



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR GOVERNING BODY MEETING

Attendance: In response to the State's declaration of a Public Health Emergency and the Mayor's Proclamation of Emergency, the Governing Body meeting will be conducted virtually.

Viewing: Members of the public may view the meeting through the Government Channel on Comcast Channel 28 and Comcast HD928 or may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofsantafe>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most smartphones, tablets, or computers.

The video recording of this and all past meetings of the Governing Body will also remain available for viewing at any time on the City's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofsantafe>. Staff is available to help members of the public access pre-recorded Governing Body meetings on-line at any time during normal business hours. Please call 955-6521 for assistance.

Radio Broadcast: The meeting can be heard on radio station KSFR 101.1.

Agenda: The agenda for the meeting will be posted at <https://www.santafenm.gov>.

Written Comments: The public may submit written comments on any of the legislative items to be considered on the *Consent Agenda*, *Discussion Agenda*, *Public Hearings* or *Petitions From the Floor* through 1:00 p.m. the day of the meeting, via the virtual comment "button" at <https://santafe.primegov.com/public/portal>.

Public Comment: To provide live public comment during *Petitions from the Floor* or *Public Hearings*, you must join the Zoom meeting by internet or phone, as follows:

Internet: To join the Zoom meeting on the internet using a computer, laptop, smartphone, or tablet, use the following link: <https://santafenm-gov.zoom.us/j/88021746973?pwd=ckF1M0xHOUFRcWFGSFFqVlhnaE1Odz09>. **Passcode: 780007**

Attendees should use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized by the Mayor to speak at the appropriate time.



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

Phone: To join the Zoom meeting using a phone, use the following phone numbers and Webinar ID: **US: 1 (346) 248-7799 - Webinar ID: 880 2174 6973 - Passcode: 780007**
Phone attendees should press *9 to use the “Raise Hand” function to be recognized by the Mayor to speak at the appropriate time.

AFTERNOON SESSION - 5:00 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Councilwoman Villarreal

3. **SALUTE TO THE NEW MEXICO FLAG**

Councilor Michael Garcia

4. **INVOCATION**

Councilor Rivera

5. **ROLL CALL**

6. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

7. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR**

8. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. Regular Governing Body Meeting – December 8, 2021

b. Special Governing Body Meeting – December 28, 2021

9. **PRESENTATIONS**

10. **CONSENT CALENDAR**



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

-
- a. Request for Approval to Purchase Two Automated Side Load Collection Vehicles for Residential Recycling Waste Collection Services with Bruckners Truck Sales, Inc. Via the Cooperative Education Services in the Total Amount of \$879,068. (Lawrence Garcia, ESD Maintenance Manager, lmgarcia@santafenm.gov; 505-955-2241)
1. Request for Approval of a Budget Adjustment Resolution (BAR) in the Amount of \$131,790 from Fund 510 Cash Balance for the Purchase of Two Residential Collection Vehicles.

Committee Review:

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 11/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- b. Request for Approval of Contract Amendment #1 to Extend the Term of the Service Agreement with Pluma LLC in the Total Amount of \$334,873 for Roof, HVAC, and Employee Parking Security Measures. (Caryn Grosse, Project Administrator, clgrosse@santafenm.gov, 505-955-5938)

Committee Review:

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 12/13/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- c. Request for Approval of Library 2020 GO BOND in the Amount of \$171,276.71 (Maria Tucker, Library Division Director: metucker@santafenm.gov; 505-955-6678)
1. Request for Approval of Budget Amendment Resolution (BAR) – Budget 2020 GO BOND

Committee Review:

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- d. Request Approval of a Construction Services Contract with CES/HELLAS Construction Inc. for On-Call Construction Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$2,500,000 Inclusive of New Mexico Gross Receipts



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

Tax (NMGRT). (Melissa McDonald, Interim Parks Division Director, mamcdonald@santafenm.gov, 505-303-9502).

Committee Review:

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Public Works & Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- e. Request for Approval of an Agreement with B&D Industries for the Installation of Soccer Field Lighting at the Municipal Recreation Complex in the Total Amount of \$666,342.43 Including New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax. (Melissa A. McDonald, Parks Division Director, mamcdonald@santafenm.gov, 505-303-9502)

1. Request for Approval of Budget Amendment Resolution (BAR) to Allocate \$500,000 from the Santa Fe County Match Funds Per MOU 19-0792 into Budget for this Project.

Committee Review

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Public Works: 01/10/2022

City Council: 01/12/2022

- f. Consideration of Resolution No. 2022-___. (Councilor Lindell and Councilor Cassutt)

A Joint Resolution Recognizing the Existence of Open Items Related to Annexation and Establishing Negotiating Teams to Develop Non-Binding Proposals to Resolve those Items. (Pat Feghali, Assistant City Attorney: pfeghali@santafenm.gov)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- g. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-___. (Mayor Webber)
A Resolution Rescinding Resolution No. 2021-3 Relating to the Open Meetings Act; and Adopting Annual Notice Requirements for 2022. (Kristine Mihelcic, City Clerk: kmmihelcic@santafenm.gov, 955-6846)



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

h. **Request to Publish Notice of Public Hearing on February 9, 2022.**

CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-___. An Ordinance Amending Section 2-1.13 SFCC 1987 to Establish that the Mayor Pro Tempore Shall Serve on One City Council Standing Committee, Which Shall be the Finance Committee. (Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt) (Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison: jbg Guillen@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6518)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body (Request to Publish): 01/12/2022

Quality of Life Committee: 01/17/2022

Governing Body (Public Hearing): 02/09/2022

11. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

- a. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-___. (Mayor Webber)
A Resolution Temporarily Modifying the City's Personnel Rules Regarding Administrative Leave to Provide a Standard Framework for Issuing COVID-19 Administrative Leave. (Bernadette Salazar; Human Resources Director: bjsalazar@santafenm.gov, 955-6591)

Committee Review:

Governing Body: 12/08/2021 (Introduced)

Governing Body (Special Meeting): 01/03/2022

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- b. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-___. (Councilor Rivera and Councilwoman Villarreal)



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

A Resolution Supporting the Application and Response to the Request for Proposals Issued by the North Central New Mexico Economic Development District, Non-Metro New Mexico Area Agency on Aging for Continuation of Services for the Senior Citizens of the City of Santa Fe. (Anya Alarid, Project Administrator: aalarid@santafenm.gov, 955-4744)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

c. **Request to Publish Notice of Public Hearing on February 9, 2022.**

CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-___. An Ordinance Amending Exhibit B of Section 21-7 to Increase Residential and Commercial Rates for Services Provided by the Environmental Services Division. (Councilor Rivera) (Shirlene Sitton, Environmental Services Division Director: sesitton@santafenm.gov, 955-2209)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body (Request to Publish): 01/12/2022

Finance Committee: 01/18/2022

Governing Body (Public Hearing): 02/09/2022

d. Consent to Mayor Alan Webber's Appointment of John Blair as City Manager. (Alan Webber, Mayor, and Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney; ekmcsherry@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6512)

Committee Review:

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

12. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY MANAGER**

13. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY**

EXECUTIVE SESSION

In Accordance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act, Specifically NMSA 1978, Section 10-15-1, Part (H)(2), Discussion of Limited Personnel Matters, in Particular, Mayor



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

Webber's Appointment of John Blair as City Manager. (Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney; ekmcsherry@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6512)

14. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY CLERK**
15. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY**
 - a. Introduction of Legislation for January 12, 2022.

EVENING SESSION - 7:00 P.M.

16. **ROLL CALL**
 17. **PETITIONS FROM THE FLOOR**
 18. **APPOINTMENTS**
 19. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - a. **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2021-__.** (Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt)
A Resolution Adopting a New Version of the Governing Body Procedural Rules. (Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison: jbg Guillen@santafenm.gov, 955-6518; Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney: ekmcsherry@santafenm.gov, 955-6961)
- Committee Review:**
Introduced: 11/10/2021
Governing Body Study Session: 11/17/2021
Finance Committee: 11/29/2021
Quality of Life Committee: 12/01/2021
Governing Body: 12/08/2021
Governing Body: 01/12/2022
- b. **Case #2021-4244.** 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Rezoning. JenkinsGavin, Inc., Agent, for Homewise Inc., Owner, Requests Approval of a Rezoning from R-5 (Residential – Five Dwelling Units Per Acre) to R-7 (Residential – Seven Dwelling Units Per Acre) for a Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street. The property is Located within the West Santa



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

Fe River Corridor Overlay District, and is Approximately 2.01 Acres. (Lee Logston, Case Manager, lrlogston@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6136)

1. CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-1. ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 2022-____. An Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Santa Fe and Changing the Classification from R-5 (Residential - Five Dwelling Units Per Acre) to R-7 (Residential - Seven Dwelling Unites Per Acre) with Respect to a Certain Parcel of Land Comprising Approximately 2.01 Acres Located at 2190 West Alameda Street (Case No. 2021-4244, 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Rezoning).
2. Request for Approval of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Regarding Case #2021-4244 in the Matter of the Property Located at 2190 W. Alameda Street; Los Canales Rezoning.

- c. **Case #2021-4245.** 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Final Development Plan. JenkinsGavin, Inc., Agent, for Homewise Inc., Owner, Requests Approval of a Final Development Plan for Fourteen Residential Units for a Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street. The Property is Located within the West Santa Fe River Corridor Overlay District, and is Approximately 2.01 Acres. (Lee Logston, Case Manager, lrlogston@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6136)

1. Request for Approval of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Regarding Case #2021-4245 in the Matter of the Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Final Development Plan.

20. ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Governing Body Procedural Rules, in the event any agenda items have not been considered prior to 11:30 p.m. and the Governing Body does not vote to extend the meeting, such items shall be postponed to a subsequent meeting, provided that the date, time and place of such meeting is specified at the time of postponement.

NOTE: New Mexico law requires the following administrative procedures be followed when conducting “quasi-judicial” hearings. In a “quasi-judicial” hearing all witnesses



AGENDA

**REGULAR MEETING OF
THE GOVERNING BODY
JANUARY 12, 2022
5:00 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY**

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.

Closed captions are provided for this meeting. Persons with disabilities in need of additional accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 505-955-6521, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

**Governing Body
SUMMARY INDEX
January 12, 2022**

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1. Call to Order	Convened at 5:00 p.m.	1
2. Pledge of Allegiance	Led by Councilor Villarreal	1
3. Salute to the State Flag	Led by Councilor M. Garcia	1
4. Invocation	Led by Councilor Rivera	1
5. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1-2
6. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
7. Approval of Consent Agenda	Approved as presented	2
8. Approval of Minutes		
a) Regular Meeting Dec. 8, 2021	Approved as presented	3
b) Special Meeting Dec 28, 2021	Approved as presented	3
9. Presentations	None	3
10. Consent Calendar	Listed	3-5
11. Discussion/Action Items		
a) COVID Admin Leave Policy	Removed	6
b) NCNMED RFP Support	Approved	6
c) Increased Env Service Rates	Approved	7
d) City Manager Appointment	Approved	7-16
12. Matters from the City Manager	Informational	16
13. Matters from the City Attorney	Informational	17
Executive Session	Not considered	17
14. Matters from the City Clerk	Informational	17
15. Communications from Governing Body	Communicated	18-20
Evening Session	7:54 p.m.	20
16. Roll Call	Quorum Present	20
17. Petitions from the Floor	Petitions heard	20-21
18. Appointments	None	22
19. Public Hearings		
a) Governing Body Procedural Rules	Approved as amended	22-51
b) 2190 W. Alameda Rezoning	Postponed	51
c) 2190 W. Alameda Development Plan	Postponed	51-52
20. Adjournment	Adjourned at 1:06 a.m.	52

**Minutes of the
Special Meeting of the Governing Body
Monday, January 12, 2022
Virtual Meeting**

1. CALL TO ORDER

A special meeting of the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, was called to order by Mayor Alan Webber, on Wednesday, January 12, 2023, at approximately 5:01 p.m., at the Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico as a virtual meeting.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Councilor Villarreal led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. SALUTE TO THE NEW MEXICO FLAG

Councilor M Garcia led the Salute to the New Mexico Flag.

4. INVOCATION

Councilor Rivera gave the Invocation. He gave the prayer from Numbers 6:24-26 in the Hebrew Scriptures. He also remembered David Solomon, a long-time referee for High School Football and Basketball games.

The Governing Body observed a moment of silence for those struggling with COVID and those who have recently died and their grieving families.

5. ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum remotely, as follows:

Members Present

Mayor Alan Webber
Councilor Jamie Cassutt
Councilor Amanda Chavez
Councilor Lee Garcia
Councilor Michael J. Garcia
Councilor Signe Lindell
Councilor Christopher M. Rivera

Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth
Councilor Renee D. Villarreal

Members Excused

Other Participants Attending Remotely

Erin McSherry, City Attorney
Kris Bustos-Mihelcic, City Clerk
Bernadette Salazar, Human Resources Director
Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison
John Blair, City Manager
Carl Boaz, Council Stenographer

6. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Webber noted the agenda was revised, removing Item 11 a from the agenda to give Director Salazar more time to consider it.

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to approve the agenda as amended with Item 11 a removed.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

7. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION: Councilor Rivera moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Regular Governing Body Meeting – December 8, 2021

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to approve the December 8 2021 meeting minutes as presented.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

- b. Special Governing Body Meeting – December 28, 2021

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to approve the December 28, 2021 meeting minutes as presented.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

9. PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

10. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Request for Approval to Purchase Two Automated Side Load Collection Vehicles for Residential Recycling Waste Collection Services with Bruckner's Truck Sales, Inc. Via the Cooperative Education Services in the Total Amount of \$879,068. (Lawrence Garcia, ESD Maintenance Manager, lmgarcia@santafenm.gov; 505-955-2241)
1. Request for Approval of a Budget Adjustment Resolution (BAR) in the Amount of \$131,790 from Fund 510 Cash Balance for the Purchase of Two Residential Collection Vehicles.

Committee Review:

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 11/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- b. Request for Approval of Contract Amendment #1 to Extend the Term of the Service Agreement with Pluma LLC in the Total Amount of \$334,873 for Roof, HVAC, and Employee Parking Security Measures. (Caryn Grosse, Project Administrator, clgrosse@santafenm.gov, 505-955-5938)

Committee Review:

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 12/13/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- c. Request for Approval of Library 2020 GO BOND in the Amount of \$171,276.71 (Maria Tucker, Library Division Director: metucker@santafenm.gov; 505-955-6678)

1. Request for Approval of Budget Amendment Resolution (BAR)
– Budget 2020 GO BOND

Committee Review:

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- d. Request Approval of a Construction Services Contract with CES/HELLAS Construction Inc. for On-Call Construction Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$2,500,000 Inclusive of New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT). (Melissa McDonald, Interim Parks Division Director, mamcdonald@santafenm.gov, 505-303-9502).

Committee Review:

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works & Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

- e. Request for Approval of an Agreement with B&D Industries for the Installation of Soccer Field Lighting at the Municipal Recreation Complex in the Total Amount of \$666,342.43 Including New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax. (Melissa A. McDonald, Parks Division Director, mamcdonald@santafenm.gov, 505-303-9502)

1. Request for Approval of Budget Amendment Resolution (BAR) to Allocate \$500,000 from the Santa Fe County Match Funds Per MOU 19-0792 into Budget for this Project.

Committee Review

Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works: 01/10/2022
City Council: 01/12/2022

- f. Consideration of Resolution No. 2022-01. (Councilor Lindell and Councilor Cassutt)
A Joint Resolution Recognizing the Existence of Open Items Related to Annexation and Establishing Negotiating Teams to Develop Non-Binding Proposals to Resolve those Items. (Pat Feghali, Assistant City Attorney: pfeighali@santafenm.gov)
Committee Review:
Introduced: 12/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022
- g. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-02. (Mayor Webber)
A Resolution Rescinding Resolution No. 2021-3 Relating to the Open Meetings Act; and Adopting Annual Notice Requirements for 2022. (Kristine Mihelcic, City Clerk: kmmihelcic@santafenm.gov, 955-6846)
Committee Review:
Introduced: 12/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022
- h. **Request to Publish Notice of Public Hearing on February 9, 2022.**
CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-___. An Ordinance Amending Section 2-1.13 SFCC 1987 to Establish that the Mayor Pro Tempore Shall Serve on One City Council Standing Committee, Which Shall be the Finance Committee. (Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt) (Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison: jbg Guillen@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6518)
Committee Review:
Introduced: 12/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022
Governing Body (Request to Publish): 01/12/2022
Quality of Life Committee: 01/17/2022
Governing Body (Public Hearing): 02/09/2022

11. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-___. (Mayor Webber)
A Resolution Temporarily Modifying the City's Personnel Rules Regarding Administrative Leave to Provide a Standard Framework for Issuing COVID-19 Administrative Leave. (Bernadette Salazar; Human Resources Director: bjsalazar@santafenm.gov, 955-6591)
Committee Review:
Governing Body: 12/08/2021 (Introduced)
Governing Body (Special Meeting): 01/03/2022 Governing Body: 01/12/2022

This item was removed from the agenda under Approval of the Agenda.

- b. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2022-03. (Councilor Rivera and Councilwoman Villarreal)
A Resolution Supporting the Application and Response to the Request for Proposals Issued by the North Central New Mexico Economic Development District, Non-Metro New Mexico Area Agency on Aging for Continuation of Services for the Senior Citizens of the City of Santa Fe. (Anya Alarid, Project Administrator: aalarid@santafenm.gov, 955-4744)
Committee Review:
Introduced: 12/08/2021
Finance Committee: 01/03/2022
Governing Body: 01/12/2022

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic read the caption for this item.

Mr. Rinaldi presented the matter. He said the City was in process of applying for a four-year grant and the resolution shows the City's commitment to our seniors and the program. He stood for questions.

MOTION: Councilor Rivera moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to approve the Resolution as presented.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

c. **Request to Publish Notice of Public Hearing on February 9, 2022.**

CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-__.

An Ordinance Amending Exhibit B of Section 21-7 to Increase Residential and Commercial Rates for Services Provided by the Environmental Services Division. (Councilor Rivera) (Shirlene Sitton, Environmental Services Division Director: sesitton@santafenm.gov, 955-2209)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 12/08/2021

Public Works and Utilities Committee: 01/10/2022

Governing Body (Request to Publish): 01/12/2022

Finance Committee: 01/18/2022

Governing Body (Public Hearing): 02/09/2022

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic read the caption for this item.

MOTION: Councilor Cassutt moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to approve publishing Notice for the Public Hearing as presented.

Discussion on the Motion:

Director Sitton said the hearing was based on our cost-of-service study for trash and recycling service.

Councilor Villarreal asked if the request was approved at Public Works/Utilities Committee.

Director Sitton agreed it was.

Councilor Villarreal assumed she would see the presentation in Finance Committee. She wanted to see the breakdown on where the increase goes and wondered if it could be possible increases to staff wages. She asked that it be provided at the Finance Committee meeting.

Director Sitton said she would have a breakout for it at the Committee meeting.

Councilor Rivera recalled when new Councilors joined the Council two years ago, some of them did not know what a notice to publish was. He suggested a quick explanation.

Ms. McSherry said the Governing Body has a practice of voting on each notice to publish for a public hearing after Committees. The purpose was to fulfill the requirement for ordinances to be publicly noticed before being voted on by the Governing Body.

Councilor Rivera added that it was an opportunity at the Committees to discuss and ask questions.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

- d. Consent to Mayor Alan Webber's Appointment of John Blair as City Manager. (Alan Webber, Mayor, and Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney; ekmcsherry@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6512)

Committee Review:

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic read the caption for this item.

Mayor Webber noted Mr. Blair was present at the meeting and provided an introduction. He pointed out the option to go into executive session regarding his appointment, it can be done if anyone wants to make that motion. For context, in the past such as with current City Manager, the Governing Body had a contract proposed and discussed that in executive session.

But for Mr. Blair, it is an at-will employment agreement because Mr. Blair was not interested in special considerations of a contract.

However, the Governing Body can still go into executive session to discuss it further.

He clarified that under our City Charter, the Mayor has opportunity to name the City Clerk, City Manager and City Attorney and ask the Governing Body for their consent. So, he asked the Governing Body for their consent for John Blair as City Manager.

Mayor Webber said he has known Mr. Blair for years. Some of you knew him when he was a young student here. He grew up here and has a record of great service. He sat with each Councilor to discuss the job and the capabilities he brings to the task. It is very challenging, and I was glad he was available to take on this work. A City Manager is on-call all the time and works with each member of Governing Body and that work figures into the overall work of our community.

He invited Mr. Blair to make a few statements about himself.

Mr. Blair said he was grateful for the opportunity to sit with each Councilor and to meet with Division Directors regarding what has worked and what has not worked.

He said he was born in Albuquerque and grew up in Santa Fe. He attended school at Chaparral, DeVargas, and Santa Fe High. In school he was a member of the band. He was the bugler at Santa Fe Downs. He went away to college and then graduated UNM Law School and spent eight years at the Capitol and working for Martin Heinrich. Most recently, he was the Deputy Superintendent at the Department of Regulation and Licensing.

While he has not served as a City Manager, he had relevant experience for it. He spoke about his work in many different public arenas.

He said, "I recognize the job as CAO for the City government, serving the Mayor and working with City Council. Overarching for me is how we work together to hold on to what we love about Santa Fe - a history and culture with diversity - and how to make it a fully functioning 21st century city."

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Chavez, to approve the appointment of John Blair as City Manager.

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor Rivera said they did meet one-on-one. He asked about participation in City budget and what experience he has had in budgeting.

Mr. Blair reviewed his experience with budgeting in State Government.

Councilor Rivera asked about the largest budget he worked with.

Mr. Blair said it was with Permits but didn't remember the size.

Councilor Rivera asked about any work with local governments.

Mr. Blair said he had nothing direct but did with communications. There is opportunity here to go forward in communicating with those hard to reach. A common thread has been interpersonal, intergovernmental communications.

Councilor Rivera asked about any experience or work in auditing.

Mr. Blair gave some details re auditing and was aware of the discussion on the City's audit. For him, submitting it on time was very important. Assuming the Governing Body consents, he would begin a direct process on getting the audit turned in. Discussion is already in place for an audit report at every Governing Body meeting. He would work at pulling all the pieces together. And, as City Manager, he would not proclaim from an ivory tower but roll up his sleeves.

He referenced his work at the Secretary of State's Office where they all spent an hour per day getting caught up on business licenses.

Councilor Rivera noted that one benefit of a contract was about ways to get increases and that was supported with an evaluation. He asked how any increases would take place and if they would need to be approved by the Governing Body.

Ms. McSherry said the technical answer is that it is submitted in the budget.

Councilor Rivera asked if it was without any oversight by anyone.

Ms. McSherry said it is an employer-employee oversight. Salaries are set without any formula or contract.

Councilor Rivera asked what the portal was to see every salary.

Ms. McSherry didn't have it at the tip of her tongue.

Councilor Rivera asked the Mayor about starting salary.

Mayor Webber first applauded Mr. Blair for just agreeing to take all questions in public.

He said the salary they agreed on was public information and it was \$172,500. When Manager LaPan Hill came, it was \$170,000 which was Erik's ending salary. During her time, she got raises to \$175,000. In the chart comparing with other city/ county managers, it was placing him in the middle of the pack. Some salaries are lower than that and some are more. That is about a median amount. It is a fairly reasonable market. This is a little lower than the present City Manager's salary.

Councilor L Garcia thanked Mr. Blair for being here. He asked what Mr. Blair's vision was in the hot issues in the City regarding public safety and where he stood on the water issue.

Mr. Blair commented that, to some extent, the Governing Body needs to tell him where we are going. The real necessity is to work with HR to ensure

we have a full police force. There is also the capital project with a new fire station. Those would be at the top of his list. “Water underlies everything we do here in the City. We are closer to being climate refugees. I remember as a child that it seemed to snow every week. So how do we tackle the issues in a growing city. We need to be thoughtful and deliberate in providing more housing and preserving our water.”

Councilor L Garcia was more interested in managerial duty. He thought Mr. Blair may have to make hard decisions. “The citizens here want a City Manager who is able to make the hard decisions. You understand the policy and will bring forth new policy, but I’m more interested in how to manage the City, e.g., when something is not right in a Division.”

Mr. Blair said he has hired many employees and fired many employees. “My approach is direct communication and there are people who report directly to me. And I might ask if there are needs for more training, etc. I have to notify employees. We are in the middle of transition on how the City government works.” He said the fundamental core in transition is that staff are expected to be at work on time, work hard and be honest and truthful. If not, he would fire people.

Councilor Cassutt asked what his approach was for making informed decisions. She pointed out that Santa Fe is a very complex system and no one person could be an expert in all areas. “How will you make sure you get the information you need to make decisions?”

Mr. Blair agreed he didn’t know everything. But he was comfortable saying that and didn’t want someone to just nod as we go along. He wouldn’t waste other people’s time. If it is an unknown area, he would reach out to one who is knowledgeable. People sometimes hoard information to get more power, but he didn’t believe in that. “I’m an over communicator. There is more strength if we all know. Information sharing needs time carved out to have all who impact the decision participate. If we decide on incomplete information, we need to stand up and say we based it on wrong information.”

Councilor Cassutt appreciated his answer. It takes confidence and bravery to admit we don’t know everything. How we maximize information sharing both internally and to other staff and the Governing Body and how we effectively communicate with the general public. How do we do that?

Mr. Blair said he didn’t want to be disrespectful for things being done but would expand the way we communicate with the public. He added that he was “just sticking my toe into the interoffice communications.” He was a big user of BCC and CC in his emails.

Councilor Cassutt asked him about communication from City Manager down the line to City Staff.

Mr. Blair said he wanted to meet everyone. “We are a team. Everyone on the team needs to be part of it. I hope to have regular meetings with staff at every level. I would spend a day in the field. If people don’t buy in to the team approach, complaints will come in. But I need to work with the whole team.”

Councilor Cassutt said he was coming in at the middle of the reorganization transition and she was curious how he saw that.

Mr. Blair said he was not able yet to focus on that to see how it works. But he was open to any conversations on how to make City government work better.

Councilor M Garcia said the audit was the most pressing issue we are facing today. It was music to his ears that he was willing to keep that in his focus. He agreed we are a team and cannot win if we are not working hand-in-hand. There has not been effective communication from City Manager in the past. Most often it came as a press release. It is not a one size fits all. He asked how much Mr. Blair would involve the Governing Body in the audit process.

Mr. Blair didn’t have a pat answer on how to do that. He would want to sit down and talk about that on where we are headed. He said he was not trying to avoid an answer but didn’t have enough information to respond better. He was “open to whatever ideas you have. And I’d love to talk about it more.”

Councilor M Garcia added that we’ve got the Open Meetings Act policy to work with. We all want success for the City – all City employees who live in the City. There should not be a mentality of executive against the rest. We should all have critical information in a timely manner. It caught us off guard when we were alerted by press release.

“I know you are not accepting a contract. And you accepted being given raises after performance is done. How open are you to performance evaluation either formal or informal? We as employees are all learning. You will have your nose in books and meeting with many people and I want to help you be successful as City Manager. What avenues are you open to for feedback from us, employees, or the community?”

Mr. Blair was open to that conversation. “In Heinrich’s office we had such feedback. It was a useful exercise because some of it was a surprise to

me. It reaffirmed how I was being perceived. A citywide survey would make me uncomfortable, and I am not sure how well it would work.”

Councilor M Garcia noted there was a certification process in the last contract.

Ms. McSherry clarified that it was not a requirement of the contract.

Councilor M Garcia asked if he was open to getting such a certification.

Mr. Blair said he was happy to look into it. He would need to determine what effort was involved and if it was necessary in running the City. He added that he still has his attorney license.

Councilor M Garcia thanked him for his responses. “If appointed tonight, I wish you the best. We want to help each other so reach out, as necessary.”

Mayor Webber clarified that the certification requires a certain time of experience before going after it. And the City Manager can take advantage of ICMA without being certified.

Councilor Villarreal thanked Mr. Blair for candidness. Her questions were previously answered. And some were answered one-on-one. She has known Mr. Blair way before we got into politics. She had a lot of faith in Mr. Blair, and he has his work cut out for him. She said, “We do have and need to deal with internal strife to have more efficiencies and accomplishments. Not knowing things until the last minute is not helpful and we need someone who is willing to admit when they are wrong. She had asked him to meet with staff at all levels. The direct experience in working with the City working on the ground is crucial. He knows I will let him know when things are not going well and will also praise him for work well done. Transparency and fairness of this doesn’t work with notification by press release. It doesn’t work for me. We should be able to find out those things before the public does.”

“It is prudent for the Charter Commission to look at the structure of our government. When we moved to full-time Mayor, that should have been done for a level playing field. City Managers work directly for the Council. We don’t have the full picture on looking at governance in a better way. I am looking forward to that. Good luck to Mr. Blair. You have a lot of the skills we need to accomplish the work.”

Councilor Lindell asked him if anyone had told him that being the City Manager of Santa Fe is probably the hardest job of all.

Mr. Blair said it was not in those exact terms. But some people grimace when I tell them about it.

Councilor Lindell thanked him for being candid. “It is probably the most interesting job interview I’ve been involved with. You must have a great relationship with your partner and your life with your partner is about to change. It is a very hard job and I encourage all of Santa Fe to assist you in it. I know you’ve already started on all of your homework. For myself, I stand ready to be as helpful as I can in the transition. Let’s get to work. There is a lot to be done.”

Councilor Romero-Wirth encouraged him to get into the field. “That is an excellent idea. That is something I would want to do because of information and relationship building. I admire your enthusiasm and energy. There are places where we have definite room for improvement. You will find you are constrained by law, by time, by sheer numbers of things. You will learn that on the job and that is good. But it is important that you are willing to take a fresh look at things.”

“You’re not asking for a contract. A contract usually protects an employee so you are showing much trust that you will be treated fairly as an employee. In light of being a normal city employee, your increases will be subject to the raises we give to city employees or is it otherwise?”

Ms. McSherry said it is what is specified in the City budget. It could be across the board including City Manager but need not be. But a particular employee cannot be excluded from an increase. The mayor could request the increase. Any exempt employee’s increase can be negotiated.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said, “Our appropriation power is important in checks and balances.”

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted he had served as Deputy many times and those people set policy for a department and worry about the internal stuff. You have had a couple of those. Was that your experience when as a Deputy?

Mr. Blair absolutely agreed. He used Regulation and Licensing as an example to share how that was true. “That is almost intuitive to me. You’ve got to have everyone in the room for those big decisions. As City Manager, I would need to ensure that happens.”

Councilor Romero-Wirth thanked him for that answer. “I personally believe a law degree is a good base for many jobs. I went to law school. If you look in government, law degrees are very prevalent. It is a credential that will serve you well. I wish you luck and look forward to working with you. I will

be working with you on the water issue. And as Finance Chair on the audit and upcoming budget.

“On governance structure, I agree when we have the Charter Review Commission that more work needs to be done there. There is more change that can happen and more support for the Council. The three key appointments were the vision with a full-time Mayor to provide the leadership needed and appoint the team to do that. We’ve all gotten lots of emails. And that is what I think of this. Thanks for being here and answering our questions. I hope it has been illuminating for all.”

Councilor Rivera asked him about the union, which is strong here, and whether he has had any experience with unions.

Mr. Blair said most of it has been in political campaigns. He has tremendous respect for unions and the work they do. They have been the backbone of our country. He has a meeting next week with union leadership.

Councilor Rivera suggested he schedule regular meetings with union leadership down the road. And as you visit with other departments, to make sure you get a vest when you ride with the Police Department.

Councilor L Garcia said he was going to ask that question too. Have you had any contact with the three unions?

Mr. Blair said he has not because he didn’t have a job yet. He was planning to reach out to them tomorrow.

Councilor L Garcia was that as very important because most of our employees are union members. Thank you.

Mayor Webber agreed this has been fruitful and extraordinary. It has been very useful for us. He was grateful for all the questions and Mr. Blair’s candid open responses.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: Council L Garcia.

Councilor L Garcia briefly explained his no vote. He said, “Basically I needed more contrast between candidates and to give the Council more

time for this top position of the City. I definitely will support you as best I can and predict a good relationship.”

Mayor Webber congratulated Manager Blair on his appointment. He was grateful to Manager Blair for stepping in. “The continuity is fantastic, and teamwork is the right spirit. I’m proud to have you as my City Manager.”

Manager Blair thanked the Governing Body for the vote and will start tomorrow. I look forward to work. This is my last night for freedom. And I plan to celebrate it.

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic announced some technical challenges with this meeting and for issues still to come up on the agenda.

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic explained an update to the link for the meeting was correct but there were issues on Zoom and the link does require additional manipulation. Her team is working through it now. She explained that the Zoom link is correct, and people can use Zoom. The phone numbers also do work.

Councilor M Garcia asked if this glitch compromises the OMA.

Ms. McSherry said it doesn’t. Communication both ways still work, although it requires more work than usual to participate. Everyone can access the meeting. The URL is correct and the right phone number works.

Councilor M Garcia was concerned when people cannot get through, that they could not hear this alert and email address.

Ms. McSherry pointed out that Public Comment is above and beyond OMA requirements.

Councilor M Garcia said his concern was with the Public Hearings.

Ms. McSherry suggested, if we experience fewer present for the hearings, the Governing Body can postpone it. If neither did work, she would have recommended postponing, but we are fulfilling our obligations.

12. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY MANAGER**

Manager LaPan Hill thanked the City for providing the best services to its constituents. She read a long statement of farewell to the Governing Body for how much she had appreciated the opportunity to serve as City Manager and the relationships she had enjoyed. She explained that she was not moving away. “If you see me around town, please say hello.”

13. MATTERS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic read the caption.

Ms. McSherry thanked Jarel. "It has been great working with you, and I hope to see you around town. I am happy for you."

She welcomed City Manager John Blair and was looking forward to working with him.

She announced that the Charter Commission will meet sometime soon. For our next meeting, we will do a litigation update. Any Councilor can get an individual meeting for background in advance and should just let her know if anyone wants to meet.

She did not recommend an executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

In Accordance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act, Specifically NMSA 1978, Section 10-15-1, Part (H)(2), Discussion of Limited Personnel Matters, in Particular, Mayor Webber's Appointment of John Blair as City Manager. (Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney; ekmcsberry@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6512)

The Governing Body decided not to go into executive session.

14. MATTERS FROM THE CITY CLERK

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic also thanked Jarel for her work as City Manager and gave her welcome to Manager Blair.

She thanked all who attended the inauguration ceremony at the Convention Center at the New Year.

The request went out today regarding the Redistricting Commissioners' invitation.

She will send out an update on orientation training very soon. Tuesday, January 25, appears to be the date.

Regarding salaries, her Office began posting contracts for about a year now.

15. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

a. Introduction of Legislation for January 12, 2022.

Councilor L Garcia said he was happy being here with everyone. He was ready to go to work to come up with the best for our City.

Councilor Villarreal welcomed her new colleagues, Councilor Chavez, and Councilor L Garcia. She hoped soon we could have a meeting in person. She thanked Jarel LaPan Hill for all her work and service to the City and how she handled the pandemic with grace. Thanks for navigating us back.

She was interested to see how the Charter Commission and Redistricting Commission will work together and asked for more information from the City Attorney's Office.

She asked for the new training dates to get them on her calendar, noting that the dates had apparently changed.

Councilor Chavez was happy to be at the first regular Governing Body meeting and was happy to hear transparency being mentioned as a priority in making Santa Fe as wonderful as it can be. She wished Jarel LaPan Hill the best of luck and was sorry she didn't get to work with her. Her conversation with Manager Blair was amazing. She recalled the discussion on ethics, etc. and wished him the best of luck. She asked to be a Cosponsor of Councilor Rivera's introduction.

Councilor M Garcia gave congratulations to Jarel LaPan Hill for all she did for our City and wished her good luck on what comes next. "Take good time for your family."

He welcomed Councilor Chavez and Councilor L Garcia to the Governing Body.

He introduced a Resolution amending Resolution No. 2020-14 to change the location of banners commemorating "Hometown Heroes" along the Cerrillos Road Corridor Between I-15 and Rodeo Road to between I-25 and the intersection of St. Michael's Drive and Osage Avenue.

He wanted an update on the audit. He heard at Finance that the Governing Body would get it tonight. He heard the letter from the State Auditor on the deadline. We must respond to the Auditor by January 20 and asked when we will get together on that response.

He attended the tree ceremony for the old Cottonwood and thanks to Director McDonald for moving forward with the tough decision. We will be getting new trees there. An arborist will be sharing that wood for crafts and gave the email address for getting wood. Welcome to Manager Blair.

Councilor Rivera introduced a Resolution proclaiming severe or extreme drought conditions exist in the City of Santa Fe; imposing fire restrictions from January 27, 2022 to February 24, 2022; restricting the sale or use of fireworks within the City of Santa Fe and prohibiting other fire hazard activities. This is the earliest we've ever had to do this. He wanted to sign on to Councilor M Garcia's resolution.

He welcomed Councilor Chavez and Councilor L Garcia to City Council. He also thanked Jarel LaPan Hill for her years of service to the City. "It has been great working with her."

He congratulated Mario for being in the strongest firefighter in the Columbus Ohio benefit. He has been in the City Fire Department for 15 years and has won other powerlifting competitions. He hoped Mario will do great and come back with a great story in representing our City there.

Councilor Cassutt also thanked Jarel LaPan Hill for her service and support through COVID and helping us through this crazy time.

She welcomed Councilor Chavez and Councilor L Garcia and looking forward working with them. Councilor Chavez is with me in District 4 and Councilor L Garcia and I were classmates in High School.

She introduced a Resolution in support of the appropriation of funds by the New Mexico Legislature for New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables for school and senior meals programs and related education programs for schools and farmers. She also signed on with Councilor M Garcia's and Councilor Rivera's resolutions. She also thanked Jesse Guillen for the recognition.

Councilor Lindell thanked Jarel LaPan Hill. She could now check the box for the hardest job in Santa Fe and she did it during the bad times.

She welcomed the two new Council members and pledged to be always available to be helpful. She dittoed the remarks regarding Captain Mario and recalled she and Mayor Webber went to such an event in Albuquerque, and it was a tremendous honor for him. "Please continue to wear your N 95 or KN 95 mask. COVID is rampant here. We need to stay well."

Councilor Romero-Wirth welcomed our new Councilors. "I look forward to collaborating with you as we move forward. I remember distinctly the day Jarel came on board. Little did you know that six weeks later you would be in incredibly challenging times. Thanks for your perseverance. We are getting through it and your role was really important. Enjoy taking time off."

She was thankful to Councilor M Garcia for the tree ceremony and thanks to Director McDonald on the reasons it needed to come down. She was excited the

new trees were made possible by TreeSmart to help us plant strategic trees across the City. That is really important work.

Mayor Webber introduced a Resolution establishing additional legislative funding priorities based on the potential availability of additional funding. The additional funding grew out of our legislative breakfast. He thanked those who helped with it. And he looked forward for a positive outcome in the new session as they build budget and capital outlay that will benefit Santa Fe.

He seconded Councilor Lindell on COVID. “Look the problem in the eye. It was not as severe if you are vaccinated and boosted. When you have both, you will be less severely affected. It is time to up our game for protection. I’m proud of the examples set by City Staff. We are in for very rough water in next few weeks. It will take great patience and empathy for us to take care of each other.”

He announced that on Monday, 20 new employees were hired. Half were a result of the fast-hiring event at GCCC. We want to welcome those new employees and let them know how important they are to our City. He welcomed our two new Council members and congratulations to our departing City Manager. “Ernest Hemingway wrote that courage is grace under pressure. You have shown that courage under most trying of times, and it was my honor to have you as City Manager. You are a Great Leader.

At 7:40, Mayor Webber proposed a ten-minute break.

EVENING SESSION – 7:54 P.M.

The Governing Body reconvened at 7:54

16. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Mayor Alan Webber
Councilor Jamie Cassutt
Councilor Amanda Chavez
Councilor Lee Garcia
Councilor Michael J. Garcia
Councilor Signe Lindell
Councilor Christopher M. Rivera
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth
Councilor Renee D. Villarreal

17. PETITIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Mayor Webber gave two minutes each.

Bob White was very impressed with the presentation of the new City Manager, but we will never know how he might have stacked up against other candidates, which for a City of 90,000 is a problem. It would be nice to know we have the best candidate out there. The it happened right after the election was bothersome for him. He thought the Councilors should have to explain to their constituents why they supported no national search.

Cynthia said she enjoyed the City Manager presentation and thanked the City Clerk for the work-around tonight to use her phone. Thanks very much. She said every time she goes to the City website, it is very difficult to find what is new or find the subject she wanted. She was constantly calling people to help her be able to navigate the website. She wondered if there could be a streamlined website so people could find needed information on all levels. She appreciated the Councilors' work and didn't envy them for anything.

Stefanie Beninato said she was lost with a problem getting in. She was happy to hear you hired a manager. She thought a lot more openings needed to be filled. On CHART, she wondered if she had understood the City would make some recommendations online. But it has become different. Who makes the decisions? Isn't it just political if it doesn't address that? She was unhappy that GCCC isn't open much because somebody did not show up and the supervisor left for paternity leave and the City was not prepared for that and GCCC got the short stick. A whole segment of people was left out and it was not fair. She understood there are shortages of people, but GCCC just had poor management. They need a good manager for people who are hired to do the work. Hiring students for Saturday work got those who swim from 7-9...

There were no other petitions.

18. APPOINTMENTS

There were no appointments.

19. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2021-04. (Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt)

A Resolution Adopting a New Version of the Governing Body Procedural Rules. (Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison: jbg Guillen@santafenm.gov, 955-6518; Erin K. McSherry, City Attorney: ekmcsherry@santafenm.gov, 955-6961)

Committee Review:

Introduced: 11/10/2021

Governing Body Study Session: 11/17/2021

Finance Committee: 11/29/2021

Quality of Life Committee: 12/01/2021

Governing Body: 12/08/2021

Governing Body: 01/12/2022

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic read the caption for this matter.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Guillen presented this matter to the Governing Body and shared his screen.

Mr. Guillen said this resolution was to clarify certain processes for the Governing Body and allow the public to participate more in the discussions of the Governing Body. He noted it was the topic of a study session on November 17, 2021. He said the content of what was on the consent calendar should be the discussion calendar and allow the public to weigh in.

He said there has been discussion on a possible red line of the document and reformatting of the document as a whole. There is a document in the packet with an overview of the changes. It has a section on definitions, order of business, recusals, a linear committee process, study sessions, official meeting sites, expanded and clarified main motions, subsidiary motions, increasing to 2/3 for votes to amend rules. Minutes would go on the consent agenda. Petitions will still be scheduled for 7:00 pm. The agenda will combine the afternoon and evening sessions into one session. An additional public comment section is added earlier in the meeting. Introduction of legislation was changed to its own section and requires full drafting of the legislation to be introduced and be approved by at least one committee. Notices of public hearings will be triggered automatically when approved by one committee. There will be a set order of committee reviews. If approved by all committees it was assigned to, the resolution goes on the consent calendar. A unanimous committee denial would stop the process from going forward. He listed possible motions allowed at committee meetings.

Mayor Webber thanked him for the presentation.

Public Comments

Joanie Ahrens, District 1, said she could not find the resolution and spent ten minutes trying to find it on PrimeGov. She asked Mr. Guillen to email the current version of the resolution, but the link he sent did not work. She knew a lot of work was done on the rules, but she requested it be pulled from the agenda. She saw a light blue rectangle on Prime Gov but could not find the actual language. There was no redline version for public review, nor was it presented orally during the public hearing. It appears this was a lack of transparency with this proposed resolution. The City needs to increase the transparency by using its electronic tools to ensure everyone is on the same page, such as using redline strikeouts.

Diane, District 2, said she downloaded the text and was confused where things were. On the special rules for quasi-judicial proceedings, she found it a real impediment that constituents cannot talk with our Councilors about things and therefore, they don't have the information we might be able to give them. She said she goes to different sources to find information. She asked how we could get rid of that.

The other comment was not being able to see the time [clock] for another speaker. She would like to cede her time to someone who knows more. But we cannot do that. Thank you.

Stefanie Beninato said she was confused by what was just presented in the procedural changes from what she saw on the web page. She was happy with adding the first public comment period but didn't know where that happens in the process. She said she submitted her comments in writing. She felt the first public comment was pretty important and giving the public more chance to participate was needed. She thought perhaps that added chance has to do with legislation. On the special meeting section, on page 8, amendments cannot be seen by the public. On page 9, it talks about someone coming to be a sergeant at arms. It is permissive and she wondered if that was the best security for the Council.

Regarding calling an immediate executive session (referring to page 15), she didn't understand how anyone would be prepared to be able to talk about that item if it was on the table and someone suggested having an executive session on it. She was for more transparency on something being introduced. And with only 72 hours' notice was a big concern for her. "We need more transparency, not less."

Rick Martinez was worried about the public hearings being reduced from three minutes to two minutes. Having only two minutes appears to be a waste of Councilors' time, if the Governing Body doesn't care about what people have to say in that extra minute. Also, He would like for the

speaker's face to be seen so that the viewers could see who was talking to the Governing Body. "The technology is here to use. The City should figure out how to put us in a box."

There were no other public comments.

Sponsors' Statements

Councilor Cassutt said Mr. Guillen covered a lot of it in his presentation. She asked Ms. McSherry to speak to the quasi-judicial part.

Ms. McSherry said she would be happy to do that.

Councilor Cassutt said she and Councilor Romero-Wirth were trying to balance efficiency with a lot of details and felt it should be worked out at the Committee level. Things are proposed and we can refer back to Staff, if needed. But redrafting at the Governing Body meeting was not good use of time. With the earlier public comment time, the Governing Body can consider changes from those comments while at the meeting.

She was also excited to have it fully drafted when the introduction was made. She was ready for questions and turned to Councilor Romero-Wirth.

Councilor Romero-Wirth acknowledged Councilor Abeyta, who worked with them on these proposed changes. He had worked on them for a couple of years and knew good governance and how to improve our processes with a more coherent structure that can be seen and understood by the public, with opportunity to comment when being able to address those problems. So, a public comment section was put in ahead of the consideration and a bill cannot be introduced until it was fully drafted so we know what it was about. And amendments follow the bill to the next committee so it can be fully crafted with amendments at the committee level before arriving at the Governing Body packet. It was part of good governance work identified when we had Jennifer Faubion present.

We had standing meetings for quite a few weeks (to work on the resolution) and Jennifer Faubion helped us see how other local governments do their work for best practices. Much thought and work went into this and there were quite a few amendments. She looked forward to considering them.

Councilor Romero-Wirth moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to approve the Resolution for procedural rules.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mayor Webber said that sets us up to consider the amendments and there are pages and pages of them. They each deserve considerations. We should move quickly in taking them up.

Ms. McSherry wanted to respond on the quasi-judicial section. She noted the specific terminology in the proposed rules for quasi-judicial were in the new rules at the bottom of page 16. The special rules deal with disclosures/recusals, etc. The new rules add the reference to appeals as a cross reference. The Council may want to look at those as well. She explained that having quasi-judicial roles in land use cases was a protection for the landowner. She pointed out that choosing to have the hearing as quasi-judicial is a decision for the Governing Body. She added that she could talk for a couple of hours on the quasi-judicial process but that was not on this agenda but a potential discussion for the future.

Mayor Webber asked for amendments in their order in the packet. The first was on page five.

Councilor M Garcia said his first amendment was on page 5 Section 4 – a 5, second line strike up and insert thereof - the reasoning it to have it 72 hours prior – sometimes creates burdensome load on Staff. With the amendment, he wanted to cosponsor but not without.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to amend the Resolution on page 5, Section 4, second line, to strike “up” and insert “in lieu thereof final votes for adoption. It is recommended that co-sponsorship be provided to Staff.”

Councilor M Garcia said the reasoning was to eliminate the proposal you have to sign on to the legislation 72 hours prior. He understood the justification given during the community process that is sometimes creates burdensome work on City Staff and that is where we (Councilor Villarreal and he) provided the language that it is recommended you provide your sponsorship 72 hours prior. But there will be instances where dependence on what the final language looks like. He said he wanted to cosponsor the Resolution - these proposed rules if it was adopted with this amendment but not without the amendment. He felt the opportunity for so-sponsoring should be available all the way up to adoption.

Mayor Webber asked him to read the language as if the amendment were adopted.

Councilor M Garcia said, “Governing Body members may add themselves as cosponsors of legislation until the final vote for adoption. It is recommended that so-sponsorship notification be provided to Staff 72 hours prior to the meeting when relevant legislation is scheduled for adoption.”

Mayor Webber recognized Councilor Cassutt.

Councilor Romero-Wirth raised a point of order to allow Councilor Villarreal, as cosponsor, to speak next.

Mayor Webber agreed.

Councilor Villarreal thought the Council knew this was a sticking point for her. Yes, we all try to let Staff know 72 hours prior to the meeting. But up to the final vote by the Governing Body we want to participate as cosponsors. Sometimes we need that flexibility.

Councilor Cassutt asked Mr. Guillen to speak to that. From her perspective, she thought when a person sponsors a bill, you are committing to moving it through the process. Not everyone can jump on at the crafting. But a lot of work goes on when moving the bill forward. Some amendments actually mitigate the process. And by the time it gets to the Governing Body all of us have a better idea how it looks and what amendments are going to change it. And there was still opportunity for councilors who believe in the spirit of the bill and the overall purpose and want to help structure it in the committee process with the option given to them to hold the bill for one meeting so that those amendments can be thought about and crafted and passed at that committee level before it passes on to the next. It does give individuals the opportunity to be a part of the massaging of the bill. For her, that was an important piece if you are going to get the credit for sponsorship to be part of the process.

Councilor Romero-Wirth added that for people listening without the bill in front of them, what we are saying that if you want to cosponsor a bill, as it is currently written, you will have to let Staff know you wanted to cosponsor 72 hours before the Governing Body meeting where the bill was on for final passage. She echoed Councilor Cassutt's words – that there was a difference between supporting a bill by voting for it and sponsoring a bill by working to shape it. You don't have to wait until you see the final version to know that you generally support it.

Her best example was the bill last year where the Governing Body raised hourly rates for City employees to \$15/hour. We all knew the Governing Body wanted it to happen. But there were problems, and we all had to work on it up to the last minute. She would like to leave this as it was and would ask Mr. Guillen to speak about why, if we don't let Staff know in advance of final passage that the Counselor will not get credit for sponsorship because it is not listed in the packet that way.

Mr. Guillen agreed. If someone wants to be added as a cosponsor when it is voted on, everything has already been published and that cosponsor would not show up on it.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said she does not support his amendment. Thanks.

Councilor M Garcia said Mr. Guillen's comments raised an interesting issue for him. In the past, amendments were proposed in the meeting that were not part of the packet that ultimately got adopted and then were lost. So, what Mr. Guillen is saying is that those amendments not ultimately part of the packet and were not included. He was concerned what happens then.

Mr. Guillen explained he was differentiating between sponsorship and amendments. Amendments affect the final outcome, but sponsorships do not. And all of those amendments included and are posted on the City website. But those are different processes.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said she was not talking about amendments. If you are sponsor of the amendment, it gets incorporated. If you sign on to a resolution and you, do it tonight, would it be reflected when someone went back to look at it?

Mr. Guillen said the request to be added as cosponsor would not show up on the agenda but would show up on the final adoption. With bills, once bills become ordinances, no sponsors are shown when it becomes law.

Councilor M Garcia understood that sponsors are listed on the website. He was hearing inconsistencies here. He searched for the STR one to see what the final product looked like and whether it showed sponsors. He thought an opportunity should be provided for the Council to shape the bill all the way up to adoption. The record should show the final sponsors.

Councilor Lindell did not feel particularly specific about this but heard the word "shaping the bill." She was respectful of that. If someone wants to be cosponsor at the vote, that was not shaping a bill. What are you doing at that time? For her, it was more philosophical. What is the purpose of co-sponsorship? What are you doing when you cosponsor a bill? Is it to get your name on the bill? Or get your name on the resolution? Or is it that you sign on early so you can help craft a bill? Otherwise, your vote shares your support.

Councilor Romero-Wirth clarified, if Councilors are working together to shape legislation, it can be no more than four Counselors trying to come up with a draft. There were four original sponsors of the STR legislation. It still must go through the process. For amendments to be made as it moves

through the process, Councilors should be able to sign on as cosponsors after introduction. Other Councilors can sign on as cosponsors if they just do it 72 hours ahead.

Councilor Villarreal agreed the 72 hours prior was important. In committees, when we said we want to be cosponsors, it sometimes gets lost. So, there are times when a few of us have said we wanted to cosponsor, and it isn't tracked and at the vote we have to repeat it again. She will strive to let staff know at 72 hours ahead.

Mayor Webber's question was about who gets credit for legislation. Presumably, when we add ourselves as cosponsor, it was something we wanted credit for. We want to be associated with it. If that was what was at stake, what is truth in advertising? if we wait until it passes and then ask to be listed as cosponsor, was that to tell one's constituents what you did? If you were willing to take credit, why not take the blame for it in its shaping, if you want to be honest with the voters? If you believe in it, why not take the credit or the blame for it?

Councilor Romero-Wirth thanked him for those words. By making our process linear and amendments attach as they move through, you would have a better understanding of the bill. We have 22 pages to work through tonight. Under the new rules, one would know ahead of time if they wanted to be a sponsor.

Councilor Chavez acknowledged she has a lot to learn and just wanted to ask questions. "I want to collaborate and claim what the bill involves. To support something was how I would vote." She said she wanted to know how to understand co-sponsorship. That would help us in decision-making.

Councilor Cassutt said the crux around the amendment was what should happen. Another one as an example of what matters would be CHART. All Councilors signed on to it, but it has been with many problems of amendments. We all believed in the philosophy and were willing to work behind it for what we truly believed in. There have been amendments that did not pass, and then the amender did not vote for the bill. You can also pull yourself off as a sponsor. That's always a possibility. You have that option.

Vote on the First Amendment

VOTE: **The motion to amend the Resolution failed (4-5) on the following Roll Call vote:**

For: Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Rivera, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Mayor Webber.

Second Amendment

The next amendment was on page 7 at the top of the page, proposed by Councilor M Garcia and Councilor Villarreal.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to approve amendment #2 to the Resolution on page 7, Section 4 c, first line, strike “but non unanimous” and the second part is item 3 on page 7 4c 4c, strike the second paragraph in its entirety.

Councilor M Garcia said the amended language would read, “Deny, with the majority voting denial of legislation moved to the subsequently scheduled committee or Governing Body.”

He said the intention of the amendment was that we speak so frequently of getting work done in the committee. What this ultimately does is it denies work to be done in committee. It is going to be a process that could ultimately lead to more staff time and more work by staff. When a committee denies proposed legislation, it should afford the sponsor and opportunity to potentially adjust or pivot their legislation accordingly so that when it hits the next committee, make the necessary changes, and potentially pass that committee instead of having to start from square one again. We should not be killing legislation and the committee process. We should be working on legislation in the committee process. That was why we ultimately proposed this amendment.

Councilor Villarreal said the whole intention was to have ability to work on legislation based on committee input. If there is a motion to deny, typically it would go on to the next committee to be able to have consideration. At that time, the sponsor could still make adjustments. The new language in the packet was if denied, it would stop the legislation from further consideration. That is why she supports this change.

Mayor Webber, to clarify, if the vote is to deny but the vote was not unanimous, it moves forward. Is that correct?

Councilor Cassutt agreed it was correct. If it was not a unanimous denial by all five members of the committee when it still goes to its next stop So, there was a difference between the 4-1 vote of denial to move on’ a unanimous 5

to 0 vote to deny with all members voting no and no members abstaining, would stop it from moving forward.

Mayor Webber used some examples to clarify the amendment for himself.

Councilor Romero-Wirth thanked Mayor Webber for clarifying the amendment. To clarify our intent with this, If a committee has all five councilors present, and all five councilors vote against a bill, it cannot move on to the next committee. That is what we are saying should happen. The thinking was that if there are five votes against a bill at the committee level, why would remove it on to the Governing Body when we know those five votes against would deny it in the Governing Body meeting. So, the sponsor would pull it back and work on it for the support it needed. This does shorten meeting times.

Councilor Cassutt commented that this was about focusing on good policy and not politics. Five members are a majority of the Governing Body. So, the sponsor would know they need to pull it back. The Committee does have some options.

The Committee can hold it and work on it. One person can abstain, and it will move forward to the next Committee. Although why forward it if you can't work on it?

Councilor M Garcia recalled a time when there was something you didn't agree with it and voted against it and the sponsor made changes and at the next committee meeting you voted for it. It could still lead to good policy. We should not kill that legislation. We are here to get the work done, not kill legislation.

Councilor Rivera asked Councilor Cassutt about one person abstaining that allowed it to move forward. He pointed out the definition on abstaining on page 21 and read that abstaining was counted with the majority.

Councilor Cassutt noted there was no Governing Body rule for that, so it defaulted to Roberts Rules of Order.

Ms. McSherry said the definition would take precedence. Using committee voting rules where it says a unanimous no vote would prevent it moving forward.

Mayor Webber understood the rule here was that an abstention was counted solely as an abstention.

Ms. McSherry said it would just not be a unanimous no vote.

Councilor Rivera accepted that.

Councilor Lindell couldn't remember a unanimous no vote in committee and she has been here more than seven years. If a legislation gets a 5-0 no vote the bill needs to be pulled and reworked and brought back. She didn't see shoving it forward with five votes against it.

Councilor Cassutt pointed out that it doesn't mean the concept cannot come back and be worked on. We've tried to get away from Robert's Rules of Order.

Councilor Villarreal agreed. It was helpful to say that. The way you describe it, it could kill a bill – that explanation helps me understand that it would not kill a bill completely. I wouldn't support this now.

The Governing Body briefly clarified further what reworking the bill might mean.

Ms. McSherry agreed that a substitute would accomplish not starting over completely.

Councilor M Garcia withdrew the motion and Councilor Villarreal withdrew her second.

Ms. McSherry suggested the Governing Body could lay the amendment on the table for purpose of changing the order.

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to lay Proposed Amendment Two on the table.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

At 10:00 p.m., Mayor Webber invited a decision on the remainder of the agenda. He asked Councilor Rivera for his opinion.

Councilor Rivera felt it could take us to 2 a.m. He wondered if there were timing issues on it. He favored postponing, especially with the Zoom problems tonight.

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to amend the agenda and postpone items 19 b and 19 c to a date certain of the next Governing Body meeting on January 26, 2022.

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor Rivera asked if these could be first item on the public hearings.

Ms. McSherry said that was appropriate. They are not supposed to go first under the new procedural rules but could be designated to be heard earlier on the agenda.

Mr. Guillen agreed that would work.

Councilor Cassutt asked what negative impact would happen by postponing these items. She wondered if the applicants would be negatively impacted.

The City Staff saw no problem with it. Director Kluck said he spoke with Ms. Jenkins who told him postponing would be no problem.

Jennifer Jenkins said, given the late hour and work still to be done, the applicants were fine with moving to the 26th and she appreciated being asked.

Mayor Webber thanked her for her understanding and apologized.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

MOTION: Councilor Cassutt moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to removed Item 19 a from the table.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Third Amendment

Mayor Webber said the third amendment was at the bottom of page 7, letter e – Councilor Romero-Wirth/Councilor Cassutt amendment –

MOTION: Councilor Cassutt moved, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth, to approve Amendment #3 to strike the public comment before the public hearing on page 7, e and that any new amendments proposed during the Governing Body meeting shall be provided in writing before discussion.

Councilor Cassutt explained this amendment was about when amendments must be written and included in the Governing Body packet. She said everyone needs to understand what was proposed as an amendment. We understand at times, an amendment would need to be proposed in the Governing Body meeting. But it needs to be drafted in writing and the amendment maker would draft it and email it to Ms. McSherry and Ms. McSherry would email it to all Governing Body members.

Ms. McSherry agreed that is absolutely the way it must happen so we can all look at it together. We can look at the actual recording to recognize it. And to save us from that, but it needs to be in writing.

Councilor Romero-Wirth thought it very important to know exactly what we are voting on, and the words need to be written out, so we agree on the wording.

Ms. McSherry pointed out that sometimes, punctuation was important too. So, it needs to be written and circulated.

Councilor M Garcia asked if it was to be done before discussion of the item or the amendment.

Councilor Cassutt agreed - before discussion on the amendment that it would be drafted in writing to discuss on its actual substance.

Councilor M Garcia asked if it should say, before discussion “of said amendment(s)...” to be understood in future councils.

Councilor Cassutt asked him to write that down to clarify the place.

Ms. McSherry suggested he could make that a motion.

Michael moved to amend the amendment before discussion of said amendment.

Mayor Webber read it as amendment. >>>> that was very clear. /Councilor Villarreal.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to amend the proposed amendment to insert after discussion “of said amendment(s)” ...

Discussion on the amendment of the amendment:

Councilor Rivera asked how it would appear in writing to the Governing Body and the public.

Mayor Webber clarified that he added three words.

VOTE: The amendment to the amendment was approved on the following Roll Call vote:

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Councilor Rivera suggested this change would probably be more difficult when the meetings are in person.

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic pointed out that the written amendment could be displayed on the chamber big screen. We have that capability in the chambers when we go back.

Councilor Rivera added that if the meeting was live, it could be displayed on the screen.

Ms. Bustos-Mihelcic explained that we have put all kinds of technical things in Chambers last year. We can use power point, slide shows, etc. We have added monitors in chambers. So, we could absolutely do that in chambers for anyone watching on Youtube or on the public television channel and also read it into the record for those listening to radio.

Councilor Rivera understood.

Councilor Rivera asked about possible delays. He had seen some take ten minutes to get drafted.

Ms. McSherry suggested the Governing Body could put it on the table at that point and bring it back when it was finished.

Mayor Webber commented on that point that what we are reading was a philosophy on how to do our business. While it could take more time, it would be an accurate record and not leave them unpolished. So, there was a tradeoff between speed and accuracy. Here the philosophy leans toward accuracy rather than speed.

Councilor Cassutt added that if an amendment was long enough it could be referred back to the committee. And consider it there. We didn't know how to draft that but that was always an option.

Mayor Webber asked Ms. McSherry if most drafting on the fly has been on Land Use cases.

Ms. McSherry agreed. It would apply to any ordinance, but it is a good practice regardless of the topic. She recommended it for helping Staff get it right.

Councilor Villarreal asked then if any conditions on Land Use Cases would have to be written out and distributed?

Ms. McSherry said yes. It would be very helpful to have them all in writing.

Councilor Villarreal saw conditions of approval as amendments and saw it applied to that as well.

Mr. Guillen noted that the section on amendments was under Legislative actions, so it was specific to legislation.

Ms. McSherry mentioned that delegation of authority to the Planning Commission, was separate. But at the Governing Body, amendments might not be on legislation. We would appreciate it all in writing to make sure what we vote on was part of the final draft.

VOTE: **The amended third amendment was approved on the following Roll Call vote:**

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #4:

Mayor Webber said the fourth amendment was in Section A-1-f to add the words, “or circumstance” proposed by Councilor Villarreal.

Councilor Villarreal said the amendment is simply to add those words.

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth, to approve the amendment adding “or circumstance” to Section A-1-f.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #5:

Mayor Webber said amendment #5 was on page 9, item 3 proposed by Councilor Villarreal

Councilor Villarreal said the amendment would utilize old language. It would state, with the amendment, “The Chief of Police or the Chief’s designee may serve as sergeant at arms at in-person meetings as needed.”

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor M Garcia, to approve Amendment #5 as stated.

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor Villarreal knew the Governing Body had not had the Chief of Police or anyone serving as sergeant at arms in the meetings. But in certain circumstances, when that was needed, this could be used, depending on the situation.

Councilor Cassutt said she had not been to many in-person meetings, but she disagreed with this change. She believed if someone were going to cause a disruption, they would not let us know ahead of time. Since those wanting to disrupt the meeting would not notify city Clerk beforehand to let

anyone know. She guessed this was the philosophy of prepare for the worst and hope for the best. She knew there were times when contentiousness was anticipated. The world has gotten a little bit crazy. There has been targeting toward government entities. And maybe that should behoove us to make sure we and other people in City Hall have some protection there.

Councilor Romero-Wirth agreed with Councilor Cassutt and agreed this was old language and we have not had a police presence at meetings in her tenure. But maybe we need to start that. We have seen headlines since January 6 of targeting of local governments and a potential for trouble and wanting to make sure elected officials and staff and the public are safe.

Councilor Villarreal saw that point of view of her colleagues but felt the Governing Body should not set a precedent like that. We've had it on the books and not had a sergeant at arms in her time on Council except for some threats in the past or when there is a prejudicial topic. She said for some people. Having a police presence helped when they needed to speak their mind on needed changes and public safety. Having a person with a gun present is comforting to some but for others, it might not. That was why she proposed "as needed" and should not be "shall" as it has been.

Councilor M Garcia could see both perspectives. With this amendment it still affords the opportunity for police presence if it is wanted. Nothing prohibits it. If we felt we needed that presence, we could request it. It affords other options for us. That was the way he read it.

Councilor Romero-Wirth pointed out that we are preempted from making our own gun laws at the local level and don't have the ability to prohibit guns in the chamber. She didn't believe one police officer stationed at the door would keep someone from testifying or intimidating if they are not right next to them.

Councilor Rivera agreed with Councilor Villarreal. Having a police presence might not be comfortable for some but not for others. And we have quite a police shortage at present. Like tonight, if we had not postponed, we would have a long night for police to be on duty. And he saw more risk from the back door from the hallway than anywhere else. He didn't know how a police officer in the back of the room would help us, if something were to happen. He thought there were other useful steps that could be taken. He agreed with the changes.

Mayor Webber agreed that we probably do need to have a discussion on security at some point. We don't have much in security measures.

Councilor Lindell said she had been in chambers when someone sat with a handgun 20 feet away from her for hours. It was horrifying and led to a

conversation in her home whether she should continue to do this job. It was awful but she thought Councilor Rivera and Mayor Webber's points make a good point. And we should consider a security plan in the future. So many things about that were uncomfortable. She was not sure a single police officer in chamber made any difference. We do need a discussion on security by the Governing Body. We are not able to stop people from coming into chamber with a gun. And until you have the experience, it was hard to describe. I hope we will take it seriously and make a plan on security, whatever we do, but do something.

Councilor Villarreal said that was what she was going to bring up. That situation was unnerving and made it hard to do business. She didn't feel safe.

Councilor Rivera asked Ms. McSherry or Councilor Romero-Wirth if the Legislature didn't ban firearms in Roundhouse.

Ms. McSherry said the prohibition is specifically for municipalities in the State Constitution.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said they did it with their own rule but preempted us from doing it.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, and Councilor Romero-Wirth.

Against: Councilor Villarreal and Councilor Cassutt.

Amendment #6:

Mayor Webber said amendment 6 was on page 11, Section D 3 c for a small grammatical correction.

Councilor Villarreal agreed.

MOTION: **Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to amend the resolution on page 11, Section D-3-c to change "Finding of Fact" to "Findings of Fact."**

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #7:

Mayor Webber said the next amendments were on page 14 with several amendments. The first was Amendment #7 in Section 1-c with different strikeovers in the same paragraph.

Councilor Villarreal had one minor change before that one on page 14 at the top. It was a grammatical change at #18.

Councilor Villarreal read it as, "The Governing Body holds a public hearing, debates, and votes on legislation requiring public hearings, except for Land Use cases that include legislation shall be heard under Public Hearings.

Mayor Webber thought the fix was ungrammatical.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said it should strike "for "and "that."

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth, to amend the resolution by strike "that" on page 14, item 18.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mayor Webber read the way it would read without "that" in the sentence.

Councilor Villarreal felt that was the appropriate language.

Councilor Chavez asked if she thought it was missing "which shall?"

Councilor Villarreal thought that would work best.

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to amend the resolution by inserting "which shall" after "Land Use Cases" on page 14, item 18.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #8:

Mayor Webber said Section G 1 c had several proposed amendments to the paragraph.

Councilor Romero-Wirth thought doing one of them would solve the paragraph.

Councilor M Garcia withdrew his proposed amendment because Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt's amendment was covering it.

Councilor Cassutt read how it would change.

MOTION: Councilor Romero-Wirth moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to amend the resolution by changing the paragraph G 1 c to read, "the Presiding Officer shall disallow comments or questions from the public that are not directed to the Governing Body. Governing Body members shall not respond to comments or questions from the public during Petitions from the Floor."

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #9:

Mayor Webber said the next amendment was to Section G 2 a - Executive Session, proposed by Councilor M Garcia.

Councilor M Garcia said the amendment was not written the way he intended so he read it as he intended. The first sentence was unchanged. The amendment would strike the second sentence and in the next sentence strike "In addition so it would read, "Any member of the Governing Body, at the conference of the City Manager and City Attorney, may direct the City Manager and City Clerk to place an executive session on the agenda. In

addition, any member of the Governing Body may move at any time to discuss the item on the table in immediate executive session.”

He said the Governing Body member should have the same rights as any other member of the Governing Body. The Mayor sits with us and is an equal member. That was his intention on the equity piece. We all need to have the same rights and treated equally. It allows any member, after consultation with the City Manager and City Attorney, the ability to place an item on the agenda as an executive session item.

Ms. McSherry pointed out that one councilor cannot direct the City Manager and she would not be able to sign off on what was just read.

Councilor M Garcia said that was why three members. It was still written in here that three members could direct ...

Ms. McSherry recommended against the three as well. She recommended just leaving that part out.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth, to amend the resolution by deleting the second sentence in Section G 2 a and the next sentence to read, “Any member of the Governing Body may move at any time to discuss any item on the table if this matter is appropriate for executive session.”

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor Lindell thought the way it now read would not allow to schedule an executive session ahead of a meeting.

Ms. McSherry did not think it disallowed a scheduled executive session.

Councilor Lindell reasoned the Mayor still has ability to request an Executive Session on the agenda.

Ms. McSherry agreed.

Councilor Romero-Wirth explained that all this does was to allow a Governing Body member to move to go into Executive Session. Any Governing Body could call of it. And this just acknowledges that.

Ms. McSherry agreed with that.

Councilor Rivera asked if this was just talking about items that are listed in executive session already.

Ms. McSherry said no, but for something like appointment of City Manager, for instance, a member could move to go into executive session during the meeting.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #10

Mayor Webber said the next amendment was on page 19 – B: Recusal From the Meeting, proposed by Councilor M Garcia.

Councilor M Garcia said his amendment was to add additional transparency to require a member to state the reason for recusal or what the conflict is.

MOTION: **Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to amend Section B on page 19 by inserting “and its nature” after “existence of a conflict...”**

Discussion on the Amendment:

Councilor Lindell was not supportive. If they say they cannot render a fair and impartial opinion, the reason may be personal and not needed to be public. A Councilor should not be forced but could give a reason if they chose to do so.

Councilor Romero-Wirth didn't think recusal was something an elected official would do lightly. She might seek the guidance of the City Attorney on it. She did not know why we would need to get into the reason or additional questioning to make sure it was a conflict. It was done rarely.

Councilor M Garcia noted we are elected officials and entrusted with the public trust and the public has a right to know why we refuse to do the public's work. He had to seek recusal for certain things and was told he had to state why. There was no reason why the Councilor couldn't say it was personal reason. He has to do it because of employment, and he thought the public has a right to know why.

Ms. McSherry said with the change proposed, she would not be able to provide guidance that it did not need to be announced. She gave several different interpretations of what conflict means. Without the amendment, it is left to the Councilor what the conflict means.

Mayor Webber was concerned about the 11:30 deadline and asked if this needs to be put on the table since the meeting won't be done by 11:30.

Ms. McSherry said that can happen any time.

MOTION: Councilor Romero-Wirth moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to suspend the rules.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Ms. McSherry didn't think she could give guidance to Councilors if they had a personal conflict.

Councilor Romero-Wirth favored letting Councilors decide on what to say about their recusal.

Mayor Webber asked Councilor M Garcia what kinds of things would fall into its nature.

Councilor Cassutt pointed out that recusals are rare and if someone was recusing enough and giving no reason, they might give people a good reason not to vote them back in.

Ms. McSherry pointed out two reason types for recusal – one was actual and the other a perceived bias. Under this amendment, it would not require a perceived conflict.

Councilor Rivera mentioned to Councilor M Garcia that when he gave reasons to disclose, he said he was sympathetic to personal reasons. This amendment does not discern between the two. I'm thinking about medically reasons for instance.

Councilor M Garcia acknowledged Councilor Romero-Wirth and Councilor Cassutt brought up good points on personal issues. The purpose is to bring about transparency. Most recusals would be about work or an interest in

something. It was not about digging up dirt or other personal matters. So, he asked what language would allow transparency and afford the City Attorney to provide guidance? "I'm open to suggestions. I want to bring more transparency to our process. What was the process? It has been brought up by the public. What was the issue? He asked for help in the language. Just saying I must recuse doesn't help the public."

Councilor Rivera just don't think every issue was as black and white as Councilor Garcia's reasons. Some could be extremely personal.

Councilor L Garcia said he liked transparency and believed the public should know much on our interests in the community. "I signed the ethics statement. When it comes to personal matters, I don't know what the wording could be, but something needs to be done when it comes to disclosing a conflict to the City. Some kind of a hybrid is needed."

Councilor Romero-Wirth thought if we don't approve this amendment, there is flexibility. anything besides business was just satisfying a curiosity. Allow people to say what they want to say about it.

Councilor Cassutt said if it was a personal reason it doesn't need to be disclosed. Allowing the flexibility was best. We cannot control all scenarios. How we want to conduct ourselves is a personal decision. It is a personal choice and allowing flexibility is important.

Councilor Chavez wanted to encourage transparency but also valued personal reasons and have that flexibility and deciding if disclosure was appropriate.

Mayor suggested language to accommodate that. Councilor L Garcia made a good point about ethics training. It could be an ethical violation or perceived as an ethical violation.

Ms. McSherry said definition of conflict is specific and she read it aloud.

Councilor M Garcia said personal reasons would not be a conflict.

Ms. McSherry clarified this was about actual conflict. She wanted to make sure everyone was aware of the definition.

Councilor M Garcia said the ones read were the black and white ones.

Ms. McSherry didn't agree with the privacy of personal issues needing to be disclosed.

MOTION: Councilor Lindell called the question, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, and Councilor Romero-Wirth.

Against: Councilor M Garcia and Councilor Villarreal.

VOTE: The amendment #10 failed on the following Roll Call vote:

For: None.

Against: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Abstain: Councilor M Garcia.

Mayor Webber agreed Councilor M Garcia should work on it.

Amendment #11:

Mayor Webber said next amendment was on page 19, Section C-1-a-i:

Councilor M Garcia said the language could be challenging for 3 councilors required to approve an amendment and 5 Councilors to pull it out. There should be opportunity for people to introduce competing amendments with constructive discussion on the competing amendments.

Moved to strike from C 1 a i leaving only one sentence.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal for discussion, to strike the sentence after “Approve.”

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor Romero-Wirth said we are trying here to get amendments to attach to the bill when voted at committee level. We could have adopted all these amendments at a committee level. They could still be pulled off with an amendment to strike them. “I had constituents call today to ask what

version we were considering tonight. But I said I didn't know the final version. We discussed all of this in committees and are now wasting our time.

Mayor Webber understood that as a bill moves through, amendments voted on in committee travel with the bill and don't have to be reconsidered at Governing Body meetings. We would see a bill that would presumably have been hammered into shape.

Councilor Romero-Wirth agreed - and we would have a linear process. For those attached here, nobody had a problem with them. We have the same hearing with the same Councilors and are wasting our time.

Mayor Webber thanked her for clarifying that.

Councilor Cassutt said the other piece to point out was that the linear process does change things. The committee has time to work on the amendments. We are trying to avoid exactly what has happened here tonight. And maybe we would not suspend our rules as much.

Ms. McSherry clarified the verbiage addressed if there was a change at the PWC meeting held right before the Governing Body meeting, but the others will already have been voted on. Packets could have been taken before an amendment was approved.

Councilor Villarreal said if amendments were approved at Finance and it went on and the next committee amendments were approved, what gets attached at the Governing Body? Was it every single change that was approved at a committee?

Councilor Romero-Wirth explained, as it moves through the Committee, it arrives at all of them. But one Committee could take off an amendment previously approved and the bill could arrive here with what to do about it.

Councilor Villarreal asked how we would keep track of it.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said she bet we would have much less to do here.

Councilor Villarreal asked if it was the most recent because it was the last committee and if it has all the amendments that were approved in committee. The most recent statement didn't make sense to her.

Mayor Webber clarified that it goes to Finance last. The last version as amended comes to the Governing Body. It was an attempt to bring a more finished product and the Governing Body doesn't need to consider all of them again.

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted the Governing Body is spending hours talking about the same stuff discussed at the committee. We can learn how things were taken off at Finance. We are trying to make better policy at the end of the day.

Councilor Villarreal observed that some are more political instead of thinking of the heart of the bill. She agreed this process needs to change. We are repeating things. But the amendment as it reads now doesn't make sense.

Councilor M Garcia said it was an amendment to undo what a prior committee did by three members.

Councilor M Garcia withdrew his amendment.

Mayor Webber moved on to the next amendment.

Amendment #12:

Councilor Cassutt noted that Councilor Villarreal had an amendment within it. She quoted Councilor Villarreal's language.

Councilor Villarreal moved to amend to say, "The motion approves legislation as most recently has been amended in Committee.

MOTION: Councilor Villarreal moved, seconded by Councilor Cassutt, to amend the language to say, "The motion approves legislation as most recently has been amended in Committee."

Discussion on the Amendment:

Councilor Villarreal said it needs Staff to track it for clarity.

Mayor Webber agreed, and the amenders also need to track them. He thought it would streamline things.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Amendment #13 and 14:

Mayor Webber saw on page 20 two amendments by Councilor M Garcia.

Councilor M Garcia said these changes provide just more equitable treatment among members. Replace “Council” with “Governing Body” and remove “Presiding Officer and...” It could potentially prove to have some rolling quorum issues.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to amend on page 20 C-3-e-i and iii by replacing “Council” with “Governing Body” and deleting “Presiding Officer and.”

Discussion on the Motion:

Councilor M Garcia pointed out there was nothing to prohibit the Clerk to inform the Presiding Officer or another Councilor. It could happen and could be an issue.

Councilor Cassutt agreed and giving warning for the one running the meeting doesn't have to be the Mayor of Mayor pro tem but whoever was presiding officer of the committee.

Councilor Romero-Wirth – this was a courtesy we give whoever was running the meeting. But maybe we need particular staff present too.

Councilor Villarreal the way we once did it was that the City Manager Staff could pull it off the agenda and have Staff at the meeting. This only allows the presiding officer and clerk to know about it.

Mayor Webber clarified this is not about the Consent Calendar. There was another part that speaks directly to Consent Calendar.

Mr. Guillen pointed out the locations.

Councilor Villarreal understood both sections were new. It feels like we are trying to control all scenarios.

Councilor Romero-Wirth said they took the language from another local government, and it seemed like a good idea. We are all serving with the best of intentions, and it seemed that informing people and not surprising them was a good idea.

Councilor Cassutt agreed. At times, substantial conversation might show up. We have had instances where information has helped but got to the

meeting and realized something was absent from the packet. And discussed for 30 minutes why it had to be postponed. With the 72-hour time for it to be posted, we would have time to notice a change to the agenda and what was not coming. It could save time. And was why we want no surprises.

Councilor Villarreal understood. But it seems we are trying to control all scenarios.

Councilor M Garcia saw the language in the consent agenda section. We use the word “should” and maybe it would best be changed to “encouraged.” He didn’t want the Executive micromanaging the Governing Body. That was what was going on here and he was trying to change it by notifying all Governing Body members instead of just the Mayor. Advance notice should be made to everyone.

Ms. McSherry said it is a technical issue. “The Executive” is in our charter and has different meaning but that was the Mayor. She explained what would make it a rolling quorum.

Councilor M Garcia wanted communications to be with the whole Governing Body not just Mayor and City Clerk. The City Clerk can ensure the right staff and all Governing Body members are notified.

Councilor Cassutt said we don’t always get all the information ahead of time. That is where we are going here. It is not about managing everything.

Mayor Webber thought the first one of Councilor M Garcia’s amendments makes good sense – to change Council to Governing Body and the Mayor is a member of it. The intentional surprises are about transparency - And transparency should trump politics.

Councilor M Garcia said for item iii – it deals with new information and in the future, these rules will be there but not the reasons for them being there. “I want information to be shared in an equitable manner.”

Councilor M Garcia decided to not strike “Presiding Officer and” in both i and iii.

Ms. McSherry asked the motion to be retracted first.

Councilor M Garcia withdrew his first motion and Councilor Villarreal withdrew her second.

MOTION: Councilor M Garcia moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to amend n page 20 C-3-e-i and iii by replacing “Council” with “Governing Body.”

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

Mayor Webber noted an amendment by Councilor Lindell for a public review.

Councilor Lindell said it was just a clear amendment to see how this works on the public comment and she had nothing to add to that. It is just asking for a review.

Mayor Webber invited her motion.

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Villarreal, to approve an amendment on page 2, line 11 of the Resolution to add a new paragraph, “Be it further resolved that the provisions of Section IV B, First Public Comment on Bills, shall be reviewed within one year of adoption of this Resolution.”

Discussion on the motion:

Councilor Villarreal asked who tracks these things. We have ordinances and things where we say we will come back in two years. She didn’t know if it was the City Manager but would like someone to track it so we will actually come back in a year to review this.

Ms. McSherry said the way it is written it is an obligation of the Governing Body. That was one reason this sort of thing doesn’t always get done.

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

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: Councilor Romero-Wirth.

Mayor Webber said we now need a vote on the main motion as amended.

VOTE: **The Resolution as amended was approved on the following Roll Call vote:**

For: Mayor Webber, Councilor Cassutt, Councilor Chavez, Councilor L. Garcia, Councilor M. Garcia, Councilor Lindell, Councilor Rivera, Councilor Romero-Wirth, and Councilor Villarreal.

Against: None

b. **Case #2021-4244.** 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Rezoning. JenkinsGavin, Inc., Agent, for Homewise Inc., Owner, Requests Approval of a Rezoning from R-5 (Residential – Five Dwelling Units Per Acre) to R-7 (Residential – Seven Dwelling Units Per Acre) for a Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street. The property was Located within the West Santa Fe River Corridor Overlay District and was Approximately 2.01 Acres. (Lee Logston, Case Manager, lrllogston@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6136)

1. CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2022-1. ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 2022-_____.

An Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Santa Fe and Changing the Classification from R-5 (Residential - Five Dwelling Units Per Acre) to R-7 (Residential - Seven Dwelling Units Per Acre) with Respect to a Certain Parcel of Land Comprising Approximately 2.01 Acres Located at 2190 West Alameda Street (Case No. 2021-4244, 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Rezoning).

2. Request for Approval of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Regarding Case #2021-4244 in the Matter of the Property Located at 2190 W. Alameda Street; Los Canales Rezoning.

This case was postponed to the next Regular Governing Body Meeting.

c. **Case #2021-4245.** 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Final Development Plan. JenkinsGavin, Inc., Agent, for Homewise Inc., Owner, Requests Approval of a Final Development Plan for Fourteen Residential Units for a Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street. The Property is Located within the West Santa Fe River Corridor Overlay District and is Approximately 2.01 Acres. (Lee Logston, Case Manager, lrllogston@santafenm.gov, 505-955-6136)

1. Request for Approval of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Regarding Case #2021-4245 in the Matter of the Property Located at 2190 West Alameda Street Los Canales Final Development Plan.

This case was postponed to the next Regular Governing Body Meeting.

20. **ADJOURN**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Governing Body, the meeting was adjourned at 1:06 a.m.

Approved by:



Mayor Alan Webber

ATTESTED TO:



Kristine Bustos Mihelcic, City Clerk

Respectfully submitted by:



Carl G. Boaz, Council Stenographer



**GOVERNING BODY MEETING OF
January 12, 2022
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS SCHEDULED FOR INTRODUCTION
BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

**EXHIBIT ONE
January 12, 2022**

Mayor Alan Webber

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*
	A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE FUNDING PRIORITIES BASED ON THE POTENTIAL AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING.	Finance Committee – 1/18/22 Quality of Life Committee – 1/19/22 Public Works and Utilities Committee – 1/24/22 Governing Body – 1/26/22

Councilor Jamie Cassutt

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*
	A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS BY THE NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE FOR NEW MEXICO-GROWN FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR SCHOOL AND SENIOR MEALS PROGRAMS AND RELATED EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SCHOOLS AND FARMERS.	Quality of Life Committee – 1/19/22 Public Works and Utilities Committee – 1/24/22

Councilor Amanda Chavez

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*

Councilor Michael J. Garcia

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*
	A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 2020-14 TO CHANGE THE LOCATION OF THE BANNERS COMMEMORATING “HOMETOWN HEROES” ALONG THE CERILLOS ROAD CORRIDOR BETWEEN I-25 AND RODEO ROAD TO BETWEEN I-25 AND THE INTERSECTION OF ST. MICHAELS DRIVE AND OSAGE AVENUE.	Quality of Life – 1/19/22 Public Works and Utilities Committee – 1/24/22 Governing Body – 1/26/22

Councilor Signe I. Lindell

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*

Councilor Chris Rivera

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*
	A RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING SEVERE OR EXTREME DROUGHT CONDITIONS EXIST IN THE CITY OF SANTA FE; IMPOSING FIRE RESTRICTIONS FROM JANUARY 27, 2022 TO FEBRUARY 24, 2022; RESTRICTING THE SALE OR USE OF	Quality of Life Committee – 1/19/22 Public Works and Utilities Committee – 1/24/22

**FIREWORKS WITHIN THE CITY OF SANTA FE AND
PROHIBITING OTHER FIRE HAZARD ACTIVITIES.**

Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*

Councilor Renee Villarreal

Co-Sponsors	Title*	Tentative Committee Schedule*

* Subject to change

Introduced legislation will be posted on the City Attorney's website, under legislative services. If you would like to review the legislation prior to that time or you would like to be a co-sponsor, please contact Jesse Guillen, 505-955-6518, jbguillen@santafenm.gov or Jeff Norris, 505-955-6692, jtnorris@santafenm.gov.