

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The following are the summary minutes from the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee for held April 24, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 2007-B, 700 North Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sharon Thomas, Chair  
Mary Ann Hendrickson, Vice Chair  
George Vescovo, Member  
Roberta Gran, Member (Via Phone)  
Russ Smith, Member  
Heather Watenpaugh, Member  
Todd Douglas Stuve, Member  
John Moscato, Member  
Abraham Sanchez, Member  
Christina Ainsworth, Member

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Abraham Sanchez, Member  
La Vonne Muniz, Member  
Harvey Gordon, Member

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Srijana Basnyat, Community Development  
David Weir, Community Development  
John Castillo, Community Development  
Dominic Loya, Community Development  
Mark Miller, Community Development

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jim Carrillo, Half Associates  
Christian Lentz, Half Associates  
Kendall Howard, Half Associates (Via Phone)  
Ian Varley, City Explained (Via Phone)  
Daniel Guimond, Economic & Planning Systems (Via Phone)  
Rachel Shindman, Economic & Planning Systems (Via Phone)

**I. Call to Order (3:03 p.m.)**

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**1. December 11, 2018**

Russ Smith made motion to approve. Todd Stuve, as well as Heather Watenpaugh seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

1           **2. February 26, 2019**

2           Russ Smith made motion to approve. Heather Watenpaugh seconded the  
3           motion. Motion was unanimously approved.  
4  
5

6   **III. Project Status and Update**

7           Consultants highlighted the ongoing tasks of Scenario Planning, the Fiscal Impact  
8           Analysis Report, the upcoming Design Workshop and Public Open Houses, and  
9           briefly updated the group on progress made in preparing Volumes I – IV.  
10

11   **IV. Elevate Las Cruces Vision Statement and Components**

12           Jim re-introduced the Vision Statement and Supporting Components. The CPAC  
13           questioned the clarity of particular statements, such as “inclusive community of  
14           choice”. Whether the Vision Statement is representative of Las Cruces was  
15           discussed. Sharon introduced handouts and possible edits that could be made to  
16           the Vision Statement and Components. After some discussion, it was agreed the  
17           potential edits warrant another CPAC meeting specifically to discuss the Vision  
18           Statement. Russ Smith made a motion to schedule a CPAC meeting devoted to  
19           the Vision Statement, and the motion was seconded by Roberta Gran. The motion  
20           passed unanimously.  
21

22   **V. Elevate Las Cruces Scenario Development**

23  
24           **1. Joint Work Session Results**

25           Ian began presentation regarding the Scenario Development process. He  
26           presented the results of the Joint Work Session “Chip Activity”. Key results  
27           included every group selecting the “Strategic Centers and Corridors”  
28           Scenario, areas in Las Cruces where there was or was not consensus on  
29           chip placement, as well as “non-chip results” like the Mesa Grande Rd  
30           extension. There was some discussion on preserving or developing the  
31           character of neighborhoods, and the importance of the Future Development  
32           Maps was highlighted.

33           **2. Fiscal Impact Results**

34           Rachel presented the findings of the Fiscal Impact Analysis. She highlighted  
35           that the analysis is currently a work in progress, it only covers impact to the  
36           City’s General Fund, and all findings are better interpreted as net impacts  
37           on the general fund relative to each scenario and not as absolute forecasts  
38           or predictions. Rachel further qualified the impact analysis as only  
39           concerned with the “net new” and not ongoing life-cycle costs when the  
40           issue of infrastructure “wear and tear” was brought up by the CPAC. The  
41           possible need for desalination plants in the future was also brought up;  
42           however, it was explained that desalination plants were not covered in the

1 fiscal impact as the report only pertains to the general fund. The accuracy  
2 of revenue related to property tax was questioned by the CPAC. The Zillow  
3 figure of 166,000 for an average home cost was questioned, and the figure  
4 235,000 was introduced by John Moscato. Construction fees on new homes  
5 and their contribution to GRT was also discussed. In response to this, EPS  
6 pointed out construction is a one-time revenue for GRT and could possibly  
7 be treated as Capital.

8 **3. Preferred Scenario**

9 Ian introduced the Consensus Scenario Map and explained the inclusion of  
10 entitlements in creating the Scenario. Some concern was shown by CPAC  
11 on the emphasis of the Solano Corridor over the El Paseo Corridor in the  
12 Consensus scenario map. It was pointed out by the CPAC that El Paseo  
13 has a Community Planning Blueprint associated with it. Halff Associates  
14 mentioned that Solano had more residential land uses than El Paseo, which  
15 would be better for an urban corridor.

16  
17 **VI. Future Development Maps Progress Report**

18  
19 Halff Associates introduced the upcoming Future Development Maps and  
20 discussed the various components to the maps. While discussing this, a question  
21 concerning the origin of the various place types utilized throughout the planning  
22 process was posed. Halff gave an overview of the differences between the  
23 Forecasted, Emerging, and Opportunity Town Centers. Halff posed the question  
24 to the CPAC of whether Opportunity Centers should or should not be included. The  
25 primary pro presented was having a plan in place for growth if it does extend to  
26 those areas. The primary con was the possibility that placing Opportunity Town  
27 Centers on the map may inadvertently communicate a want for growth in these  
28 areas. This was discussed further by CPAC without any overall consensus, though  
29 there was support for utilizing a clear prioritization or tiered system to these town  
30 center categories.

31  
32 **VII. Design Workshop Demonstration Sites**

33  
34 Halff Associates discussed the upcoming Design Workshops, and the possible  
35 demonstration site locations. While the Mesilla Valley Mall was used as an  
36 example of the acreage for a Town Center during the presentation, Halff  
37 Associates clarified the use of the site would be partially dependent on the  
38 receptiveness of the owner(s).

39  
40 **VIII. Public Comment**

41 There were no public comments.

42  
43 **IX. Next Steps**

1 Next steps for Halff associates included progressing on the Future Development  
2 Maps and the Report (Comprehensive Plan Draft Volumes). CPAC was asked to  
3 participate in the upcoming Design Workshop and Public Open Houses, City staff  
4 would send out a doodle poll and Schedule the additional CPAC meeting devoted  
5 to the Vision Statement.

6  
7  
8

**X. Adjourn (5:31 p.m.)**