



**City of Las Cruces**  
PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE

**Capital Improvements Advisory Committee**  
Minutes for the Meeting on  
September 15, 2016  
1:30 p.m.  
Utilities Center  
Conference Room 218

**Committee Members Present:**

Ronald Johnson, CIAC Chairman  
Brian Crawford, Committee Member  
Eugene Suttmiller, Committee Member

**Committee Members Absent:**

William Beerman, CIAC Vice-Chairman

**City Staff Present:**

Carl Clark, RES/TS Administrator  
Sonya Delgado, Parks and Recreation  
Administrator  
Justin Dunivan, Deputy Police Chief  
David Weir, Community Development Director  
D. Eric Martin, Facilities Management Administrator  
Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect  
Carolynn Rouse, Office Assistant Senior  
Alma Ruiz, Office Assistant Senior

Chair Johnson: Called the meeting to order at approximately 1:34 p.m. All those present, that would be Commissioner...

Crawford: Brian Crawford.

Suttmiller: Gene Suttmiller.

Chair Johnson: And I'm Chairman Johnson.

**Acceptance of the Agenda:**

Chair Johnson: I'd like a motion to accept the Agenda.

Suttmiller: Motion so made.

Crawford: Second.

Chair Johnson: All those in favor? Aye.

Suttmiller: Aye.

Crawford: Aye.

**The Agenda was Accepted Unanimously 3-0.**

**Acceptance of the Minutes:**

- Chair Johnson: You have received the minutes in the past. I will open for a motion to approve those.
- Suttmiller: So motioned.
- Crawford: I second.
- Chair Johnson: Any comments on the minutes?
- Crawford: No, sir.
- Suttmiller: No.
- Chair Johnson: I will call for a vote. Those in favor? Aye.
- Crawford: Aye.
- Suttmiller: Aye.
- Chair Johnson: Thank you.

**The Minutes were Accepted Unanimously 3-0.**

**New Business:**

- Chair Johnson: We have no new business in front of us right now.

**Old Business:**

- Chair Johnson: We'll go right to our constant over the next few months. This lady will become familiar to us. Today, introduce yourself and outline what we're going to do today.
- Delgado: Sonya Delgado, Parks and Recreation Director. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I'm here to talk about the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process and just kind of give you an overview of what will be expected of you, how this process unfolds; and then right behind me we have Eric Martin and Cathy Mathews to talk about our Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), that process, what it looks like right now and what we've been doing. We'll kind of catch you up to speed on that one, hopefully we won't take up too much time.
- Chair Johnson: Thank you.

Delgado: As I was saying, we'll talk about the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and update on Land Use Assumptions. These are the items that you will be discussing as we go through this process in the next years: update Park Impact Fees, approve and recommend the new Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan (ICIP).

A little bit of the history, they adopted the Resolution 95-368 enacting the Park Development Fees in July of 1995, which is also called the Park Impact Fee (PIF). The fee was set at \$249 per dwelling unit. These fees can only be used for adding new levels of service, and right now it's for new neighborhood parks. In 2006-2007 it was raised to \$550, in 2007-2008 raised to \$800, and now it stands at \$2,600.

City Council must take action before June 30, 2018, and our goal is to have it to Council by January of 2018. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board will recommend approval of the plans; the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, which is you, will recommend approval of the plans and a PIF.

Our level of service as defined, you'll see that in there as LOS, is a measure of how many acres of park land and/or the number of amenities per 1,000 citizens. It relates to the distance homes are from Park properties; ½ mile, one mile. The maintenance level of service is the measurement of how often tasks are completed on a maintenance schedule; and that's more on our end, and what our staff can and cannot do at the moment.

Our Las Cruces Municipal Code requires that at least every five years, the City either updates the Land Use Assumptions, updates the Park Capital Improvement Plan, updates the PIF, or determines no updates are needed. The last time we did a big update, which was the last five years, as you can see we jumped to \$2,600.

You can leave the current fee intact, adopt a suggested fee and send forward a recommendation, or eliminate the Park Fee altogether and recommend other alternatives.

On the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, we're currently working with the Public Works Department to put out an RFP (Request for Payment) for an update on our Master Plan and that is currently in the process. That won't be for probably a few more months, two or three more months?

Martin: Yes, three months. It's usually at the end of the Selection Advisory Committee, so we've got to get that scheduled and everything in place to do.

Suttmiller: So we're looking at what, January?

Delgado: Probably the end of the year, December or January.

Land Use Assumptions, Public Works consultants completed the Land Use Assumptions Updates and Parks and Recreation. Our PIF study incorporates the new Population Assumptions that were done. That one was done last year, I believe, correct?

On the Parks ICIP, it will be developed and the Committee will comment and recommend approval. That will be something that Mr. Martin will bring forward in just a little bit after me, to kind of discuss what's been happening, what's moving forward and what's on our list upcoming, and that we need a whole lot of money.

Suttmiller: Don't we all.

Delgado: The options that you will have will approve the Parks and Recreation Master Plan; approve the updated Land Use Assumptions; approve, adjust or eliminate the Park Impact Fees; and then approve the Parks ICIP. If you have any questions, I'll try to answer questions.

Suttmiller: It looks straightforward to me.

Delgado: At the last meeting, you had asked me how the fees are working for us now, and whether we saw a change. We did see a big change when the fees were raised, and now we're getting some parks. We're actually getting quite a few parks right away; so now our issue, and it's an issue that was brought up before and comes up every single time we talk about the fees, is the maintenance. Yes, this only gives us new levels of service, and we get new parks, which are great; but now it's starting to stretch our staff a little bit. We have four parks that are coming on this year, and we'll probably have a couple more coming down the way. Like I said, they're great, they're needed, but now we're trying to figure out how we're going to tackle and adjust for the maintenance side. We're working on that.

Chair Johnson: That's an issue more for City Council than for us?

Delgado: Right, correct.

Chair Johnson: We recognize that from several cycles with older groups that we appreciate that when we build new, we have to maintain them.

Delgado: Correct.

Chair Johnson: The federal government has provided us all kinds of buses, but never bus drivers. It's the same issue with anybody, sometimes we get police officers.

The Parks, it says review of State Law and City Ordinances. Just a question, have there been any changes to the State Law or City Law, or any Court decisions that have affected us over the last four years that would alter our determinations here?

Delgado: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, no. There haven't been any changes, no.

Chair Johnson: Okay, so our authority comes from the State that directs us to perform these activities and the City Council parrots that authority, largely.

Suttmiller: Mr. Chairman, does our new member have a copy of the laws relating to that process?

Chair Johnson: I'm getting to that.

Suttmiller: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair Johnson: You're exactly right. In the past, we've got a bundle of what the new laws were or where that authority was, and it might be incumbent that Mr. Crawford just gets a copy of that authority. You don't have to bring it before us here, but it would be nice for him to have it in his package. He may have gotten it in his package when he was provided his initial materials.

Ruiz: He did not.

Crawford: I don't remember reading that.

Chair Johnson: I know I didn't four years ago. The difference between the Master Plan and the Land Use Assumptions we passed, can you explain that to the Board?

Delgado: The Parks and Recreation Master Plan is the vision for Parks and Recreation for Las Cruces; what we need, what's forthcoming. The Land Use Assumptions lets us know where we might be having some land available to us, which direction the City might be growing into.

Chair Johnson: They just want that nexus to be made for everybody. We've got one which seems to sort of jump that we don't have the other one, but I can see how one could lead to the other one. It would be nice to see a timing schedule to January 2018.

Delgado: Okay.

Chair Johnson: What you see during that period of time, to make sure that we perform what we need to do; because there's two approvals we have to make, right? The Master

Plan we have to approve, is that one approval, and then the other approval is the fees themselves?

Delgado: It will be all of it together. It will be the Master Plan, the Land Use Assumptions, the Park Fee, and then we'll go to the whole end of the CIP List. They will all go together.

Suttmiller: We recommend approval, I believe, we don't approve.

Chair Johnson: We just recommend, that's right. We need this. Alma will send a letter, of course. If I could just see that, and where there may be slip time, because I want to make sure that given there's only three of us right now, Mr. Beerman will be back and hopefully we'll have a fourth member by the end of the year. I'm hoping sooner than that, but we can talk about that later if you want.

Ruiz: Mr. Beerman would be four, so we need a fifth.

Suttmiller: Right. Good.

Chair Johnson: Okay. Any other comments?

Crawford: No.

Chair Johnson: Okay. Thank you. We'll see you next month.

The next item under Old Business will be Parks and Recreation Current Projects, presented by Mr. Martin and Cathy Mathews.

Martin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Cathy Mathews is in our Public Works Facilities section and serves as the City's Landscape Architect. As we evolve our roles and that kind of thing, I thought it would be good to introduce her to you, because I don't think necessarily you all have met her. She is our primary lead on the vast majority of our Park projects and works closely with Sonya and her staff on everything. She's also up on a lot of the different projects that we're working on, and she can provide a bit more detail sometimes than what I might have available on any nuances of the projects and things like that. I just thought I'd introduce Cathy, she'll be running through the presentations, but I'm also here in case there are any other questions come before the Board.

Mathews: Thank you, Eric. Thank you again, my name is Cathy Mathews, I'm the Landscape Architect for the City and I appreciate being here this afternoon to speak with you and give you an update on our Impact Fee projects. Currently, on our list for this year are the East Mesa Public Safety Area Park, Highland Park, etcetera. We can go down the list. Most of these parks are in Districts Five and Six, with Young Park Inclusive Playground being in Council District Number Three. To date, we have completed the Airplane Remote Control Park,

the Archery Park, the latest phase of the Desert Trails Community Park, and the East Mesa Area Park. Also completed have been the Soccer Park and the Splash Pad Park in the Metro Verde Subdivision. In process right now is the Sculpture Park at Metro Verde, and in planning is the Highland Park project.

Suttmiller: Where's that at?

Mathews: Do you know Highland Elementary School off the north side of US 70?

Suttmiller: Oh yes, sure. Right behind there, around there.

Mathews: It's just north of that school.

Suttmiller: Thank you.

Mathews: Other projects that we have currently ongoing are the North Del Rey Neighborhood Park, it's in planning right now, very preliminary planning. Oro Vista Park is also in preliminary planning. Oro Vista will be a multi-use facility, right now it's a detention pond with some grass and irrigation in it, but the intention is to make it a multi-use facility. Parkhill Estates Neighborhood Park, we're working with the developer to make that neighborhood park happen within the next year, the agreement was just signed yesterday or the day before. Pueblos at Alameda is a small project that we're working on with the Homeowners' Association (HOA) in the area to make a small piece of land into a park for that neighborhood. Then, of course, our Young Park Inclusive Playground project. We just kicked off design a couple weeks ago, and it will be a very exciting kind of addition to Young Park.

This graph shows the revenue.

Chair Johnson: Cathy, may I ask you a question?

Mathews: Please.

Chair Johnson: Are these projects all Impact Fees, or are they mixed funding?

Mathews: Let me go back. They are all Impact Fees, with the exception of Young Park, which is Park Impact Fees, State Legislative Funding, and private donations. We've got a mix of funding for that, largely Park Impact Fees though.

Martin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. What we try to do is if there are Park Impact Fees used in any way on a given project, we list those projects here from an awareness perspective, even if those funds are being leveraged with other funds to make the project happen.

- Mathews: So there is our revenue up until May of 2016 actually. We just recently got the latest report that shows through June, I believe, of 2016.
- Martin: Yes, it shows through June. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Finance has been going through a little bit of turnover and we're going through our audit process right now, so we have several new faces. The gentleman who used to do all of our Park Impact Fee tracking left a few months ago. They do have a replacement for him, a lady by the name of Maggie, and she's trying to catch up and get up to speed on everything. They hope to get the reports out a little bit more timely going forward from here. We only had limited data to work with at the time we put the presentation together, and then I forwarded over to Carolynn the most current spreadsheet that Maggie had sent to us, but they're still catching up on some things. Hopefully for our next update, we'll be totally current on our PIF collections and everything from a reporting perspective.
- Mathews: As you can see on this trend line, we were increasing between 2012 and 2014. That's kind of leveled off a little bit with a tiny little increase here in 2016. That could continue.
- Martin: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, as you look at the graph, that big difference between what Ms. Delgado was talking about in terms of the fees that were being levied, that where \$2,600 now has moved us into that \$500,000 a year revenue level compared to if you go back to 2012 or 2013, so we're actually having a fair amount of funding to work with because a park this day and age is not cheap; a few hundred thousand is normal. If you start a brand-new park and bring it online, it may run you half a million dollars. At this collection rate, you can build at least one or two new parks per year, depending on size, scope and things like that.
- Chair Johnson: The previous table just shows the upticks and downticks of the permitting process, I assume?
- Martin: Yes.
- Mathews: Right, exactly.
- Chair Johnson: So if you look at May and May, you see the difference. We had a good May, even though the fees were the same in May here and May there. That's good.
- Martin: We're seeing that uptick, I think, in building permits and those kind of things. The economy is starting to look a little better and there's a lot of development going on.
- Mathews: We're towards the end of this presentation, and I just wanted to go over a few of the projects we have in process right now.

We've got \$70,000 designated for the East Mesa Public Safety Complex Park, and since that building is going to be completed soon, we'll shift from planning into design on that project as well. As that building comes online, we'll shift from planning into the actual design on that project.

Highland Park is an exciting one with a \$300,000 budget, a pretty hefty budget for a park. Currently, we have a trail that runs from the neighborhood. Up here to the north in the neighborhood, we have a graded trail, although not a paved trail, that runs all the way to this little parking lot adjacent to the school, so we've achieved that Phase I portion of the full Master Plan. The next phase with our \$300,000 would be to start developing these field areas. They are designed to serve both soccer and baseball practice fields. It's a desperately needed amenity out in that area.

**Martin:** What you'll see, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, just like with the East Mesa Public Safety Park along Highland Park, the land that is used for that comes from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) recreation public purpose lease processes. How that works is that once we meet the full build-out of the parks and meet the development plan that's been provided, then BLM will patent or transfer that property for our ownership and perpetuity for City use ongoing into the future. We do try to leverage those relationships with other agencies to provide the land necessary to construct some of these other parks to meet those levels of service and the needs elsewhere in the community.

**Chair Johnson:** These soccer fields are designed for adults, children, mixed, separated?

**Mathews:** Mr. Chair and members of the Board. They're sized to accommodate adult soccer fields, but it just depends on how you stripe them.

**Chair Johnson:** You can size them down.

**Mathews:** Yes, you can size them down, and the idea was also to incorporate general play space or area for spectators to sit as well on the grass, so there's plenty of buffer spaces and plenty of seating observation areas as well around the fields.

The Metro Verde Sculpture Park, like I said, is in process right now. Actually, it's a little bit further along than it shows in this picture. I just got word earlier this week that the contractor is putting in the irrigation system and will be laying sod this week, so we should have a big spot of green out there. The sculpture is also in already, as is the play equipment, so we're coming very close to being complete on this park. It's at the corner of Red Hawk Boulevard and Engler Road, and it will be a big showpiece right at the front of that development there.

The Metro Verde Soccer Park was also built in conjunction with the developer at Metro Verde. It includes play equipment, swings, some benches, some

fencing to keep the soccer balls in the park, and a lot of turf space as you can see in the larger photo. It's very popular, is heavily used, and from the get-go has been a terrific amenity for the neighborhood.

The Splash Park as well was in another partnership between ourselves and the developer. It includes, of course, the Splash Park, with features for older children and younger children. This photo was taken before the equipment was actually installed, so there are features like buckets and other kinds of spray features, cannons and the like, that kids can play with and enjoy out there in the splash pad. As you can see in the background here, there is a large play equipment structure as well, including a zip line and some picnic shelters and picnic tables. Then as you can see on the bottom left, there is a large open green space just for open play and the like. This one is completed and again, it's very popular and attracts folks from all over the City.

Oro Vista Park is the multi-use facility that I mentioned. Currently, it serves as a detention pond for our storm water management system. There is an irrigation system out there, and attempts were made at seeding, but those improvements need to be supplemented. That's what this budget would allow us to do, is to bring in a trail system, perhaps some trees, some shade, other kinds of amenities that would allow the neighbors to make use of this facility for recreation in addition to the storm water management function that it serves.

Then, our big showpiece, the Young Park Inclusive Playground. An inclusive playground is designed to accommodate all children: able-bodied children, disabled children, children with cognitive disabilities, or emotional disabilities. The idea is that you create a space for children of all abilities to play together and to interact with each other. This was our initial concept for the park; likely, it will be significantly altered now that we've got our landscape architect on board. We've been talking about incorporating the existing trees in the park into the play area, as well as adding new trees and creating sort of a more free-flowing kind of play space, rather than just placing a structure and saying, "Have at it, kids." We'll more carefully design the location and the types of play features in the park, and hopefully with our increased budget, which is actually more than what is shown here, we will be able to get really a true showpiece kind of an inclusive playground.

**Martin:** Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, we'll be adding about \$170,000 to the project, bringing the total to \$330,000. That is scheduled to go before City Council this coming Monday and assuming approval of everything, we'll have that supplemental budget to actually provide basically a full build-out for this project versus the original phased approach that we were speaking about.

**Chair Johnson:** Is that money encumbered already, is it under contract, or do you use in-house forces to do that work?

- Mathews: Mr. Chairman, currently we're contracting it all out. We're in design right now, so we have contracted with Morrow Reardon Wilkinson Miller, a landscape architecture firm, to do this design work. They've got a survey underway, and we have picked up our design contract as well. Once the design is finished, we'll go out to bid and contract with a contractor for construction.
- Chair Johnson: Brian, did you have a question?
- Crawford: No, I think that's great.
- Mathews: That's the end of my presentation. I'll be happy to answer any other questions that anybody has.
- Chair Johnson: Could you help me with the definition of encumbered? Because you've got expenditures, which we know is money out the door, but we know that you've got contracts out there to be doing this ongoing work. I would consider that encumbered work.
- Martin: Basically, from the financial aspect, we start with our budget. We go out and put a contract together, put a requisition into the system and it gets converted into what we call a purchase order. That formally encumbers the funds at that point, meaning if you've got \$100,000 and you do a contract for \$50,000, that \$50,000 in that budget is now set aside for that contract for that vendor. Then, as we go through and expend the funds, of course, then the encumbrance reduces, the expenditure amount goes up as we pay out the bills, and eventually the encumbrance goes to \$0 and the expenses go to \$50,000. The encumbrance is what we do with the contracts to reserve the funding to make sure it gets spent and is appropriated for that purpose.
- Chair Johnson: That's why I wonder, because you've got \$19,000 here as encumbered, and that seems like an awfully low number for the amount of work that seems to be active.
- Martin: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the numbers, because we're starting with design contracts and surveys and things like that, and we have not hired the construction contractor, then until that occurs and we have that contract in place, you will see a lot of unencumbered or non-designated funds at that point. The project has the \$160,000 total here plus the other that we'll add to it, and so out of that, all that's been encumbered are just those things that we have contracted services in place for.
- Chair Johnson: I wasn't necessarily talking about this, I was talking about all the projects here. I'm not talking about Young Park, I'm talking about the other nine or ten here that seem to be in different stages of construction but not fully expended out.

Martin: Let's go back to the first slide where we have our list of projects.

Chair Johnson: What I'm worried about and what I'm interested in is the bottom line that says, "Ending fund balance of XYZ." Whatever that number is, is that a true picture, or is there more encumbered there?

Martin: No. The encumbrances, Mr. Chairman, that you would see in the paperwork that you've been provided are current as the budget of that date and time that report was run. A lot of projects, we do a lot of planning and spend a lot of staff time on research and development, discussion with departments, and things like that. Like with your East Mesa Public Safety Area Park, you've got the funding that's set aside out there from a Capital Improvement Program perspective, but we haven't hired a landscape architect yet to actually engage in that design because we're in that planning phase right now, so there won't be an encumbrance there. Highland, same type of thing. The Metro Verde Neighborhood Parks, there are those encumbrances there that basically have been substantially drawn down because two of those three parks are complete already. North Del Rey has been a long-term park and there is nothing to encumber at this point; same thing with Oro Vista until we work out some of the planning. Parkhill Estates, that developer was developing that park based on agreement with the City some years ago to develop the park in lieu of the City collecting the Park Impact Fees, so there won't be any encumbrances there. Pueblos at Alameda, the HOA basically gave us about \$45,000 that they had collected for Impact Fees for that area, not enough to construct or do anything with the park, so we keep that funding on deposit until we see what direction do we head.

The reason we don't necessarily go out, just hire landscape architects and just start jumping into that plan and design component immediately is if we don't have the funding, and Pueblos at Alameda is a good example of that, that might be a \$250,000 or \$300,000 park. At 10% we would anticipate spending \$25,000 to \$30,000 on the design components. Our design cost usually runs about 8-10%, because of changes in code, electrical code or plumbing code, anything that changes at the landscape of the State level, local level. Our plans have changed about every two years; so if we were to go and encumber all of our funds and get all of our design right down the line, if we don't have the funding set aside ready to go for construction, we get those plans and put them on the shelf and they sit there for two years. We basically may have to go back and hire another landscape architect, review those plans and if the plans need to be changed, we potentially pay that amount again to update all the plans so we can go out and construct. Yes, you do see a fund balance there that's pretty healthy right now, and it swings from one end to the other depending upon where we are. Some of these will all hit at the same time, others will trickle out over time. Mr. Chairman, does that help answer your question?

Chair Johnson: Yes. I'm just wondering, do we have then a plan for that \$1.9 million? I'm sure 2017 plans will have a lot of that, but I would assume some of the things that you've shown here will be drawing down some of that money too.

Martin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, yes, that is correct. The City is also beginning to embark on its Capital Improvement Program Process, we're kicking that off here in the next few weeks. We will also be hearing from different user departments and everybody as far as what they're interested in project-wise. It's not just PIF as far as Parks, it's Public Safety, it's Building Projects, etcetera. Once we gather that information this fall, we will also bring that information back to you because then we'll be looking at how our collections are going, what kind of expenditures do we anticipate, what is that true fund balance.

Chair Johnson: That's what I'm looking for. I get a little nervous when I see a big number. I don't want someone saying, "Well, you've got all this kind of money, you don't need any Impact Fees." That's not true.

Martin: No, it's not true.

Chair Johnson: Okay. Enough said. Gene?

Suttmiller: Nothing.

Mathews: Thank you very much.

Chair Johnson: Thank you.

#### **5. Next Meeting Date:**

Chair Johnson: The next meeting date is October 20<sup>th</sup>. I hope we will have a quorum. Gene?

Suttmiller: I have no intention of being anywhere other than here.

Chair Johnson: That's wonderful.

Crawford: I'll be here.

Chair Johnson: I'm coming back from Chicago the day before, just to be here. At that meeting, we will be continuing to follow up with Parks and Recreation, and that will be interesting. In November, we have a meeting. I don't know, Eric or who looks at this, but I think we've scheduled this out in increments that are digestible so that we don't have to have too much, but we also get the Capital updates from Public Safety, Parks and Utilities in the manner that we want them. I was telling Brian that we have actually a strategy here, believe it or not, of getting updates now and then to hear where things are going, so we don't really forget too much

and we keep on track. That's why I was looking for that schedule to January 2018 just to see if there are going to be any blips by anybody, because we could have a blip by not being able to get the contract we want at the same time.

**6. Public Participation:**

Chair Johnson: Is there anybody from the Public here? I see none.

*There was none.*

**7. Committee General Discussion:**

Ruiz: I wanted to apologize because after our last meeting, I left on a two-week vacation and didn't execute the advertising of the vacancy position. I have been working with our PIO (Public Information Office), so we do have that ready and slated to be advertised starting Sunday, Tuesday and Thursday for four weeks running on those dates. Hopefully, we'll get a lot of interest between now and the first two weeks, and then the Mayor can appoint hopefully someone prior to the next meeting. We'll shoot for that, but I'll keep the Chair posted in regard to any applications that we receive on an ongoing basis.

Chair Johnson: That would be great. My only concern, as you know, is I know that couldn't be helped, but we wanted to not have them too far behind the 8-ball as it relates to what Sonya is doing.

Ruiz: What's going on now, right.

Chair Johnson: Getting fresh is sometimes hard to do.

Ruiz: Yes. Once we do have an identified member, we will, like we did for Brian and Mr. Beerman, we will be providing copies for them and Parks and Recreation's presentations will be included with that.

Chair Johnson: Thank you. Any other board comments? Brian? Gene?

Crawford: No.

Suttmiller: No.

Chair Johnson: Alma, all I would suggest is that whatever time you think it's appropriate for me to advise or meet with the City Manager, the new City Manager, to update. I don't need to meet as often as Lonnie, once or twice a year would be fine with me. I only want to update somebody when there is something to update.

Ruiz: Okay.

**8. Adjournment.**

Chair Johnson: Can I have a motion for adjournment?

Crawford: Yes, done.

Chair Johnson: I have a motion from Brian for adjournment.

Suttmiller: Second.

Chair Johnson: All in favor? Aye.

Crawford: Aye.

Suttmiller: Aye.

Chair Johnson: Adjourned. Thank you, one and all.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:12 p.m.



Ronald C. Johnson Date  
CIAC Chair