

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are the summary minutes from the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) Meeting held on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., at the East Mesa Public Safety Complex located at 550 North Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sharon Thomas, Planning & Zoning Commission, Chair
Harvey Gordon, Planning & Zoning Commission
Luis Guerrero, Planning & Zoning Commission
John Moscato, Las Cruces Home Builders Association
Todd Stuve, Health Policy Review Committee
George Vescovo, Economic Development Policy Review Committee
Heather Watenpaugh, NMSU
Abraham Sanchez, Planning & Zoning Commission
Christina Ainsworth, Dona Ana County

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mary Ann Hendrickson, Infrastructure/CIP Policy Review Committee, Vice Chair
James Bennett, Planning & Zoning Commission
La Vonne Muniz, Planning & Zoning Commission
Russ Smith, Planning & Zoning Commission

STAFF PRESENT:

Srijana Basnyat, Community Development
David Weir, Community Development
Debra Fuller, Community Development
Mark Miller, Community Development
John Castillo, Community Development
Griselda Martinez, Economic Development

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim Carrillo, Halff Associates
Christian Lentz, Halff Associates

I. Call to Order (1:10 p.m.)

Chairperson Thomas called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. May 29, 2019

Motion passed unanimously (9-0).

2. August 13, 2019

1 Motion passed unanimously (9-0).
2

3 **III. Project Status and Update**

4 JC: Reviewed ongoing tasks, as well as a general timeline for next steps. The City
5 Council Special Work Session, to take place on January 8th, 2020, was discussed.
6

7 CL: Briefly reviewed the structure of Elevate Las Cruces in terms of the physical
8 framework, vision framework, and policy framework. Aspects of the policy
9 framework were highlighted; such as, the organization of topics into themes within
10 framework is meant ensure each topic is not siloed away from others. Emphasized
11 Elevate Las Cruces is an ambitious plan with nearly 500 actions; however, it is a
12 25-year plan and all actions are not meant to be implemented immediately upon
13 adoption. The next step in the project is to prioritize specific actions in order to
14 allocate resources for initial short-term actions.
15

16 JC: Expanded by discussing the varying timeframes of actions, built-in
17 redundancies between actions, and how the themes and actions all work together
18 to avoid siloing between topics.
19

20
21 **IV. Discussion on the Las Cruces Work Program (Policies, Timeframe, and
22 Partners)**
23

24 **1. Summary of Organization of the Implementation Work Program**

25 CL: Reviewed the policy framework in more detail by discussing the types of
26 actions, time frames for actions, and coordinating agencies. CPAC and
27 Subcommittees' feedback will aid in filling in additional coordinating agencies,
28 as well as prioritization of policies and actions. The role of coordinating
29 agencies was clarified, as agencies listed are not the only agency which may
30 work with the city, rather the listed agency or organization is representative of
31 the type of agency which could coordinate with the City. Does not preclude
32 other agencies if not listed in plan. Just examples of resources in community.
33

34 JC: explained Implementation Work Program has been revised based off of
35 feedback received, including extensive feedback from city staff via the
36 Interdepartmental Work Group (IWG). Requested feedback from CPAC sent to
37 Planning Team by Monday, December 16th.
38

39 **2. Review of Policy Prioritization by Theme**

40 Handouts containing Policies ranked through feedback received from surveys
41 were distributed and explained. Halff Associates walked CPAC through the
42 ranked policies seeking feedback on prioritization.
43

44 **a. Community Livability Theme**

Neighborhoods -

1 HG – healthcare is top priority; need to focus on this issue regarding our
2 elderly/seniors; downtown mix of housing and retail; the way that they are
3 growing is scaled to upper class; need more affordability
4 GV – 1.2 makes sense at the top
5 Neighborhood needs to be a better community
6 AS – question concerning CL - 1.2: Does desire to define identities increase
7 as city size increases?
8 JC – Discussed value of neighborhood identities. Discussed city’s role in
9 addressing substantive concerns like blighted properties, infrastructure
10 concerns.
11 AS – Rephrased question on CL – 1.2: Have not seen neighborhood identity
12 very prevalent in Las Cruces. Does growth create more compartmentalized
13 areas which require or seek to define neighborhood identities.
14 CL – CL – 1.2 is usually tied more to area in need of redevelopment or that
15 are more vulnerable i.e. older areas of community. New subdivisions usually
16 do not need this as already have existing support in form of HOA’s and
17 already have community events planned.
18 SB – neighborhood identity policies; support in maintenance and
19 establishment
20 CA – promote vacant properties for redevelopment
21 ST – more neighborhoods with neighborhood associations and watch
22 programs affiliated with CLC; develop a council of neighborhoods
23
24 Parks and Recreation –
25 Consensus is 3.2 is top priority – trail system is disjointed
26 4.2 need more family orientated events and better promotion
27 AS – 3.2 top
28 JM –
29 DW – changing level of street types; not overbuilding streets; codes
30 amended for practical standpoint
31 3.1 – well-distributed is very important
32 ST – actions to implement ATP; CL – Parks and Rec master references
33 ATP for location of trails; facilities need equal accommodations for all sports
34 and areas in City
35 HG – subsidize or assist different facilities
36 Griselda – very specific wording or donation so no violation to anti-donation
37 clause
38 CL – actions in P&R plan to cover money for facilities; comp plan is an
39 umbrella; details in lower level strategic plans
40 DW – P&R reviews fee schedule every year
41
42 MOBILITY –
43 TS - Trail system and mobility to join county and Mesilla
44 8.1 – retrofit existing roads
45 LG – connectivity to public transportation

1 6.3 – works well in other cities
2 Headed in right direction
3 AS – car management and traffic; 8.1
4 NMSU – 8.3 very important
5 JM – reduce pavement where appropriate; what is anticipated with required
6 street cross sections for new bicycle transportation
7 SB – context; not every road will be the same; comp plan to state improve
8 road design but exactly how needs to be determined by future code revision
9 processes
10 CA – 8.1
11 ST – connectivity between neighborhoods; 8.3 job centers, workforce
12 training, community resources, more things listed
13 HG – two ways to go east and west; new development to require better road
14 layout; 6.1 traffic signal timing and synchronization; congestion due to
15 significant construction
16 DW – tech investment will make things more efficient
17 GV – 9.1 he ranked low due to “ALL”; need interconnected system but does
18 not need bike, ped, and multi-use trails to be on every roadway; really good
19 paths in close proximity
20 SB – Techniques are not all equally applied to every roadway.
21 GV – poor wording, would have ranked higher if emphasized
22 interconnectivity and did not say “all” roadways.
23 SB – CC adopted a Complete Streets Resolution which requires all streets
24 to accommodate all users; how streets are designed, the type of
25 infrastructure, and how each user is prioritized will vary based on context of
26 roadway.
27 SB, CL, ST – All agree CL - 8.4 and 9.1 wording may be an issue.
28 PUBLIC SAFETY AND REST OF ITEMS
29 LG – trust with enforcement is top priority; good to move forward with
30 Historic Preservation; public health needs better access
31 AS – language potential and reality of gentrification
32 GM – profitable and equitable acknowledgment
33 HW – emergency response; 18.2 ties to other items
34 JM – no issues
35 CA – 11.2 is important for crime prevention instead of upping security
36 ST – LC Urban Agriculture and Food Policy Plan should be mentioned;
37 Public Health should mention mental health, needs improvements, starting
38 with crisis facility
39 HG and GV – no additional comments
40 TS – lack of services with mental health in hospital bc it is not profitable;
41 18.1 healthcare CLC’s perspective of primary care providers; positive
42 relationship with law and then implement neighborhood associations
43 ST – mobility 10.2 study has been done
44

45 **b. Community Prosperity Theme**

1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2 CA – 4.1 should be ranked higher, likes wording “focus and coordinate
3 efforts”, really want to be regional in those efforts

4 JM – cost associated that impacts every resident, happy with provision

5 GM – 4.4 – retaining existing businesses is important

6 GV – 4.2 mentioned in Sub-Com meeting because it’s just as important

7 GM – attn is owed to those local businesses who are committed to our city

8 HW – 4.4 at top with 4.3 and 4.2, need to compete and retain; 1.2 mention
9 of skilled

10 AS – priority is retaining our workers that we train and educate

11 LG – same issues with AS mentioned

12 TS – internship and co-op at places you anticipate actually working is super
13 important to retain our students

14 JC – workforce development is super important

15 ST – also where we are lacking; WORKFORCE INNOVATION
16 OPPORTUNITY ACT should be mentioned

17 **c. Community Environment Theme**

18 LAND USE –

19 ST – No mention of business park and jobs in north and east mesa;
20 employment centers not necessarily industrial

21 CA – 1.1 and 2.1

22 JM – 1.1 compatibility matrix and place type; new development is not held
23 to a lower standard because it’s near a lower standard

24 JC – good point because of mixed uses and future of development

25 HW – prioritized correctly

26 AS – 1.3 is a higher priority; 1.2 or 2.2

27 LG – 1.2 and 2.1 are closely related; growth is university district and
28 neighborhoods are not accommodating, work more closely with NMSU,
29 better college and campus experience

30 TS – 1.1 should really happen first so why not a higher priority

31 GV – 1.2 and 2.1 are same thing basically, reword to better align with
32 different goals

33 HG – 1.1 should be highest everything falls into place because of it

34
35 COMMUNITY FORM AND CHARACTER –

36 CA – 3.1 important so people do not have to drive across town for many
37 goods and services

38 JM – 4.1 action item under this – builders and developers looking at the
39 market, not wanting a requirement for different uses; encouraging and
40 provide incentives; not good to have requirement; vacant land for years if
41 land is designated

42 HW – 5.1 surprised it is not ranked higher

43 AS – 4.1 is important; addressing need for affordable housing, then add that
44 wording in there and actually see it throughout the city

45 LG – closer access to all needs

- 1 TS – 4.1.3 might be too limiting like John said, affordable housing should
2 consider aging in place
3 SB – “provide” can also mean to allow because two family (extra unit or
4 casita) is currently not allowed in single family development; if solutions for
5 housing options need to be allowed by right, it’s also a note to City to provide
6 that
7 GV – nonbuilding costs associated with development can affect affordable
8 housing, need to be cognizant of that
9 HG – 4.1 and 5.1 can be combined?
10 JC – difference in type and form/scale, but will examine maybe rewording
11 ST – 3.1.3 – a little broader not one mile intervals, grow more organically,
12 too narrow and specific, make language more accommodating for different
13 types of centers; 5.3 ped and bike facilities; 4.1 concerned about aging and
14 affordable housing, you can put different type housing and options within
15 close proximity and it will work
16
17 **INFRASTRUCTURE, UTILITIES, AND ENERGY –**
18 JM – 8.1.5 what is meaning?
19 HW – nothing to add
20 LG – Water and recycling and solar important for THIS city
21 TS – will take time to get there but all important
22 GV – pace modes can be predatory to narrow competition; renewable
23 energy that protects consumer and be affordable
24 HG – 9.1 and 8.1 be combined; 8.1 can word “preference” be removed?
25
26 **NATURAL RESOURCHES AND OPEN SPACE**
27 HW – 14.2 higher on list
28 TS – 13.1 natural drainage super important because of drainage issues in
29 existing neighborhoods
30 GV – balance with economy 4.2 economic responsible
31 HG – 11.1 rated higher; water conservation super important
32 ST – climate change driving ag to use more than the 90%; unknown is what
33 will happen with Supreme Court case; 13.2 wildlife habitat and “corridors”
34 CA – agree with preserving open space and water conservation
35 JM – 14.1 whose open space; integrate action item – requirement; protect
36 mountain views are unnecessary
37 JC – mountain view is important and should be considered and balanced
38 SB – going to be an action under 14.2 that there will be a study; ways to
39 protect views without infringing on property rights
40
41 **REGIONALISM**
42 ST – Border areas and regional areas that are participating; list those
43 entities, policies, plans

1 GM – re: economic development aspect – desire to do that, how do they
2 balance powers and negotiate; border plex alliance not contributing towards
3 their budget so must be careful with negotiation
4

5 **V. Discussion on the Future Development Map and Future Thoroughfare Map**

6
7 **1. Review of Final Adjustments**

8 JC – discussed recent revisions to maps and overview of place types. Scenario
9 planning process informs Future Development Map (FDM).

10 CL – Future Thoroughfare Map tied to FDM. FDM change as needs of
11 community evolve. Annual review process and updating guidance provided in
12 Volume I. Highlighted potential for considering SLO and BLM Joint Planning
13 agreements, and that the FDM reflects as closely as possible the Scenario
14 Planning.
15

16
17 **2. Review of the State Land Office Considerations**

18 JM – Concerning East Mesa area on Future Development Map. Last major land
19 area is virtually undevelopable. Open Space Place type is not developable, and
20 other place types on East Mesa are very low density. Majority of land readily
21 available given existing infrastructure. City has historically developed
22 Eastward, and the FDM restricts Eastern Development. FDM rezones State
23 land away from Holding which by allows 1 acre lots. 1 acre lots would not be
24 appropriate either for development on East Mesa; however, this eliminates
25 current development rights of State land. This is not the role of Comprehensive
26 Plan. Innovation and changing of trends will happen in large scale
27 developments not in small scale. Large development allows for mixed use and
28 affordability. State land estimates 300 to 400 million to be made off of East
29 Mesa land, and all goes to New Mexico education system. Understand the
30 Consensus Scenario exercise; however, why burden development through 1
31 or 2 exercises done by people without an understanding of land development?
32 Non-developers making decisions and getting it all wrong in a big way.

33 CL – Future Development Map and plan represent collective results.
34 Regardless of the experience of participants in the Scenario Planning process,
35 their opinion are still valid. that is dismissive of those involved who have
36 different perspectives

37 JM: Opinions from non-developers with no stake in results of Scenario Planning
38 Exercise.

39 CA: Participants may not have monetary stake, but there are many reasons to
40 have a stake in results. FDM is also a statement on behalf of the City
41 concerning where will to have new infrastructure or manage. Financial burden
42 to city and city taxpayers.

43 JM: Area currently has infrastructure

44 SB: Suburban place type on FDM is where current infrastructure ends

1 SB & JM: Both agree leap frog development can and has occurred in Las
2 Cruces.

3 JM: Suburban development does not mean leapfrog development. It is not
4 affordable to build that way, and not saying to develop Eastern edge first.

5 SB: Growth projection-wise the edge of the Suburban Place Type is enough
6 land for current projection. FDM can ensure incremental growth.

7 JM: Opinion of developers and builders that there is not enough currently to fit
8 16k units without developing East Mesa.

9 JC: There is currently enough space. Building out requires fiscal impact to
10 maintain infrastructure. Ability to serve transit, medical, etc. already exists in
11 core. For time being, city needs growth here where we can fit it in. State does
12 have a fiscal interest in property and supports a worthy cause. It is a significant
13 amount. City has responsibility to say where city growth should go, then work
14 with SLO.

15 JM: Every growth scenario has a positive impact.

16 JC: Based on Scenario planning, believe FDM is currently supported. Will need
17 look at in future for review and amendments.

18 JM: Analyzed units can be built within infill? How many accommodated?

19 CL: The dot density map utilized for Scenario planning located units using
20 computer modeling based on current conditions to demonstrate available land.
21 Will ensure scenario planning is clearly explained in document.

22 ST – What was outcome of event at DACC with State Land Office and public
23 input? what did the community wish to see out on the East Mesa? How many
24 dwelling units?

25 SB – It was a visioning meeting where there was some emphasis by public that
26 desired open spaces, trails and some development - the material collected is
27 available; however, there was no dwelling unit discussion at that point.

28 **VI. Public Comment**

29 None.

30 **VII. Next Steps**

31 Halff Associates reviewed Next Steps concerning City Council Work Session, and
32 revisions which will be taking place after completion of current round of Open
33 Houses and meetings.

34 Before Adjournment, Todd Stuve requested to address CPAC.

35 TS: In April wife, Tessa Stuve, was successful in bid for City Council. As CPAC
36 appointed by council want to address. Important to note a potential conflict of
37 interest as wife will be on City Council in 2020.

38 HG: Does not agree a conflict of interest exists

39 ST: Unless there is a more specific item, does not believe there is a conflict of
40 interest.

41 GV: Due to Todd on committee since beginning of process, it would be a huge loss
42 to the process if Todd were to recuse himself.

43 DW: CPAC is a recommending body to Planning and Zoning Commission. It is
44 policy and not quasi-judicial. Working as a committee.
45

1 GV: There's no financial benefit so have no problem.
2 AS: While the subject has been brought up, also want to divulge potential Conflict
3 of Interest. In day job boss, Johana Bencomo, is also now a Council-elect. As no
4 one stands to benefit financially, no conflict of interest.
5 ST: If something more specific comes along then may be Conflict, but fine until
6 then.

7
8 **VIII. Adjournment (4:10 p.m.)**

9
10 A motion was made by Mr. Gordon and seconded by Mr. Stuve. The motion
11 passed unanimously (9-0).

12
13
14

DRAFT