area since 1999, and as of tomorrow we will be licensed mortgage loan originators to provide financing. I would like to thank staff and this committee for considering doing something for something that the city always talks about, a) affordable housing and b) in-fill projects. As you can see this project totally supports all of that. I would like to urge you to support this project. We have been selling homes since 1999, in our community we have no one moving in and no one moving out. Most of the communities in Santa Fe almost all of them are full and the only vacancies that occur are typically to do with them not being able to get financing, otherwise most of the communities here in town are full. So when a private citizen steps up to do something about affordable housing, I commend and applaud them. Not only are the construction jobs needed right now but the housing is needed as well. I urge your support of this application, thank you.

#### **Joni Miller, 3471 Cerrillos Road, Owner and Manager of the Trailer Ranch – which is directly adjacent to the proposed property.**

We are a senior independent living mobile home community. I am going to talk to you about our very special nature. We have the best kept secret in town, without a doubt. Some of our residents are in the audience – many others could not be here tonight. We had our own community meeting and I am here to speak for the residents and express their valid concerns.

Plat: Placed for Commissioners to view.

We are the longest adjacent developed strip of property located to the southwest of the subject property. We start on Cerrillos Road and go across down (area designated on plat). They have 14 acres and are zoned C-2 – 66 mobile homes, 4 apartments – 8 long term RV sites and 48 RV storage sites. In addition they run a small RV Park that borders Cerrillos Road. They are home to over 100 seniors ranging from 55 to 104. For over 6 decades the residents of the Trailer Ranch have been comforted that they experience virtually no crime and we need you to help us maintain a safe environment. In reality, any new development will pose a threat to our safety and security but this particular proposal doubles the existing density. We are not against the property being developed and we know it will be eventually, but this property was very recently annexed into the city. Our very own city councilors spoke out about not being able to provide sufficient police, fire, and emergency manpower to the newly annexed area. So logic tells us that it is premature for an increase in the property density to even be considered at this time. That said, in spite of all the valid arguments against the proposals and should the Planning Commission decide to approve both the proposed general amendment plan and

the proposed re-zoning to double the current density, than we implore your help in attempting to insulate our high risk residents as much as possible by requiring a proper buffer.

We hereby request that the Planning Commission put a specific condition of approval on the zoning change. To require that a wall be constructed on the east, north and south link of the property line with the west wall in particular to be no less than 8' in height and constructed in concrete block to deter anyone from jumping or climbing over the wall into our community. The N-S wall should be similar constructed no less than 6' in height. In addition, due to the fact that the proposed zoning does specifically reference the construction of 46 mobile home park, we further ask that some specific language regarding park rules and regulations also be made as conditions of approval. Some examples of our own very effective rules are; only 1 family per household, a maximum of 2 cars per household unit is allowed, a maximum of 2 pets per household unit is allowed, and pets are not allowed to be a nuisance of any kind or that will be grounds for eviction, all tenants must be required to install and landscape yards and no over growth. Again, on behalf of the Trailer Ranch residents we would like to thank the Planning Commission for listening to our concerns and to know the impact of the decision on Trailer Ranch Community. Thank you.

**Bob Stark, 2019 Hopi Road, Santa Fe, NM**

I am here speaking on behalf of my grandmother, Ms. Nelda Hogan she is 104 and has lived at Trailer Ranch for at least 30 years. She feels very safe and is happy. She wanted to express her concerns and her desire to live there and be secured for the rest of her life. With this new development, she always welcomes new neighbors and people of all kinds. Thank you.

**Truman Johnson, Owner of Trailer Ranch**

The safety and security of our residents is really important to us. Some say, well a mobile home park is a mobile home park. Well, that isn't always true when it comes to senior residents. Our senior residents' average age is about 72; they have limited mobility, limited access ability to get around so safety and security to them is very important. In addition, Trailer Ranch only has one entrance and one exit; it is on Cerrillos Road but that provides us with additional security. The office of Trailer Ranch is located on the front part of the property, we maintain security with ourselves and everyone else in the park and it really makes for a compatible senior community. It is different from any other park you would normally see and we are the only senior mobile park in Santa Fe. There are many in Arizona, they have very high security, most of them are gated with guards. We are similar to that even though we are not gated. We do have the one entrance and one exit. My request is that we continue with the safety and security of our residents is very important to us.

**Rick Montoya, 2085 Plaza Montoya, Santa Fe, NM**

I would like to congratulate the Trailer Ranch on the way they have handled business for many years. It has been very quiet, we are a neighbor of theirs and we have never have had any problems arising from their establishment. One of the concerns that I have for our area where we live; we were born and raised here in Santa Fe and have seen Santa Fe

grow. The planning that really concerns me is it seems like the density could be adjusted to a lower density, right now it seems that when you get 47 units in there with 2 cars; you will get into hundreds of vehicles. Ingress and egress is our concern and are important to us. Families with children and so forth, if they are not happy with their playgrounds they are going to want to move out. The reason I say that is because we have had neighbors to the east who started out with 2 mobile homes and ended up with 4 mobile homes, the situation ended up so crazy that we were constantly getting debris and trash thrown over the fence; in fact there is still a big engine block that ended up on our land and no one knows where it came from. We are all for Mr. Montano if he wants to develop his land, but we would like to see moderate planning of this land. We are for growth, but I think moderation and a well planned and well thought out project would benefit the community. As I have said, we were born and raised there, we have no chance or no choice but to deal with whatever is coming down our way. If we don't do it right the first time, it is usually too late to change after that. With that in mind that is one of our main concerns, keep it in moderation; I think the density that is planned is way too high. Another concern of ours is that most successful mobile home parks are owner occupied. That means the owner sees people drive in or drive out, if they see any problems or have any concerns it is handled immediately. In this situation if it is not owner occupied; it is going to be a three ring circus out there. Right now you see a lot of trespassing and unruly neighbors going through our land; we are stuck with it and we will deal with it, we were born and raised there. I would strongly suggest or request an 8' cinder block wall separating their establishment and our property. That would be one way to control anything that could be come unruly or be a problem.

**Carlos Gallegos, 02 Taylor Road, Santa Fe, NM**

I am the Owner of Zia Factory Outlet Mobile Home Sales here in Santa Fe off of I-25 – La Cienega exit. I am here to lend support to this project I think it is a wonderful and well needed project in Santa Fe. One of the complaints for those coming in to the dealership is that there is no where to put their homes in the city limits of Santa Fe. 98% of my business is from the bridge at La Cienega to the Colorado border. Of that 98% and I would say that 1% of that is from the city of Santa Fe, there is just no place to put manufactured homes. Everyone talks about affordable housing, our units start from \$29,000 to \$160,000 – I would caution the commission to not put undue burden on the developer in putting up walls; all you are doing is adding cost to that development, driving up the prices that they will have to charge for spaces, so I think the way it is submitted is a good plan. I think the additional road that they are wanting is an over kill. Again we need affordable housing in the city of Santa Fe.

**Victor Montano, Owner of this property.**

I am 67 years old and I have had this property that I acquired many years ago. We have always had a hard time deciding how to develop this piece of property. It has been real hard so we had an opportunity to extend the size of the property; we bought the neighbors land which added 3 ac. feet. I have other businesses and this project is intended to help the community. All this goes to my grandkids that are 1 to 14 years of age; this project is for them and for their future. I think this is a good project; Jim Siebert did a good presentation. I think this project should go through.

**PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED.**

**QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION:**

Commissioner Mier: I know you had the EIN and several issues were brought up. The first are the issues of security, the wall that is being proposed; what was the position of your client?

Jim Siebert: The wall was discussed, we proposed a 6' fence, and the owner would like to put a heavy plastic that would serve as a very solid barrier; this is the separation that he was thinking of. I have not had an opportunity to talk to him about an 8' brick wall.

Commissioner Mier: Would that remain as a possibility?

Mr. Montano: The proposed and recommended barrier is the manufacturer of fiber glass and this is about 3" thick with poles; this product will outlast block walls, and they are guaranteed basically for life.

Commissioner Mier: Mr. Montano, so what you are saying basically is that your preference would be to install a fence or a barrier of that nature instead of a brick wall?

Mr. Montano: Yes, and you can see an example of this wall at Home Depot. We need to keep this project within budget; we are not the rich people in the block.

Commissioner Mier: Mr. Siebert, the issue was also raised about security covenants, basically some of the rules that have made the community function well, was that at all discussed with your client and what was the response?

Jim Siebert: In regards to park rules and regulations; the concern expressed to me was something that Mr. Montoya brought up in the case of the Trailer Ranch, the owner is the manager of the park, and in this case, Mr. Montano would not be the manager of the park but he would be responsible to hire a manager that is capable of enforcing the rules and regulations and insuring safety in the park.

Commissioner Mier: One of the things that was discussed and mentioned and I can see in other mobile home parks it has become a great burden and trouble in the community is the fact that you are limiting the number of households per mobile home, is that something that would be acceptable and amenable to your client?

Mr. Siebert: I have had discussions with Mr. Montano about this and the idea is to make this a first class park and that is exactly one of the rules that would be enforced.

Commissioner Mier: The issues that were discussed by Mr. Montoya when he made his presentation, the fact there were issues of trespassing damage to neighboring property owners. Do you think with the proposed fencing that it will be minimal or non-existent?



Mr. Siebert: I tell you the experience that I have had with parks; it all gets back to management. If you manage the park well, a secure park is a clean park and it looks good. The fencing is obviously an issue; Mr. Montano has expressed the fencing that he likes, I believe it all goes back to management.

Commissioner Mier: My concern, I have a vested interest in this community; I grew up in the Village of Agua Fria. I don't fault Mr. Montano for trying to develop his property. I think some of the requests feel reasonable although they may decrease the profit line; the individual who spoke on behalf of this property there will be profit to be received. I am concerned about the residents who have spoken tonight. I would like to hear from Mr. Romero in terms of the traffic. Rufina Street was intended to relieve Agua Fria and what has happened now is that you have two major roads feeding into Siler and hitting Cerrillos Road.

John Romero

Commissioner Mier wanted to hear more on the traffic study and the concerns that were raised. The impacts to Agua Fria could be mitigated through deceleration lanes. A lot of congestion hasn't been resolved because up until recently we haven't had north-south aerial head collectors. For instance with Rufina, my experience was that once it was placed, Agua Fria's traffic was reduced a decent amount between South Meadows and Siler Rd., but from there on it continued to be somewhat heavy because in essence that is where Rufina discontinued. Regarding this development, a placement of right turn-left turn decelerations would relieve the traffic burden. What we have noticed is that in mobile home parks and apartment complexes they tend to generate less traffic than say housing. For instance housing during the afternoon rush hour is basically a 1 to 1 issue. For every one house it generates one car, in most households there are two people that work, 2 cars and for whatever reason that is what occurs. That ratio has been based on one of the most heavily studied standards, we did our own internal studies in the city and found out that sometimes it was less than that. I'm not sure why that is, that is for detached residences. For apartments, mobile homes, those types have even less. I'm not sure why, the only thing I can think of is that it is off peak traffic, etc. careers might detract from the high peak traffic.

Mr. Romero wanted to comment on the statements that Mr. Siebert made reference to. The plans that he referred to, the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization Master Transportation Plan as well as the Southwest Area Master plan, all these plans that show roads, the intent of those connections were for arterial road type purposes. The north-south connections were connecting Cerrillos to Agua Fria – Cerrillos to Rufina – Rufina to Agua Fria. The east-west were connecting Lopez to Siler Road, those types of connections. What I am asking here is it necessary to provide those types of connections, I am not asking to provide a connection from Cerrillos to Rufina, nor east-west roads that ultimately span towards Zafarano and then on. What I am trying to accomplish is when we have properties like this that have subdivided strips, a lot of that happened a long time ago. If we don't plan for connections and a comprehensive street plan, we end up with what has happened on Agua Fria, a lot of strip development where every strip has its own access point. You drive down the road and every 100 ft. you see a road, a road and it provides for a lot of congestion and a lot of conflict points and a lot of difficult driving.

What I am trying to accomplish is those vacant parcels on the side, I want to provide them with an alternative means of access. That way when those sites come in for process they don't all have to have their own road that accesses Rufina. Addressing the right-of-way reservation, Mr. Siebert showed the ½ road that was built off Vegas Verdes; I am not requesting that he build the road, I am just requesting that he reserve the right-of-way. I am also requesting that no homes be permitted to be placed on that and the reason for this, it could be that a person is living on those lots say for 20 years and then when it comes time to use that property they get an eviction notice. Sometimes that is easier said than done and at that point it doesn't matter what is on the plat, it makes it difficult to remove them. Again, it is reserving the right-of-way; whenever those adjoining properties are ready to develop they would be responsible for constructing the road on the reserved right-of-way.

Commissioner Mier: If you are reserving the right-of-way, am I correct that the adjoining properties would need to have the same requirements to make that driveway useful in the future.

John Romero: Yes, that is correct. Say for instance on the east side – those two narrow strips; if they decide to come in together and have one comprehensive development, we would look to have their point of access come in through this (referred to drawing) public road to Rufina. They would have their own cul-de-sac that would access through this public road not private road. The general plan asks for connectivity through main roads.

Commissioner Mier: My concerns are as the residents and neighbors have said, I think there is an issue or perception of safety issues, by doing this in the density that is being requested, without the safeguards that are being requested, it is taking a community that has been existent for many years and putting them in a position of discomfort. In speaking with Chief Wheeler as I also serve on the Public Safety Committee, one of the biggest concerns we have due to the annexation is the strain on the Southside for public safety. I am yet to hear from the SFPD as to what this will mean to them.

Commissioner Hughes: Staff: The first case is to change the designation to medium density residential, if that was done would stick field housing be put on that property?

Dan Esquibel: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: Staff states that they would not disapprove this request but they didn't approve the development plan? Aren't those parcels one in the same?

Dan Esquibel: Yes, the development plan is part of the mobile home park requirement as far as the rezoning criteria. I do believe that there are issues that can be resolved by the developer so the zoning and the general plan is recommended for approval with modifications to the development plan to meet the better organization of that park.

Commissioner Hughes: Is the development plan supposed to come back to the planning commission for approval later?

Dan Esquibel: That could be required.

Commissioner Hughes asked Ms. Baer if they are down to one final development plan or if they were down to one final development plan approval process.

Ms. Baer: That question depends totally entirely on the zoning category. There are three zoning categories that require preliminary and final development plan, like PRC and PUD, and this is not one of them. You might not necessarily see this again if you approve this tonight; it could go on to city council for their approval and the development plan would be part of that and because it is not a separate lot they could come in for what they are going to construct. Or you could ask that it come back.

Chair Lindell: Mr. Siebert, was a second ENN held?

Mr. Siebert: It was not.

Chair Lindell: Why was it not held?

Mr. Siebert: The requirement is to have one ENN and generally what happens is that we would have an informal meeting, and we did not have an informal meeting.

Chair Lindell: Was the second informal meeting held?

Mr. Siebert: No.

Chair Lindell: The attendees at the ENN from my packet, it says -- the group was informed another meeting would be held and it was not.

Mr. Siebert: Correct.

Chair Lindell: How many parking spaces per unit are designated?

Mr. Siebert: 2 parking spaces per unit and there are 28 additional spaces provided along side the public road.

Chair Lindell: Do the CC&R's (Covenant Codes and Restrictions) if they exist at this point in time, does it state how many vehicles could be owned per unit?

Mr. Siebert: We did not have a set of rules and regulations at this time.

Commissioner Bordegaray: Thank you for passing the photos around, Mr. Esquibel. Referred to neighboring adjacent manufactured housing – Atocha. Do we know when this was built, I was curious about the evolution of this.

Mr. Truman Johnson: In the 70's – the Ramirez family.

Commissioner Bordegaray: In terms of the character of this as neighbors to you all, are there problems and concerns that you identify with the Atocha development?

Truman Johnson: It is very important that you bring that up because the issue of management has been brought up about the success of the mobile home park and we have on site management at Trailer Ranch and the Ramirez family has had on site management at Atocha and have started turning it over to their off spring as we have. They really manage that park. To answer your question, we have had very few problems. We have a double fence between the two parks and that keeps a lot of problems out.

Commissioner Bordegaray: Thank you Mr. Johnson. My next question, I am curious with the existing condition of Trailer Ranch and Atocha in terms of the fencing, what is the relationship between the two?

Mr. Johnson: There is about a one foot separation between the two fences, the fences range from 6' to 8' tall in various parts of the park. The elevation is different; the Atocha Park goes down a little bit in elevation so in some places it is over 8' tall. It is very well constructed chain link fence with an 18" separation barb wire between the two. The Ramirez family has been onsite managers, long time family in Santa Fe and they do take pride.

Commissioner Bordegaray: I have actually driven by and noticed the appearance of Atocha from Rufina and it presents very well. Another question, the trailer park is seniors only?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, we comply with the Federal House Fair Housing Act that we maintain 80% of our residents as 55 or over as the federal regulations require. The park has always been; was developed in 1949 by a previous owner and the owner had it as an Adult park, which is illegal. Under the Fair Housing act passed back in 1966 you are allowed to have a senior facility as long as you maintain a certain amount of residents over 55 years of age.

Commissioner Bordegaray: This may sound like a wild question but it is a question at large for all of you, I am a neighborhood planner myself. Do any of you have friends or neighbor in Atocha that you visit? Is there any interaction and your families that live at Atocha? I am getting at neighborhood connectivity; we try to promote neighborhood connectivity.

Ms. Barbara Warren: Yes, but the two parks are not that accessible.

***The Chair asked Ms. Warren to step to the podium and be sworn in.***

***Sworn In:***

Barbara Warren: For the park next to us, their entrance is on Rufina and we are on Cerrillos Road. We are divided by security fencing so it is very hard for connectivity.

Ms. Johnson: We do converse with the people on the other side we don't completely segregate ourselves and not have any association with them whatsoever. But one of the points made is that since there is such a change between us and those, some of the homes

are not readily accessible to talk to through a chain link fence. But we actually know some of the neighbor's right behind us. I would like to give them credit for actually helping us with security, we have out buildings that border their property, and they have alerted us when they see any safety concerns. The issue for us as far as security is the fear of the unknown. We know what we have with Atocha; we don't know what we will have with the new neighbors. The other issue is that the grade does not change between our property and the proposed property. We also have a dry storage area in the back that is extremely vulnerable; it is virtually a sitting duck back there. Since people do not know it exists thus far no one has entered it.

Commissioner Bordegaray: Thank you very much. This is going in the direction I wanted to hear what had to be said. These are the kind of issues that should be discussed in an informal meeting and I would encourage the owner Mr. Montano and the capable planner, Jim Siebert to facilitate.

Chair Lindell: Public testimony has been closed for this case. Unless you have a specific question that you would like to ask this gentleman.

**Terry Becker, Trailer Ranch, Unit 39, 3471 Cerrillos Road, Santa Fe, NM**

Madam Chair, I had raised my hand to respond to a question that Commissioner Bordegaray had presented to the residents and I would like to have that opportunity to answer that for the Commissioner.

Commissioner Bordegaray: Chairman Lindell, I did ask that question and would like to hear the answer.

***(Mr. Terry Becker was sworn in.)***

Terry Becker: To answer the Commissioners question in regards to neighbors who are directly behind me; we carry on conversations and discussing many different issues. The barrier that is between us makes it difficult to do anything other than to communicate with each other, other than having to go around to their park. The people who are behind me have mentioned that there are conditions and restrictions that the owners of that park are very specific about and require the residents to follow so they have mentioned the uniqueness of their community in relationship to other communities in the Santa Fe area. To answer your question, they do carry on a good neighbor policy. Thank you.

Commissioner Mier: I really appreciate the interest in trying to form a greater community and the openness. So many of us grew up in that environment and being a resident of Agua Fria where we didn't have fences between property lines. What we have before us this evening is a well established community, one that has a segment of population that is somewhat vulnerable and to some degree relies on an environment that is secure. I think that as a commission we have to acknowledge that and I hope that Mr. Montano and Mr. Siebert can work with this community and neighbors and reach a fair compromise. Thank you.

Mr. Esquibel: There are a couple places in the code that dictate the height of the fence or a wall in the city; in residential districts you are allowed 6', in residential compounds you can go as high as 8', in mobile home park it is regulated in the wall section of the code and the mobile home section of the code that 6' is the maximum, so to go beyond that would require a variance of the code.

Ms. Vigil: Question for Mr. Montano -- You have heard the testimony from Trailer Ranch and one of the concerns is the type of development that is proposing and not being sure who will be moving there and how it will develop in the future. Have you considered doing a 55 year and combining it?

Mr. Montano – The feedback I have gotten is that the young generation needs a lot of help to get started. I think this trailer park will help them in the long run, I think this is a good project, I have daughters who can run these successfully, and I have several businesses in this town that are successful. The Trailer Ranch on my side of the property which would be to the east, talking about a wall, they have a lot of trees.

Commissioner Vigil: My question is; would you consider your project being a 55 or older mobile home community?

Mr. Montano: We can take a good look at it.

Mr. Siebert: I think a lot of good thoughts have come out of this process, and I realize there are concerns about safety and security and maybe a way to address that is to develop a set of rules and regulations. I would request that this be tabled and we have an opportunity to discuss those concerns and some of the other thoughts that were presented tonight.

Commissioner Vigil: What type of fence is between the property at Trailer Ranch, is it a chain link fence?

Mr. Siebert: There is an existing block wall that covers a certain portion on the southern end and the remainder is chain link.

Commissioner Vigil: Is that portion where they have their storage? How tall is that brick wall?

Joni-Trailer Ranch: No. The existing brick wall is about 5'6". There is razor wire for security.

Commissioner Bordegaray: I appreciate Commissioner Mier's comments in response to my issues that I raised and I really respect that. I have two more questions, more site plan related. Did you all meet with Justin Schneider from Santa Fe Public Schools on the potential demand on schools in the district?

Mr. Siebert: I have not, we had to cancel because he was booked, and I have a meeting with him Monday or Wednesday of next week.

Commissioner Bordegaray: I think that is a very important meeting. He says that schools are at capacity in that area. Second question I have is related to the park and the playground; can you orient me as to where you have a playground.

Mr. Siebert: Park Location – adjacent to the area at Trailer Ranch storage area.

Commissioner Bordegaray: Would that be a private park for the residents of that mobile home park? I raise that issue because it is in our packet and the shortage of park space in that part of the city.

Mr. Siebert: Yes

Commissioner Spray: Questions to Dan Esquibel: I noticed that under conditions and approvals staff says; “Staff does not support the development plan at this time as a result of some issues that should be resolved prior.”

Dan Esquibel: That is correct. It will cause a redesign of the current plan; we would have to re-review it to make sure that it matches up. If he redesigns, it could create other issues that would have to be looked at. The present development plan cannot be supported and we are asking it to be drawn up so we can look at it and readdress the issues.

Commissioner Spray: You also state, “additionally it is unclear whether the proposed planned amendment of re-zoning and density proposed necessitates the need for a general plan amendment.” Would you comment on that?

Mr. Esquibel: One of the issues regarding and was discussed earlier is that within a C-2 district you have a density allowed for residential and the same thing occurs with transitional mixed use, the same thing occurs within low density residential. Although the density allowed in all of those three planned areas allow for the density that is being requested by the applicant currently. There is a question as to whether or not there is an actual need for the general plan amendment or if the rezoning can occur straight. It could go either way. If it was a call, the office would take a more conservative approach so that we could keep a consistency in that area rather than to go through a rezoning process.

Commissioner Spray: I have a question on the rezoning policies area referred to in page 7, staff states that the current zoning is R-3, allowing for 3 dwelling units per acre. Does that still jive with what we said before in terms of the other?

Mr. Esquibel: The zoning is R-3; the underline general plan is low density residential which will allow between 1-7 units, zoning restricts it down to 3 units. The current zoning itself allows 3 units. The mobile home park density standards actually allow up to 8 units.

Commissioner Mier: If we table this matter as is being requested by Mr. Siebert, will this matter than come back before this commission or will it go straight to City Council?

Tamara Baer: If you decided to postpone and I would recommend that you postpone to a date certain, than you could choose to have both cases and the development plan come back to this body.

Chair Lindell: Are we still looking at a roadway that is 1/3 private, partial private and partial public?

Mr. Siebert: Yes, that is correct; originally it was all private. The concern that the traffic engineer had was that there was no possibility for connectivity to other parcels and what we have done is created a certain section of public right of way for future public connectivity. The limitation to all these tracts in this particular area is that they are very long and very narrow. What happens is as you make the road wider than it limits the type of mobile home that you can put on that property. What has happened anywhere we have gone to a public road we would have to go to double wides which are shorter and limits the type of unit you can put on the lot. So that is the difficulty of putting a public road.

Chair Lindell: Mr. Romero recommends however that the road be built to sub-collector standards and dedicated to the city throughout the entire project.

Mr. Siebert: I think it is collector standards, which he has always expressed to me. What we have is a sub collector which is 6' less but in these very narrow strips, 6' means a lot. One of the ideas that came up and we need to discuss more, one of the problems on the connectivity, the traffic engineer would like to the west, it goes in to the storage area for the Trailer Ranch. I'm not sure that the Trailer Ranch would like to have this from a security stand point because it becomes this wide open strip that you have no control over. The reason I asked for the tabling is that we have issues we have to work on.

Chair Lindell: Question on the proposed affordable units, are there 7 on this property?

Mr. Siebert: Yes you are correct, there are 7. It is 14% and they would fall in the rental category.

Chair Lindell: Affordables will be actual provided mobile homes?

Mr. Siebert: What Mr. Montano is looking at is that he would put the mobile home there and he would rent the space and the unit itself.

Chair Lindell: Would tenant than pay an affordable rental cost in addition to renting the space?

Mr. Siebert: They are combined. The city housing regulations have established a standard for mobile home parks as well as apartments, space and unit are combined.

Chair Lindell: Those fees are then determined by the affordable housing ordinance?

Mr. Siebert: Correct



Chair Lindell: One more comment I have on the development plan, page 9 or 11 in the packet which is the idea and amount of clearance between these mobile homes if were one were to put, and is typical the way they sit 18" above the ground, we would not meet the required set backs on each one of these, the clearances would not be what is called for.

Mr. Siebert: This is an issue we are still discussing with staff. The interesting this about this is the Regulation Commission that actually oversees manufactured home communities and installations and the discussions we are still having with staff, right now there is an administrative opinion that stairways are permanent fixtures to mobile homes, and in fact modular home is not a permanent home. So that issue still needs to be resolved

Chair Lindell: This is what is in my packet so I would not have any idea that this is still under discussion.

***Commissioner Mier: I would move that we postpone this matter to a date specific in October and it come back to the Planning Commission, and that the applicant work with staff, second by Commissioner Vigil, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.***

- b. Case #2010-82. Purple Horizon Mobile Home Park Rezoning.** James W. Siebert, agent for Purple Horizon Properties, LLC, requests rezoning of 7.62± acres of land from R-3 (Residential, Single Family) to MHP (Mobile Home Park). The application includes a development plan for 46 modular home spaces. The area is located north of Cerrillos Road, south of Rufina Street, and west of Home Depot. (Dan Esquibel, case manager)

***Commissioner Mier moved that Case #2010-82 be postponed until a date specific in October, second by Commissioner Montes, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.***

Thank you to everyone. It will be advertised in the paper for the second hearing.

## **6. Business From the Floor**

**None**

## **7. Staff Communications**

Tamara Baer: Applicability standard for Big Box when does it apply, it applies when it is 30,000 square feet or a combination of space in a single structure it could be one business or numerous businesses at 30,000 square feet.

## **8. Matters from the Commission**

Chair Lindell welcomed Commissioner Spray and asked that he give a brief introduction on himself. Welcome.


**9. Adjournment**

***There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Hughes moved to adjourn at 8:00 pm, second by Commissioner Mier, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.***

Signature Page:

---

Signe Lindell, Chair



---

Fran Lucero, Stenographer