

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, Halff Associates
Christian Lentz, Halff Associates
Kendall Howard, Halff 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

34 **2. Fiscal Impact Results**

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

DRAFT