ATTENTION PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES:
The meeting room and facilities are fully accessible to persons with mobility disabilities. If you plan to attend a meeting and need an auxiliary aid or service, please contact the City Clerk’s office at 599-1101 or 599-1106, prior to the meeting so arrangements can be made.

AGENDA

Tuesday, June 11, 2019 - 4:00 p.m.
HQ, 119 W. Main Street
Farmington, NM

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the May 14, 2019 Minutes

3. Discussion and Recommendation on pursuing a Certified Local Government, CLG

4. Main Street Complete Streets Update – Sherry Roach

5. Downtown Farmington Update – Michael Bulloch

   Business From:
   a. Floor
   b. Chair
   c. Members
   d. Staff

6. Adjournment
Questions:

1. Community involvement in drafting the ordinance – support/opposition from the public/business.
   Leslie was not in her position at the time the CLG designation was made.

2. Once the CLG was established: Was it embraced by the public: by business? How well is it working?
   She is not aware of any opposition at the time the CLG designation was adopted. She sees the CLG designation only as a positive with no negatives.

3. What were the original goals for establishing the CLG? Was it largely to protect existing historic properties? OR Mostly a vision for future development?
   The initial goals are unknown to her, but the requirements for compliance from the SHPO (Karla) are actually helpful in keeping up to date with work load.

4. Could these goals be achieved by zoning, building inspection or similar ordinances?
   Unknown to her.

5. What has been the economic impact of the CLG: largely beneficial? Just Okay? OR burdensome?
   Leslie is a City employee and she handle other duties beside the CLG. She also has a background in development and can usually act as the “professional” for historic designations. Therefore the only cost is that portion of her usual salary to cover this duty.
   She is so busy processing applications from the existing overlay zones that there is no time to inventory and consider adding additional zones that she feels should be added.

6. Were you successful in receiving Historic Preservation Grants? If so, do you regard these as useful, successful, of limited value, or not worth the effort.
   The grants from the state are very helpful, especially when they need to hire a consultant to cover topics outside her expertise (completing surveys, research certain nominations) or when she does not have the time to complete them herself. Some grants are worth $1500 to $2000 but require matching money which is sometimes difficult to get from the municipal government. It is important to note that staff time and cost are considered as part of the match for most grants.

7. With regard to maintenance of the CLG relationship with SHPO and NPS: Compliance with rules and reporting is - easy, tolerable, or considered a burden?
   Her biggest problem is not complying with the SHPO and NPS requirements, but rather keeping the surveys and historic designations up to date. It is a constant educational effort to keep property owners appraised of their property’s status and to be sure they understand the
significance and benefits of historic designation. This becomes a real problem when a property's ownership changes and the new owner is not aware of the designation and the CLG has little way of tracking the ownership change.

8. What is the yearly expense to maintain the CLG?

As mentioned above, she is the staff person for what is known as the Landmark and Urban Conservation Commission. The Albuquerque City Councilors have sustained this effort by contributing funds from their annual discretionary budget allotment from the City.
Certified Local Government Findings

What are the advantages to joining the CLG Program?

- Technical assistance (more robust)
  - CLGs receive technical assistance in historic preservation through training, information materials, statewide meetings, workshops, and conferences.
- Direct participation in the National Register nomination process
  - CLGs participate with the State Register of Cultural Properties and the National Register of Historic Places by reviewing local nominations prior to their consideration by the state Cultural Properties Review Committee;
- Eligibility to apply for annual grant funds
  - Upon certification, local governments become eligible to apply for federal historic preservation grants;
  - State is allocated approximately $80,000 a year for the state's 10 CLGs (Currently a 50/50 matching fund)
- Establishing a local community policy towards historic preservation;
  - Establishment of a local ordinance / preservation commission that provides greater control over local preservation concerns
    - The ordinance guidelines can be either binding or advisory
    - The preservation mandates can be either by owner consent or mandatory
    - Must be approved by council and will be citywide

Funding opportunities:

Individual grant awards for the CLG Grant Program are estimated to be between $5,000 and $24,999.

All awards will be paid on a reimbursable basis only. The grantee must have the necessary financial resources available to fund and complete the total project. NMHPD will then reimburse the grantee for eligible project costs. These costs may be included in the local match. Eligible matching costs include:

- Project costs paid by the grantee during the project period;
- Project costs financed with cash contributed or donated to the grantee by other non-federal third parties, including other public agencies, institutions, and private organizations and individuals;
- Project costs represented by services and personal property, or use of these, contributed or donated by non-federal third parties during the project period.

New Mexico's nine Certified Local Governments (the City of Albuquerque, The Village of Columbus, the City of Deming, the City of Las Vegas, the County of Lincoln, the City of Santa Fe, the Village of Santa Clara, the Town of Silver City, and the Town of Taos) are eligible to apply for grants.
Certified Local Government Findings

How to get certified?

- Certification happens jointly through steps by local, State, and Federal Governments:
  1. Contact your State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and ask for the CLG Coordinator. They will assist your community in understanding the requirements and application process.
     a. Once a preservation ordinance and preservation commission have been established meeting the requirements outlined above a community may request certification, in writing, to HPD. The application for certification should include a copy of the preservation ordinance, a list of commission members, commission members' resumes, how the commission will be staffed, a draft Certification Agreement, a CLG checklist, a Request for Certification, and list/maps of designated historic properties.
  2. Submit completed application to the SHPO, who will approve and forward to the National Park Service (NPS).
     a. Once HPD reviews the application and finds it complete and that it complies with program requirements the application will be sent to the National Park Service for their review and certification.
  3. Certification occurs with NPS approval and written notification to the State and the Local Government.

What are the responsibilities of a CLG?

1. Establish a qualified historic preservation commission.
2. Enforce appropriate state and local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties. In most cases this is done in the form of a local ordinance.
3. Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of local historic resources.
4. Facilitate public participation in the local preservation program, including participation in the National Register nomination process.
5. Follow additional requirements outlined in the State of New Mexico CLG Manual.

What are design guidelines?

Design guidelines are a set of criteria established for a designated historic district that outline how buildings shall be treated when construction projects are being considered. Communities that are not ready to adopt an ordinance may opt for a less comprehensive approach by developing guidelines for voluntary use. While good examples of design guidelines are available in other communities a community considering design guidelines should develop guidelines that reflect the architecture and design elements in its own community.
1. **Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chair John McNeill, and there being a quorum, the following proceedings were duly had and taken.

2. **Approval of the April 16, 2019 Minutes**
A motion was made by Commissioner Dykeman and seconded by Commissioner Tanis to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2019 meeting. The motion passed unanimously 5-0.

3. **Proposed Bike Lane Changes - Isaac BlueEyes and Mark Hathcock**
Isaac BlueEyes, City Traffic Engineer, with Mark Hathcock, Associate Traffic Engineer, presented a PowerPoint presentation on Accessible Improvement Ideas for on Street Bikeways. Mr. BlueEyes explained the current bike lanes and the proposed changes. The proposal for Miller Avenue will consist of restriping the lanes. Tucker Avenue will have two flashing beacons at the Main and Tucker crossings. There is a proposed new Animas Park shared use path as well. These proposals were approved by City Council and funding is available.
Mr. BlueEyes explained a focus on four additional areas for bike lanes. These areas include a road diet along Sullivan Avenue between 20th Street and 30th Street and a road diet between Main Street and San Juan Boulevard, narrowing lanes on 20th Street between Sullivan Avenue and Carlton, Bisti Bay Connectivity, and Main Street Connectivity.

The total cost for the bike lane changes approved by City Council, said Mr. BlueEyes, is $23,250.

4. Discussion and Recommendation on Project Priorities for the Implementation of the MRA Plan
   a. Develop a questionnaire for existing business owners in the Animas District
      Commissioner McNally said she is interested in working with Commissioner Tanis to put together an inventory on the existing property and business owners in the Animas District. Chair McNeill referenced Bobby Kimball, City GIS Supervisor, as someone who should be able to help with the project.
   b. Develop better understanding and eventual map of available/future utilities within the Animas District
      Commissioner McNally said she would like to have a better understanding of the utilities and infrastructure within the Animas District in terms of phone lines, fiber optics, buried cable, storm sewer, and water supply. Ms. McNally said she would like to have this information to have a better idea of what is currently available and what can be done.

Commissioner Tanis agreed with Ms. McNally as it would help with the promotion of the Animas District in terms of locating businesses in the area. Ms. Tanis said she would like to educate property owners on what is happening in the MRA and how to involve them in what is going on in the community.

Chair McNeill asked Ms. McNally and Ms. Tanis to team up and work on these projects.

Dr. McNeill said he and Ms. McNally will be meeting with the temporary City Planner, Cindy Lopez, to discuss possible changes that can be made in the Animas District to help promote the area after the completion of the Complete Streets Project.

Chair McNeill noted MRA projects that are currently in the process of implementation such as the bike trails and connectivity, the food hub, the transit center which is waiting on funding, and the CLG, Certified Local Government, which will be discussed by Commissioner Dykeman.

Commissioner Dykeman presented a handout summarizing a CLG survey that was conducted in Las Vegas, NM, Los Alamos, NM, and Santa Clara, NM. Discussion ensued with those municipalities concerning the feasibility and benefits of a CLG. The municipalities recommended working with SHIPO, the State Historic Preservation Office, Mr. Dykeman asked that more discussion be continued at next month’s meeting to look into pursuing a CLG for Farmington.

Chair McNeill suggested having city staff look into the possibility of a CLG for Farmington. Dr. McNeill’s understanding was that a professional consultant would be
required to research historic designations and work on applications for these designations. The Commissioners agreed to have Warren Unsicker, City Economic Development Director, look into the next steps to pursue a CLG.

5. **Discussion and Recommendation for a Fence for the Palmer House**
Bart Wilsey, Gateway Museum Director, discussed three proposals for a 6-foot wrought iron fence to be placed around the Palmer House located on N. Allen Avenue across from the Civic Center. The need for the fence, said Mr. Wilsey, is to protect the building. The Commissioners recommended the first illustration listed in the May 14, 2019 Agenda Book. The recommendation was unanimous, 5-0.

6. **Discussion and Recommendation to Apply for EPA Recreation Economy for Rural Communities Grant for Main Street**
Warren Unsicker said the Recreation Economy for Rural Communities Grant would allow the evaluation and examination of the downtown MRA District, particularly the Animas District. It would help to utilize and integrate outdoor recreation and find ways to connect downtown to the river area as well as attract manufacturing. Mr. Unsicker said the grant would bring in people from the EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, to provide work sessions and give insight on the implementation of the next steps to move forward. Mr. Unsicker asked the MRA Commissioners for their recommendation to City Council to apply for the grant.

There was a unanimous consensus of recommendation from the MRA Commissioners, 5-0.

7. **Main Street Complete Streets Update—Sherry Roach**
Sherry Roach said the Main Street Complete Streets construction project is progressing. Storm water issues are being addressed. Some of these issues may be costly to design and to complete due to various constraints.

The offsite signage to divert truck traffic from Main Street will be finalized soon based on the Traffic Assessment Report.

Ms. Roach said the Crime Data for April is similar to last month. Crime is at a minimum in the MRA District. Police will be on foot, bike, and in vehicles downtown. During the summer, park rangers will also be patrolling the parks.

Ms. Roach mentioned a recent seminar on Developing Commercial Properties in the Downtown Area. The seminar was well attended. Topics discussed included historic preservation and historic tax credits, restoration, and remodels. The result was to inspire property owners on what they can do with their vacant spaces to make them more attractive to potential customers. Ms. Roach noted a handout from the Village of Santa Clara, a PowerPoint presentation on Historic Tax Credits, and a questionnaire from the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division.

Ms. Roach mentioned a Survey Monkey survey on the City’s Facebook page asking citizens what they would like to see in the downtown area. Commissioner Dykeman suggested opening the downtown theater.
8. **Downtown Farmington Updates**

Michael Bulloch said there will be a Community Visioning meeting for the Harvest Food Hub and kitchen on May 30, 2019 from 5:30-7:30 at 119 W. Main Street to discuss a commercial kitchen incubator.

Judy Casselberry said Erin Havens is the Project Manager for the Food Hub. She said San Juan College was given a $565,000 grant to be used over five years to provide funding for people and equipment for a Food Hub. Ms. Casselberry is asking the City for help in providing the space for the commercial kitchen. Currently, said Ms. Casselberry, the group is looking at the building previously used by The Roof.

Erin Havens said the Food Hub would be used as an aggregation and distribution center for local produce so farmers can bring their produce to a central location. The local produce can be used by schools, restaurants, and local industries. The idea is to pilot a program this summer. Ms. Casselberry said that people would be able to test their product with a retail element that would be open to the public. There has also been discussion on a commercial garden. Mr. Unsicker said the City is discussing issues that need to be addressed to provide for the needs of the Food Hub.

Mr. Bulloch said the next ACD, Arts and Cultural District, Team meeting is scheduled for June 12, 2019. A follow up meeting will be scheduled with Michelle Negrette from New Mexico MainStreet to discuss the Economic Transformation Strategy.

Farmington did not make it into the semifinals for the America’s Main Street contest.

Approximately $18,000 was requested from the AARP grant for the Breezeway Plaza Project. AARP is expected to respond by the end of June. Mr. Bulloch said he is trying to obtain wood pallets to build chairs, benches, and planters for the plaza. The existing concrete planters on Main Street may be used as part of the design for the Breezeway Plaza.

Mr. Bulloch said he and Ms. Roach were at the Downtown booth for the Farmington Convention and Visitor’s Bureau Daycation event last Friday. A prize package was put together from local businesses.

San Juan Country Club was interested in partnering game nights with Game Changers.

The New Mexico Resiliency Alliance just opened its 2019 Resilient Communities Grant cycle. Proposals are due by June 3, 2019. In addition to their $5,000 grants, they will award up to $10,000 to two communities with a 50% required match.

Mr. Bulloch said the Secret Garden project for $5,000 is being discussed. A match would come from Karen Ellsbury and Patrick Hazen. Other options were discussed concerning proposals related to Economic Vitality. Mr. Bulloch said the secret Garden could be a catalytic economic development project.
The Commissioners and staff discussed the possibility of 505 Cycles opening his business in the downtown area.

The Downtown Makers Market begins Thursday, June 6, 2019 and runs through the end of October.

The Summer Art Walk is June 14, 2019 from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Ms. Roach said she is discussing the possibility of demonstrating the road diet approved for the Complete Streets Project during the Art Walk.

9. **Business from:**
   a. **Floor** - There was no business from the Floor.

   b. **Chair** - Chair McNeill asked to have the June MRA meeting moved to June 11 as he will be unavailable on June 18 for the regularly scheduled meeting. The Commissioners agreed to move the June meeting to June 11, 2019. The change will be advertised for the public.

   c. **Members** - Commissioner Dykeman asked what was happening at 401 Auburn Ave. Karen Walker said there is a zone change request for that property. The petition is being handled by Helen Landaverde. Chair McNeill asked that it be brought to the attention of Ms. Landaverde that the MRA Commissioners would like to hear about any changes to properties in the MRA.

   d. **Staff** - There was no business from Staff.

10. **Adjournment:**
    A motion was made by Commissioner Tanis and seconded by Commissioner Mills to adjourn. The Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency Board of Commissioners meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.


___________________________________    ____________________________________
John McNeill, Chair       Karen Walker, Administrative Assistant
Accessible Improvement Ideas for on Street Bikeways

Opportunities For on Street New Bikeways Without Widening the Street

- **Bike Lanes**
  A. Use shoulder as a Bike Lane, OR
  B. Narrow lanes and make space for new Bike Lanes, OR
  C. Road Diet to make space for new Bike Lanes

- **Shoulders** - Restripe and add shoulder lanes
  A. Narrow lanes and make space for new shoulder, OR
  B. Road Diet to make space for a new shoulder
  C. Preferably 6 feet wide

- **Shared Lanes** - Recommendations
  A. Should be Low Volume Streets and Low Speed Streets
  B. At least 2 lanes in each direction to act as a "passing lane" for motor vehicles
  C. Wide lanes are preferable

Things To Keep In Mind

- **Speed on Level Terrain**
  - 8-15 MPH (average)

- **Speed on Downhill**
  - 20 -30 MPH (average)

- **Speed Uphill**
  - 2 - 10 MPH (average)

- At least 4 feet for Bike Lanes, 6 feet better
  - Uphill grades should be wider than downhill grades if Bike Lanes cannot be equal
The Focus
Finding the Most Easily Obtained Connections Without Widening the Roadway or Right-of-Way Acquisition

PART 1 – Along Animas River Trail
1. Miller Avenue (MRA)
2. Tucker Avenue
3. New Animas Park Shared Use Path
   * Broadway

PART 2 – Near New City Facilities & City-Wide
4. Sullivan Avenue
5. 20th Street
6. Blas Bay Water Park
7. Main Street (MRA)

Connectivity Near Animas River
1. Miller Avenue - Between Murray Drive and Broadway
2. Tucker Avenue at Veterans Memorial Park
3. New Animas Park Shared Use Path
   * Broadway

1. Miller Avenue:
   Between Murray Drive to Broadway
   Existing Conditions
   • Within MRA
   • Minor Arterial Street
   • 4,500 ADT
   • 35 MPH
   • Minimum Street Width is approximately 40 feet
   • 3 Lane Street:
     1. Southbound Lane = 12 feet
     2. Center Median Lane = 16 feet
     3. Northbound Lane = 12 feet
1. Miller Avenue: Continued Recommendation

2. Tucker Avenue: Current and Recommended Conditions to Access to Veterans Memorial Park and the Animas River Trails

3. New Animas Park Shared Use Path

(*) Broadway: Butler Avenue to Cedar Street - Existing Conditions
(*) Broadway: Continued Recommendation

- Remove raised concrete median only on Broadway from Cedar Street to Lake Street and install asphalt for repaving. No ROW acquisition required.
- This would increase connectivity for nearby bike lanes:
  1. Carlton Avenue
  2. Southside River Road
  3. Scott Avenue and
  4. Animas River Trails

Part 1: Summary - Recommendations for River Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Facility</th>
<th>System Recommended for Bike Facility Improvements</th>
<th>Bike Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Miller Ave (MMN)</td>
<td>Restriping of Lanes: Two 4-ft Bike Lanes, Two 11-ft Travel Lanes, One 10-ft Center Median</td>
<td>New Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$2,700.00 Water Rerouting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tucker Ave</td>
<td>Access to Veterans Memorial Park and the Animas River Trail</td>
<td>Shared Lanes</td>
<td>$11,000.00 2 Flashing Crossing Beacons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Animas Park Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Access to Animas Park from the South</td>
<td>Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Owner to Incor Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Broadway</td>
<td>Median Removal</td>
<td>Shared Use Path</td>
<td>$161,300.00 Razed Median Domes, Water Shooting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Areas**

5. Sullivant Avenue
6. 25th Street
7. East Way East Park
8. Allen Street
5A) North Sullivan Avenue
Between 20th Street and 30th Street
- Currently 4 Lanes
- 5,988 ADT (Highest ADT in 2007 - 6,010)
- Recommended Road Diet:
  - Go from 4-lanes to 2-lanes with Bike Lanes
  - Match Sullivan Avenue near Aquatic Center

5B) South Sullivan Avenue
Between Main Street and San Juan Boulevard
- Currently 4 Lanes (Raised Median)
- Low ADT
- Recommended Road Diet:
  - Go from 4-lanes to 3-lanes with Bike Lanes
  - Match Sullivan Avenue near Aquatic Center

5A) Sullivan Road Diet: Between 20th Street and 30th Street
- 5,428 ADT
- Street width approximately 48 feet
- Meets NMCDOT Road Diet Guidelines

5B) Sullivan Road Diet: Between Main Street and San Juan Boulevard
- 2,856 ADT
- Street width approximately 60 feet including raised median
- Meets NMCDOT Road Diet Guidelines

6. 20th Street Revitalization
Between Main St and Sullivan Ave
- After new paving, two 6-ft Bike Lanes were added
- Success in improving bicycle connectivity to:
  - Farmington Public Library
  - Allen B Theaters
  - Boys and Girls Club
  - Restaurants and business
  - Other bike facilities

Recommend Restriping Next Block of 20th Street
- Restripe between Sullivan Ave and Crollon Ave
- Add two 4-ft Bike Lanes
- This will improve bicycle connectivity to:
  - Defined Fitness
  - Restaurants and business
  - Phase 1 and 2 of 20th Street Revitalization

Estimated Cost
5,428 ADT: $3,300.00
2,856 ADT: $850.00
Restriping and add 2 Bike Lanes: $1,600.00
7. Connect Bisti Bay Water Park to New 20th Street Bike Lanes

Recommendation For Bike Connectivity Between 5. Sullivan Avenue, 6. 20th Street, and 7. Bisti Bay Water Park

8. Main Street (MRA)
Between Auburn Avenue and Court Avenue

8. The 3 Sections of Main Street
### Parts 1 & 2 Total Estimated Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Broadway &amp; Section 2 of Main St. Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Without Broadway &amp; Section 2 of Main St. Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller Ave (MRA)</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>Miller Ave (MRA)</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>$181,200.00</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>$181,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Ave</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>Tucker Ave</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sullivan Ave</td>
<td>$3,100.00</td>
<td>North Sullivan Ave</td>
<td>$3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sullivan Ave</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>South Sullivan Ave</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th St - Sullivan Ave to Carlton Ave</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>20th St - Sullivan Ave to Carlton Ave</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St - Section 1 (MRA)</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
<td>Main St - Section 1 (MRA)</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St - Section 2 Proposal</td>
<td>$1,400,000.00</td>
<td>Main St - Section 2 Proposal</td>
<td>$1,400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St - Section 3 Proposal</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>Main St - Section 3 Proposal</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$1,584,550.00</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$373,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Program for Fiscal Year 2019/2020

**Bike Lanes**
1. Broadway Between Murray Drive and Rincon Street
   - Dedicated shoulder lane as Bike Lane – Summer 2019

**Shoulder Lanes – Per Traffic Calming**
1. Fairview Between Main Street and 20th Street
   - Wide street, add shoulder striping – Summer 2019
2. Municipal Drive Between 20th Street and 30th Street
   - Wide street, add shoulder striping – Summer 2019
3. Villa View Drive Between Main Street and Fortuna Drive
   - Wide street, add shoulder striping – Summer 2019
4. Carlton Avenue Between 30th Street and Butler Avenue
   - Wide street, add shoulder striping – Summer 2019

### Other Additional Suggested but not Included Long Range Unfunded Ideas (Forwarded to MPO Bike Plan)

**Shared Lanes**
1. East Main Street Between Piner Hills Boulevard and Villa View Drive
2. Etiwanda Avenue Between Gladiolus Street and Paeon Place (Anitas Valley Mall) and through the Mall to Beckland Drive
3. Fairview Avenue Between 20th Street and Cliffwood Drive
4. Airport Drive (Municipal Drive) Between Main Street and Navajo Street
5. Wool Avenue Between Main Street and Apache Street
6. Municipal Drive Between Gladiolus and 20th Street
Certified Local Government Survey - Summary

Farmington MRA Commissioners Dr. John McNeil and Doug Dykeman conducted phone interviews with three Certified Local Governments (CLG) in New Mexico. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain information on the benefits and problems associated with setting up and operating a CLG program. The CLG programs interviewed are: City of Las Vegas, Los Alamos County, and Santa Clara Village. One set of questions was used for each of the three interviews.

The following is a summary of the interviews, however the results of individual interviews are attached.

**Community involvement in drafting the ordinance – support/opposition from the public/business.**

- Las Vegas – N/A
- Los Alamos – Public outreach included Fact Sheets and Community events (Farmers Market) resulted in no opposition at City Council. Citizens stood up in favor of the ordinance
- Santa Clara – Little public input.

**Once the CLG was established: Was it embraced by the public: by business? How well is it working?**

- Las Vegas – Enthusiastic support of business and public has resulted in significant increases in City tax revenues.
- Los Alamos – Public outreach continues, and close working relationships have been developed with interested entities.
- Santa Clara – Business and residential property owners have shown interest in the program. General support of public is good.

**What were the original goals for establishing the CLG? Was it largely to protect existing historic properties? OR Mostly a vision for future development?**

- Las Vegas – Both, historic preservation and economic development.
- Los Alamos – Primarily historic preservation.
- Santa Clara – Primarily economic development.

**Could these goals be achieved by zoning, building inspection or similar ordinances?**

- Las Vegas – No
- Los Alamos – Not Easily
- Santa Clara – CLG is better method.

**What has been the economic impact of the CLG: largely beneficial? Just Okay? OR burdensome?**

- Las Vegas – Highly beneficial.
- Los Alamos – No Data
- Santa Clara – Unknown
Were you successful in receiving Historic Preservation Grants? If so, do you regard these as useful, successful, of limited value, or not worth the effort.

Las Vegas – Very Successful in obtaining CLG grants.
Los Alamos – No CLG grant yet. But two grants directly from Park Service
Santa Clara – CLG grant was obtained to create the CLG

With regard to maintenance of the CLG relationship with SHPO and NPS: Compliance with rules and reporting is - easy, tolerable, or considered a burden?

Las Vegas – CLG reporting is easy, Grant documentation is much more complicated
Los Alamos – CLG reporting is easy
Santa Clara – CLG reporting is easy
Important! Must work closely with SHPO staff.

What is the yearly expense to maintain the CLG? Time and cost. Are these actual calculations or impressions?

Las Vegas – Existing City employees manage the CLG (Costs are not itemized)
Los Alamos – Existing County employees manage the CLG. Time expense is estimated 4 hours per week.
Santa Clara – Existing City employees manage the CLG
Questions:

1. Community involvement in drafting the ordinance – support/opposition from the public/business. The Las Vegas ordinance was in place several years before Mr. Archuleta was assigned to the CLG. However, he recommends highlighting the benefits of the CLG, which are in his experience: technical assistance from state and federal agencies, economic improvement, CLG grants, assistance obtaining funding from other sources (Capital Outlay, NPS/SHPO funds, Private Funding).

2. Once the CLG was established: Was it embraced by the public: by business? How well is it working?

The community has enthusiastically supported the restoration of the E.Romero Fire Station and the beautification of the Railroad District. These projects being funded from multiple sources.

Working together with Main Street program the downtown has been revitalized resulting in a marked increase of businesses. These are largely Arts and entertainment businesses – restored movie theater, restaurants, bars, and music venues. This has resulted in a significant increase in tax revenues for the city.

3. What were the original goals for establishing the CLG? Was it largely to protect existing historic properties? OR Mostly a vision for future development?

Both, the goals were historic preservation and economic development. Some of the economic benefits are listed above (in Item 2). The historic benefits include restoration of the E Romero Fire Station, Roof repair on the old City Hall, and feasibility study of the restoration of the Hotel Castaneda. Development of the River Walk is being conducted with the assistance of Historic Preservation.

4. Could these goals be achieved by zoning, building inspection or similar ordinances?

Probably not.

5. What has been the economic impact of the CLG: largely beneficial? Just Okay? OR burdensome?

Highly beneficial. Significant increase in business (private investment) has revitalized the downtown. As a result the tax revenues to the city have increased. Revitalization of the Railroad District is an ongoing project, but the reopening of the Hotel Castenada will likely improve conditions in these areas.

6. Were you successful in receiving Historic Preservation Grants? If so, do you regard these as useful, successful, of limited value, or not worth the effort.

Las Vegas has been successful in obtaining several CLG Grants:
Romero Fire Station – Grant funds used to tuck point the brick, paint the building and install windows.
Old City Hall – Grant funds used for Roof repair
Grant funds used to remove bat guano from other buildings

IMPORTANT: Develop relationships with State and Federal officials so that multiple funding sources are accessed to complete projects. CLG grants alone are often insufficient. Capital Outlay from the State Legislature is a potential source of funds. Also do not forget the technical assistance that is provided by SHPO

7. With regard to maintenance of the CLG relationship with SHPO and NPS: Compliance with rules and reporting is - easy, tolerable, or considered a burden?
SHPO Compliance is easy. The periodic reports are not difficult to complete. Grant reporting and financials are much more complicated.

8. What is the yearly expense to maintain the CLG?
Time and cost. Are these actual calculations or impressions?
The city of Las Vegas has assigned the commission work to an existing employee (Robert Archuleta). Much of the CLG work is shared between city employees, especially with the Main Street program.
CLG Grant was used for the restoration assessment of old City Hall, Las Vegas
CLG Grants used for the restoration of E. Romero Fire Station, Las Vegas
Farmington MRA Commission, Certified Local Government Interview

Certified Local Government: Los Alamos County

Person Interviewed (and contact info): Barbara Lai, Los Alamos County Senior Management Analyst - Barbara.lai@lacnm.us 505-663-3436

Interviewer: Doug Dykeman

Questions:

1. Community involvement in drafting the ordinance – support/opposition from the public/business.

   Outreach to the community was conducted before becoming a CLG. Outreach included both space at community events (like the Farmers Market) and preparation/distribution of CLG fact sheets. Fact sheets focused on CLG status – what it does and what it does not do). This effort resulted in no opposition at County Council. Some citizens stood up in favor of the ordinance.

   Creation of the CLG took about 3 months including the ordinance, SHPO applications and National Park Service acceptance. During this time County staff worked directly with SHPO to build the CLG ordinance and the Board ordinance.

   The goal of the ordinance was to insure flexibility and not restrict the public/business with burdensome rules. For example, boundaries were drawn to avoid properties owned by entities that did not want to participate.

2. Once the CLG was established: Was it embraced by the public: by business? How well is it working?

   The community supports the CLG. Public outreach continues at community events under the auspices of the Historic Preservation Commission. Brochures describing the CLG are available throughout the area. Close working relationships are maintained with the Historical Society, Planning and Zoning Commission, and Building Inspection.

3. What were the original goals for establishing the CLG? Was it largely to protect existing historic properties? OR Mostly a vision for future development?

   Historic Preservation was the primary goal. The economic benefits of tourism are being explored at this time. Los Alamos is considering a relationship with the same tourism consultant that Farmington is using.

4. Could these goals be achieved by zoning, building inspection or similar ordinances?

   Not easily. The Historic Preservation Commission reviews and signs Certificates of Alteration under the ordinance. Planning Department and Building Inspections honor and enforce the Certificates of Alteration

5. What has been the economic impact of the CLG: largely beneficial? Just Okay? OR burdensome?

   Data is insufficient, the commission is exploring more rigorous methods of collecting and processing data. They are working with the tourism contractor on this problem.
6. Were you successful in receiving Historic Preservation Grants? If so, do you regard these as useful, successful, of limited value, or not worth the effort.

Los Alamos has not yet applied for a Historic Preservation Grant. With Historical Society support two National Park Service grants were awarded in consecutive years for the purpose of developing an interpretive plan for the historic Fuller Lodge.

7. With regard to maintenance of the CLG relationship with SHPO and NPS: Compliance with rules and reporting is - easy, tolerable, or considered a burden?

Compliance is easy. One of the better ways to handle it is to keep SHPO's representative in the loop that is correspondence and email lists for meeting schedules and agendas.

8. What is the yearly expense to maintain the CLG?

Time and cost. Are these actual calculations or impressions?

No new out of pocket costs thus far. The county has assigned the commission work to an existing employee (Barbara Lai), who spends an average of 4 hrs per week on the Preservation Commission.
Farmer's Market – May 3
Preserve Our Historic Treasures
Become a Certified Local Government for Historic Preservation
I Belong in Our Community – Where Am I?

As a Certified Local Government: I will promote the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic and cultural properties. I will apply for state and federal grants to protect our historic resources. I will work with the community to champion the preservation goals of Los Alamos.
Farmington MRA Commission, Certified Local Government Interview

Certified Local Government: Santa Clara Village

Person Interviewed (and contact info): Sheila Hudman

(575) 537-2443 ext. 5


Questions:

1. Community involvement in drafting the ordinance – support/opposition from the public/business.
   This is a small, low income community of about 1600 people. The village borders a historic landmark (Fort Bayard). There was little public input in the creation of the CLG. The goal of forming a CLG was to designate buildings as landmarks and not create a district. This was more acceptable to the community since it didn’t seem so restrictive.

2. Once the CLG was established: Was it embraced by the public: by business? How well is it working?
   Support now is great. SHPO suggested that the first thing to do was create a historical plan addressing development of their historic area which included Fort Bayard. The CLG designation is so new that no properties have been through the whole process. Two property owners (residential) have shown interest and are submitting applications to their board. Only 3 business properties are probably able to qualify.

3. What were the original goals for establishing the CLG? Was it largely to protect existing historic properties? OR Mostly a vision for future development?
   The initial goal of forming the CLG was to increase tourist interest in the area and create jobs and economic support for the small community. The ultimate goal is to have the property and surviving buildings of Fort Bayard included in the Village limits of Santa Clara so that the Village can then take over the preservation and restoration of this Historic Landmark. This would include 50 existing buildings as well as recreating lost buildings to create something similar to a living museum and include retail shops. It is expected that this will eventually employ 300 people. As a result, the Village has the full support of Grant County.

4. Could these goals be achieved by zoning, building inspection or similar ordinances?
   Sheila felt that their goal of providing tax credits and grant funding to their low income community was better met by creating a CLG.

5. What has been the economic impact of the CLG: largely beneficial? Just Okay? OR burdensome?
   It’s too early for them to answer this question.

6. Were you successful in receiving Historic Preservation Grants? If so, do you regard these as useful, successful, of limited value, or not worth the effort.
   No applications have been completed yet except for the grant to create a CLG.

7. With regard to maintenance of the CLG relationship with SHPO and NPS: Compliance with rules and reporting is - easy, tolerable, or considered a burden?
The following data is collected from the Downtown Farmington area between South Miller Avenue west to South Auburn Avenue and West Broadway north to West Main Street.

There were 8,260 total calls for service in April 2019 within the Farmington City limits and 7,142 total calls for service in April 2018 which equals a 16% increase. Of these, 80 calls were within the Downtown area in April 2019 and 77 in April 2018 for a 4% increase.

The following graph reflects a Year to Year by Month comparison for reported cases related to the Downtown Farmington area:

There was a total of 8 reported cases in April 2019 and 12 reported cases in April 2018 reflecting a 33% overall decrease. As exhibited above, there was a decrease in reported criminal activity with the exception of concealing identity, harassment/stalking, and narcotics. All other activity remained constant.
The following represents a 2019 month to month analogy for the more significant reported cases related to the Downtown Farmington area reflecting the totals and percentage variation:

*Please note...when dealing with small numbers, small number changes cause large percentage changes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>01/19</th>
<th>02/19</th>
<th>% CHG</th>
<th>03/19</th>
<th>% CHG</th>
<th>04/19</th>
<th>% CHG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Burg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Burg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Laws</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault / Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic / DWI VIO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>-33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>125%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-67%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing all calls for service within the Downtown area during April 2019, a total of 80, the table below reflects the prevalent day and time these incidents occurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HARVEST FOOD HUB AT SAN JUAN COLLEGE INVITES YOU TO

THE HARVEST FOOD HUB AND KITCHEN
COMMUNITY VISIONING

THURSDAY, MAY 30TH
5:30-7:30 PM
COMPLETE STREETS HQ
119 W MAIN ST, FARMINGTON

Join us to discuss your vision for the food hub and commercial kitchen incubator in downtown Farmington! We will brainstorm equipment needs, services, layout and design, operations and more. If you are a farmer, restaurant owner, local food producer, aspiring food producer or community member, we would love your insight. The event is free and open to the public.

SAN JUAN COLLEGE
Enterprise Center

For more information, please contact San Juan College Harvest Food Hub havense@sanjuancollege.edu castleberryj@sanjuancollege.edu

Follow us @harvestfoodhub