Long Range Planning Sub-Committee (LRPC)

Wednesday, June 29, 2016
11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Round House Meeting Room
City of Santa Fe Rail District Offices
500 Market St., Suite 200

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 1, 2016 meeting
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   1. Demographics Presentation – Staff

6. MATTERS FROM THE STAFF
7. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE
8. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC
9. NEXT MEETING DATE: Wednesday, August 3, 2016
10. ADJOURN

An interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk’s Office (955-6521) upon 5 days notice. For questions regarding this agenda, please contact the Long Range Planning Division at 955-6609.
**Long Range Planning Sub-committee** meeting notes from June 1, 2016

**Members in attendance:** Kim Shanahan (Chair), Justin Greene, Vince Kadlubek, Piper Kapin, Michael Maremont

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff in Attendance:** Reed Liming, Richard Macpherson, Lisa Martinez, Greg Smith

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at approximately 11:05 a.m. and all LRPC members were present.

April 27th LRPC notes were approved, Vince made a motion to approve and Piper seconded the motion.

**City Of Santa Fe General Plan 1999: Overview and Analysis (Discussion)**

Reed presented the information in the packet regarding the General Plan and some of the background on how long the plan took and the cost of the General Plan (5 years and $500,000).

Reed spoke about the pros and cons of the 1999 general plan. (N.M. legislation is fairly open to what a general plan has to cover.)

Reed gave a background on the 1999 plan.

There seems to be a growing interest in the general plan updating.

Reed spoke about the successes and struggles of achieving the general plan themes.

Many departments have their own plans now; not as useful and even confusing to try and include every other depts. plans.

Piper asked what are we trying to solve?

What has changed since the ’99 General Plan?

What are the future issues we need to prepare for?

What themes are the most pertinent and can we prioritize the themes?

Discussion about who the plan is for, the intended audience, etc.

Cost of updating general plans in other cities.

Do we want to continue using a future land use map?

Piper asked what the role of the L.R.P.C. can be in the updating process.

Michael asked who will use this document.
Justin mentioned how divisions like economic development and housing fit into a general plan update.

Kim said who and how do we do an update, is it done by staff or a consultant.

Lisa said City Council wants to do some strategic planning. She said a big plan update would require a consultant probably.

Lisa spoke about the Gerhardt apartments and traffic issues in that project.

Kim said city council has not given any clear direction on general plan up-dating in the last four years, at least.

Lisa said it would be good for Long Range Planning and Land Use to do some strategic planning.

Kim said the Council seeks advice and would welcome our advice.

Lisa spoke about what strategic planning can do.

Vince said what’s the role of the committee, and are we working toward a recommendation.

Vince said he likes strategic planning and focusing on fewer topics, can present updates to Council from Long Range Planning.

Piper said different dept.’s seem to be operating separately from each other.

Vince said strategic planning and the General Plan update can be done at the same time.

Kim said using sub-contractors may be necessary in updating the general plan.

Reed said a budget could be set for updating using a consultant.

Justin spoke about how an update process might work.

Kim said the development community likes the Future Land Use Map.

Vince asked what the role of the committee is and the end result.

Vince said develop a report, get citizens involved, we need to decide direction we’re moving in.

Lisa spoke about the study session on the general plan in July.

Study session will primarily be on the West Santa Fe River Corridor plan.

Piper spoke about the over-arching issue of what the process is for up-dating.

Piper spoke about getting a Councilor interested in the update process.

Justin spoke about a general plan updating & how phases might work
Michael said start with the update that Reed and Richard have created.

Piper said it would be nice to have a check list for planning commission cases.

Kim suggested the LRPC look at the themes and decide which ones to emphasize in an update.

Reed asked Greg how he has used the General Plan and how he views it in relation to Chapter 14.

Greg said 90% of what he has done is to review Planning Commission cases and issues in regards to the General Plan.

Greg said he also uses the Future Land Use Map to check cases and applications.

Greg liked the list of pros and cons that Long Range staff produced & said water is not as much of a priority as in years past and sustainability issues have become a bigger topic.

Michael said he likes having the Future Land Use Map in the update Reed and Richard produced.

Piper said as a land use sub-committee the most productive thing we can do is focus on land use issues.

Reed said many dept.’s have developed their own plans for their departments & divisions.

Piper said the multitude of dept. plans may be problematic.

Richard said emphasize land use planning in an update.

Lisa spoke about general plan updates in other cities.

Justin mentioned that other dept.’s staff can present to the LRPC.

Reed said other dept. issues have been summarized in the current up-date.

Reed said a big document is not necessarily better or more helpful.

Justin asked about the capacity of Long Range staff.

Kim talked about the changed demographics in Santa Fe.

Reed mentioned that Santa Fe’s population was getting older.

Lisa spoke about the aging population and the healthcare industry.

Kim talked about the millennials and their college debts.

Piper spoke about the millennials and factors why they aren’t coming to Santa Fe & that the boomers need the millennials.
Reed felt that some millennials will find their way to Santa Fe the same way baby-boomers came to Santa Fe from other places (not sure when, how many and at what pace).

Piper asked if staff can provide a work plan for the subcommittee to help with.

Kim spoke about the need for affordable housing and a place for more attention.

Justin spoke about assessing the 14 themes.
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Santa Fe Urban Area Population Change 2000 - 2010

Santa Fe Urban Area Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>84,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Santa Fe Urban Area

Population Change 2000 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Change (By 2010 Census Tract)</th>
<th>Population Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss 10%-50%</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss &lt;10%</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain &lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain 10%-50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain &gt; 100%</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Source: Comparative Analysis derived from U.S. Census 2000 & 2010, Summary File 1"
Santa Fe Urban Area
Hispanic Population Change
2000 & 2010 Census

Santa Fe Urban Area Hispanic Population
2000 2010
41,794 46,440

Percentage Change
(By 2010 Census Tract)
- Loss 10%-50%
- Loss <10%
- Gain <10%
- Gain 10%-50%
- Gain >100%

"Source: Comparative Analysis derived from U.S. Census 2000 & 2010, Summary File 1"
Santa Fe Urban Area
Child Population Change
2000 & 2010 Census

Santa Fe Urban Area
Child Population
2000  2010
17,967  17,785

Percentage Change
(By 2010 Census Tract)

- Loss 10%-50%
- Loss <10%
- No Change
- Gain <10%
- Gain 10%-50%
- Gain > 100%

"Source: Comparative Analysis derived from U.S. Census 2000 & 2010, Summary File 1"
Santa Fe Urban Area
Median Household Income
2010 Census (ACS)

Median Household Income

- >$80,000
- $60,000-$80,000
- $50,000-$60,000
- $40,000-$50,000
- $30,000-$40,000
- <$30,000

Source: U.S. Census 2010, American Community Survey, 2010 5-year Estimates

“Source: U.S. Census 2010, American Community Survey, 2010 5-year Estimates”
Santa Fe Urban Area
Senior Population (Age 65+)
2010 (Census)

Santa Fe Urban Area
Senior Population (Age 65+)
2020 (Projected)

Source: U.S. Census 2010; Summary File 1, File QT-P1.
Extrapolation to 2020 by city staff.
Youngsters & Oldsters
Age-Group Population in Santa Fe County

1970-2010 Source: University of New Mexico, Bureau of Business & Economic Research
2020 Estimate Source: Reed Liming, Long Range Planner, City of Santa Fe

- **Youngsters (under 18)**
- **Oldsters (age 65+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Youngsters</th>
<th>Oldsters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>21,153</td>
<td>4,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22,749</td>
<td>6,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>25,697</td>
<td>10,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31,101</td>
<td>13,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30,292</td>
<td>21,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Estimate)</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Fe County Population by Age Group

Santa Fe County Population Pyramid 2020

- 25% of Santa Fe’s population is age 65+
- 1st time in Santa Fe’s history more people age 65+ than age 0-19

Santa Fe County Population Pyramid 2030

- 30% Of Santa Fe’s population is age 65+ (50,000)
- “Flip” in age-cohort from 1970... Older age group has greater population than the age-group directly below it

Santa Fe County Population Pyramid 2040

- 1/3 of Santa Fe’s population age 65+
- Women Age 85+ become the largest age cohort
- Static growth of youth in Santa Fe

Source: University of New Mexico, Geospatial & Population Studies (UNM-GPS).
Santa Fe County Population Growth by Decade and Component

(includes City of S.F.)

Source: U.S. Census; NM Department of Health

Average Annual Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>External Growth</th>
<th>Internal Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>1,466 (68%)</td>
<td>694 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>1,499 (64%)</td>
<td>858 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>2,231 (73%)</td>
<td>805 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>719 (48%)</td>
<td>769 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>605 (67%)</td>
<td>298 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External growth (i.e. "net migration"; Population entering minus Pop. leaving S.F. County)
Internal growth (i.e. "natural increase"; Births minus Deaths in S.F. County)