

# Minutes

1/28/2020 - Minutes

## 1. Call To Order

Thomas: Okay I guess we'll start. I notified the people who are not here in case they forgot. Okay, I'm going call the meeting to order.

## 2. Approval Of Minutes

### 2.1. December 12, 2019

Thomas: The first item is the approval of the minutes. Can I have a motion?

Gordon: I make a motion that we approve the minutes.

Thomas: And a second?

Bennett: I'll second it.

Thomas: Any discussion? All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

## 3. Action Items

### 3.1. Case CP-20-01

Case CP-20-01: Endorse the final draft of the City of Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan, to be known as "Elevate Las Cruces." The proposed plan is a major revision to the currently adopted comprehensive plan and will include a Future Development Map and a Future Thoroughfare Map. The planning area includes the City of Las Cruces and its Extra-Territorial Zone.

Thomas: We have one action item. Endorse the final draft of the City of Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan, to be known as "Elevate Las Cruces", etc. So we need a motion to forward this to Planning and Zoning, recommend it to Planning and Zoning. What language do we need here?

Basnyat: It's on the last slide.

Carrillo: I think what we'll do is if you're okay with (*inaudible*) I'll go to the presentation, summarize the changes, and then comments.

Thomas: We want to have a motion on the floor.

Carrillo: Then after that then there'll be a motion.

Thomas: No, typically we do the motion first and then we have all the discussion.

Carrillo: Go to the end and go to the last line.

Thomas: It doesn't go to the Planning and Zoning right?

Basnyat: What this is a vote to endorse the final draft of the City of Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan.

Thomas: We can just use the languages here. Okay. All right, I need a motion.

Gordon: I make a motion that we vote to endorse the final draft of the proposed Comprehensive Plan called "Elevate Las Cruces" with modifications as presented.

Thomas: Is there a second?

Ainsworth: I'll second it.

Smith: I'll second it.

Thomas: Second, okay. Two seconds, that's fine. So then I'm going to turn it over to Jim. He's going to go through the changes that have been made since the last time we met, right? Then we'll have a discussion about that.

Carrillo: Madam Chair. And they've asked me to use a microphone for the first time. Let me know if it's too loud or I get too excited with this. So what we're going to do is I'm going to go through the changes and the modifications that came out of the Council workshop as well as feedback from you and the many comments that you sent us, feedback we've received since our last meeting. I'll go through that and if you bear with me what I'd like to do is go through all those changes and just go through this presentation. Again part of this meeting is getting some of this on the record so that when the Planning and Zoning Commission meets you can vote on it and you'll have something on the record for it. At that time after the end of it I will turn it back over to Sherry and then it's for your discussion. Because it is moving on for formal action what we would need is any changes or recommendations you have for edits or things like that that they become part of a formal process of amending that motion that you just seconded and forwarded. So that's the time for discussion and going through with that. From there it goes on to Planning and Zoning of course then it goes onto Council for their review.

So I'll try to make this fairly quick. These are the changes. You received all of this in your packets. I'm going to hit most of the highlights of those. There may be a few things that I don't go through in this time but those are all in your packets and you should have all of that. Very briefly as a background, of course this is the Comprehensive Plan. We're updating the current Comprehensive Plan, which was approved in 1999 and updated in 2013, administratively updated in 2013. We talked many times about the role of the Comprehensive Plan as being the plan that guides other actions, guides policies of the City moving forward. It is not the ultimate sayer with detail on everything. There are many other plans that fit underneath it. There are many other policies, there are many other actions that fit under that. Indeed one of those could be an update to your Development Codes which of course would sit underneath this Comprehensive Plan, so it provides that guidance moving forward. But it is very important because it is that ultimate guidance that comes from this year and a half long process that we've been engaged in. It also does fit with Smart Growth Principles and systems thinking and again as I've said many times we want to make sure that we look at all the different aspects of the City working together instead of being in their separate tracts and their sort of separate processes; that we understand how these overlap and they all work with each other in an ideal case where they then make the goals of the plan come true. Fiscal impact has been part of the process and there've been quite a bit of significant public input throughout this entire process.

This is very close to the end of it. But 18 month, little bit over 18 months of the process. In many plans that's very, very typical. Some plans go for longer than that and it is because of all the engagement and the importance quite frankly of this plan to the future of the City. This is your 10th meeting and again I'd like to say we much appreciate all your

efforts and your attendance, and not only that all the work that goes in behind the scenes; reading the documents, commenting on them, giving us your input time and time again throughout this entire process, so we very much appreciate your efforts and your involvement with this process.

So very quickly I'm going to run through a summary of the changes. The first let's start with the future development map, and what you'll see is the map that was in your packets and actually we've been evolving that map since we've added a few notes and other things like that so this map is continuing to get some adjustments. The principle adjustment that has been made is that we're noting on the updated Future Development Map the recommendation to do specific planning exercises with the state and with the Bureau of Land Management on the Centennial area and the East Mesa area as follow ups to this process. And that's where significant additional levels of detail can be added on coming down from a very high level that we're at and into a more detailed level. So that's a recommendation and there is actually an action that's built into the plan that addresses that.

The special considerations map. This is the one you had. The same note is being added to those maps to be sure that we follow through with that. The thoroughfare map, the map that you received in your packets, if you'll recall earlier on we had an extension north of the airport and it actually ran across the Monument lands and so it was removed. In further discussion and what we're proposing to show in the final map is something that does continue it because we believe that that connection across that industrial area is necessary and appropriate. But it will be at the edges of the City's property which is also BLM and state lands in that area too but not encroaching into the National Monument lands so it kind of hugs just the edge of that.

Gordon: So this replaces what's in the book now?

Carrillo: It will with your approval, yes. It will replace that with your approval. A couple of other things: Camino Coyote was added as a major collector that's adjacent to Lohman. Let's see if I can highlight that area right here. Again just elevating its importance in terms of traffic and traffic management along Lohman. The other change is at Foothills north of Lohman was shown as a collector connecting back to Sonoma Ranch and that's been, sorry to Roadrunner, that's been removed. The feeling is that in that area there it can serve as a local road and there's local traffic on it and that allows more local traffic management so that's coming from staff recommendation to remove it as a collector.

There was a new set of illustrations put into this as one of the comments that came out of your feedback. Which they'll be very clearly and when we're talking about the thoroughfare program we needed to make sure that the Active Transportation Plan, did I get it correctly, Active Transportation Plan. I keep calling it the active plan, the Active Transportation Plan was recognized as an integral part of your future thoroughfare considerations. And so what we did is we put a spread that has that. The request from staff has been that we actually show the actual map that was approved as part of the Active Transportation Plan instead of an illustration. My illustrators were very offended by this but I agree with that. That's an adopted plan and that's a real plan so it should be shown in there. The intent is not that you can go into that plan in the document and be able to read it but it's just recognizing that it is an approved and adopted plan and so it's recognizing the importance of it. Likewise with transit, the importance of transit when you're considering a thoroughfare considerations that they're put, so these are two pages that were added to the document.

There were new actions added in response to the feedback that we received. If it's okay with you all I'm not going to go through every single one of these. These are all in your packets but I will highlight just a few of those. The first one there is conduct planning studies with East Mesa and the BLM lands around Centennial. We felt that was important again to continue the discussion and to bring that down to a level where all of the

interested parties including the state could provide feedback on that. I don't know if David is here. I know that the state has provided correspondence to the City regarding their thoughts on that and so I may ask David to just say.

Weir: We continue to, we've worked with the State Land Office throughout this process and there've been some very productive comments and discourse with the State Land Office continues today. So we just need to continue to have that. I believe that the Chair has some comments. You have also in relation to this topic and look into the presentation.

Thomas: Well, just that the State Land Office is sending Steve here to the meeting tonight and I think when you're talking about these things there's other State Land Office land in the City.

Carrillo: Yes.

Thomas: And so.

Carrillo: Some I believe in the City and some outside the City.

Thomas: Like a blanket statement for all of that, for all of the State Office Land not just the East Mesa. And they also are currently developing an exchange with BLM and if there are BLM pieces in the City you should tell Steve where those are. They're willing to put it into their whole package of things that they're going to work with BLM to exchange so that we can get rid of BLM land in the City and just have all state lands since they're, but they're willing to work with the City on planning.

Carrillo: And that may be a topic for discussion among you as Committee members later on.

Nichols: Jim I might also add that this information of the letter and the discussion has been held with the Assistant City Manager and the City Manager as well as the Mayor. They're all informed of the letter that came from the State Land Office, State Land Commission Office. And so everyone's thinking about you know what they mentioned in the letter and taking it under consideration.

Carrillo: The middle, the third one is one that has been talked about which is Development Consensus or public engagement strategy. That covers anything that the City does quite frankly as you move forward. You heard some of the discussion when you had the Council workshop regarding participation and of course everyone in a process does the best they can to get as much participation as possible, that's important. But making sure that subsequent efforts that the City does, there is a process where you try to get as much of that in and reach out to any and all populations that are affected by actions of the City.

New actions, we talked a little bit about the El Paseo corridor and perhaps that connection between the two and the street cars. So assess the feasibility of corridors that could support enhanced transit including connections between downtown and NMSU. So these are specific actions that were added to the language of the document.

Thomas: I did not, can you go back? I'm sorry to interrupt for just one word. What is minimum spacing requirements mean?

Carrillo: Which one?

Thomas: On the second one. On the Dollar stores.

Carrillo: One of the topics I think that we talked about as a group was that whole issue of food deserts and the way Dollar Stores can sometimes impact that in a negative way because they can become places where it's just very quick and easy to access foods that are

unhealthy. But they come, they essentially just crowd out everyone else, all the smaller shops or grocery stores that might provide that. So it's taking a look at, sort of talking about establishing some sort of recommendations.

Thomas: So minimum space requirements that means how close they can be to one another?

Carrillo: Or to other kinds of support food entities. There were modified actions, again based on the feedback that we received and the language that is highlighted and underlined there are the additions that were added to some of the actions and policies within the plan itself. For example, University Avenue Corridor Study to adjust redesign of the corridor as well as the student housing. So again some language just to clarify some of those statements.

The second one on this page was one that staff had a recommendation on that because we were talking about smaller vehicles and perhaps purchasing smaller vehicles to operate within areas that were more constraining. And there was some concern that the City would invest a lot in smaller vehicles and they'd probably be used in certain areas. So essentially it just gives more flexibility to assess what that fleet of maintenance and operational vehicles might look like and then find the right ones, the right mix of those.

This last one was to adopt the latest International Energy Conservation Code and International Green Construction Code. This was removed as an action. What the City typically does is the City follows state guidance and so if at some point the state adopts these codes then the City would then move forward with considering whether to adopt them as well. But at this point the feeling was that since the state hasn't adopted them yet it would be premature on the part of the City to move forward with that. So that was removed as an action.

A short-term work program was added to the document and on your new drafts that you received it should be on page 336 I think, or it's three or four additional pages. Essentially just out of the feedback we received from the Council, that we received from you, we took those and we created a list of, these are the ones that are perhaps shorter term actions across the board in the many different actions throughout the plan that should be addressed and looked at.

Guerrero: What was the, sorry what's the page number again?

Carrillo: That was page 336. And this is the version that I have which you know we're continuing to work towards that final version so I'm trusting that that's the right page but it is towards the end of the implementation. So if it's not that page it's very close to it.

Gordon: Yes it is.

Carrillo: And it's a section that's called "short-term work program" and it has three different diagrams and one for each of the different themes: environment, prosperity, and then of course...

Thomas: Yes it is 336.

Carrillo: Yes and of course livability has to get two pages. So livability has more than the other two but again they're important. These are ones that are in terms of things that we, based on the feedback we received, we foresee the City wanting to take on and work with you or a partner agencies to work at these. So again that's more in terms of a helpful guidance in terms of these are the things that we need to start to tackle fairly quickly.

There were a number of other minor edits to the document and I'll just highlight a few of those. There's some minor tweaks to the acknowledgements and one name misspelled in there. A couple of other things were just from a technical standpoint. Adjustments to the language were made. One of the key ones there is this statement at

the bottom of the page which is again the emphasis is that when we look at streets, you know currently you'll design, you'll have a design speed which may be a certain radius for curves and things like that and velocities, you'll have a posted speed which is saying "okay this is miles per hour" and you'll have an actual speed. And as all of us know but we're never going to admit it, you know we take that posted speed as a recommendation rather than an enforceable limit. And so what this does is it tries to look at how do we bring these more in line with each other? So we're realistic about what the actual speed that we're driving on these roadways is.

How this comes into play is it's important because then it affects if someone is walking on that street or you want bikeability on that street, you certainly want to make sure that you have an environment that is conducive to those other forms of transportation, for the active transportation on that roadway. So it's sort of a different approach of thinking about it and it's emphasized in the plan by changes to, small changes to language like this.

In Volumes II, III, and IV again just small changes to the acknowledgement. And then in Volume IV we did have one thing where we just needed to make a change for consistency with the plan. There probably are some other minor typos and things like that that we'll continue to go through and look at. You know those are things that can just go by course and I don't think any document is 100% absolutely perfect although we certainly like to think it is but we want to try to catch absolutely 99.999% percent of those if we can.

So with that, those are the changes to the document. At this point I'll turn it back over to Sherry as Chair and welcome your conversation regarding the plan.

Thomas: So I think maybe first of all we should talk about the ones that you listed up here. Can you go back to the first page of things that you listed? We can, can we just quickly go over these and see if anybody sees anything that they want to comment on?

Carrillo: You want the map, all the map changes and all that?

Thomas: And then we'll see if there's anything else people want to add. Okay so this is the community development.

Carrillo: Yes. I'll highlight the one that's been proposed for adjustments.

Thomas: So any comments or discussion about this? So my only comment here is that there's other State Land Office lands within the City, so how do we want to handle that?

Carrillo: Okay. My solution to that is there was and there is language in the document that does call for continued study. And I don't think word studies is used but continued joint planning between the City and the state and the BLM on that. So I think we just need to highlight that language and make sure that stands out.

Thomas: And that's not the exact language that's in that, you've got (*inaudible*) there on the East Mesa. It's a little different I think. And it's really hard to read.

Carrillo: Yes in the document scale yes it is.

Thomas: "Federal and state lands may be subject to alternative development plans not depicted on this map and subject to joint planning agreements with the City of Las Cruces." And then it says its actions to CE-5.1.1. I guess somehow I'd like for it to, because you're just pointing to two pieces here and there are a whole lot more, so anyway we can make it more general, all of the State Land Office lands.

Carrillo: My recommendation would be there is an illustration in the document but I can't recall what page it is, but there is an illustration that shows all of the State Land Office, State and BLM lands.

Thomas: I was looking for that.

Weir: Page 29.

Carrillo: 29, thank you.

Basnyat: Page 29.

Thomas: Page 29?

Carrillo: So my recommendation is that we put some very specific language in that that addresses all of those pieces of property. And that's where it sort of is covered at the *(inaudible)*.

Basnyat: I believe there is language.

Carrillo: There is something ready for that, maybe.

Basnyat: Something about master plan.

Thomas: It's while the City should determine suitability proposed development based on the future development map it may enter into joint plan agreements with federal or state entities that permit alternative development patterns for select tracts. Then you added ...

Basnyat: Master planning.

Thomas: Master planning on these areas should we encourage. That was the additional language. Federal and state lands.

Basnyat: There's also specific action items.

Carrillo: There was a specific action item that was added, 2.3.

Thomas: Well I think this covers it because it says federal and state lands and then it just says, "these lands" and so that and that refers to all the ones that are there, so I think we're probably okay.

Carrillo: Correct. The action that is highlighted, it's one of the following slides. It's on page 228 reads "conduct planning studies with the East Mesa and the BLM land located near Centennial High School west of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard." Again, our feeling was that's been something that's a topic of a lot of discussion so those are two that we felt it was important to highlight that.

Thomas: So that one those is more specific to just two places right?

Carrillo: To two places, yes.

Thomas: I think it probably needs to say to be consistent with this that it needs to say state and federal lands rather than just those two. Any discussion on that? Are people okay with that?

Carrillo: So keep a record because again we'd certainly like you to go through this and make formal

amendments to your motion to include all of these as we discuss through these.

Thomas: So we're talking about CE-2.3.4. Okay. Anything more on this, on the map?

Moscato: Well, are we just discussing these changes now or the map in a more overall picture?

Thomas: Yes if it's pertinent to this. Yes go ahead.

Moscato: To the map? Okay. So it seems that the language we just discussed doesn't really have any meaning if the sentence that was skipped in what was just read still remains here. "Such agreements should only be approved by the City where it determines that growth cannot be absorbed by existing land supply and in conjunction with an amendment to the future development." So when it says "cannot be absorbed by existing land supply" I think that opens up the possibility that staff or P&Z or City Council can say "well, here's 20 acres here or 50 acres here or 100 acres here still existing land supply elsewhere in the City. Until that land is absorbed we're not going to approve any changes to the future development of that." So it's kind of meaningless to say there's going to be a study but change can only apply if there's no land elsewhere in the City that can be developed. So I think at a minimum that sentence begins "such agreements" I would recommend that we consider or discuss deleting that sentence. I'd even go a step farther with the future development map if there's going to be a study, if there's going to be a joint planning agreement with the state or with the BLM, I don't understand why place types are being imposed now. Why that can't simply be designated as a study area with place types, land uses, development to be determined by those agreements that will be you know explored by the parties involved.

There's also a couple of points that I don't think have ever really been fully discussed here at the CPAC meetings. Number one, if you turn to, I know there's a lot of pages here but in volume three, page seven you'll note that the Comp Plan that exists today designates that entire East Mesa area as intended growth. I'm not sure that there's ever been any discussion that explains to us why if this area has been labeled intended growth for the past 10, 15, 20 years why all of a sudden there's a need to change that now. Because there's a significant portion of this land that's going to be excluded from growth under the Future Development Map place types as they stand.

I've also heard comments about "well those place types have been determined based on the chip game results" but that's not entirely accurate either because if you look at appendix III-B on page 56 you'll see that that entire East Mesa area was the third highest score of any areas to be developed in the entire map. So there wasn't really any consensus that that not be developed or that development be severely limited. In fact the chip game results show that there was more of a consensus that that was future development just as the existing Comp Plan indicates. So I appreciate that there's been some effort to address the fact that there's going to be or might be a joint planning agreement with the Land Office and maybe with BLM in the future.

My recommendation would be that or my statement would be that that's really doesn't go far enough and there's no reason to impose these place types now that more or less set a bias for the future. Especially the open space preserve which goes against what the current zoning is of that land right now. Right now that land can be developed into one acre lots under the holding zone designation that exists and by designating thousands of acres as open space preserve you're really eliminating that use. And I know there's a statement on the map that says this map isn't the zoning map. It's really worse than a zoning map because at least a zoning map goes through a zone change process. This isn't going through a zone change process it's just willy-nilly changing the development potential of that land without going through the formal rezoning process that would typically be followed. So I think there's a lot of reasons why I would suggest that the Committee consider a recommendation to simply label that area as a study area.

Thomas: You're talking about all of the State Lands?

Moscato: Yes.

Thomas: Within the City limits?

Moscato: Yes, anything that would be projected to be part of a joint planning agreement. Why not just leave it, leave the place types, leave land uses, leave development potential, up to that agreement?

Carrillo: Madam Chair. If I can sort of give you the context that the plan and respond in why things are shown in the plan the way they are and that'll give you some context for discussion and considering John's thoughts. First and foremost in the chip game there were chips placed in that area but my recollection is many of those chips were, revolved around that cluster development that we talked about. So it was very concise. It was in a more appropriate type of development for that area and it was on the fringes of that larger area. I don't recall any of the plans completely consuming that area and saying "let's fully develop it" so that was the context for that discussion.

If you recall in the chip game we had, all had a starting point where we said "this is the growth that is anticipated over the next 25 years" so about 40,000 population, about 16,000 units that will respond to that population growth that we have. And so there were plenty of places to place those including some of the fringe areas of this area and that's the way I think the plans shows it where there is some recognition that there's potential for some areas along certainly the western part of that area where you could do that.

The condition that's put in the language in here in terms of supply is that we want to be cognizant number one of infrastructure and how the City grows, not just immediate infrastructure but future infrastructure and responding to that and the different kinds of infrastructure and services that the City supplies. So we want to have some sense of where that development might occur so that the City can logically and carefully go and place that development. So we don't think it's appropriate just to say you know it's a blank slate and all of this can be developed. Now we've talked repeatedly that as growth occurs and as conditions perhaps change over the next 10, 20, 30 years and beyond there's certainly ample opportunities to go back and revisit that and change them.

We do feel because this is the one plan that looks at the entire City and looks at the land use from the entire City and this is how we anticipate development from an overall standpoint of the City that it is important to have these areas considered as to how they might develop. So there is a need for a starting point that says, "this is the thinking that went into the overall picture of the City." It does not mean that that starting point cannot change and cannot be adjusted as it goes through a process but we felt that it is important to have that starting point. So there is ample area for development. There is flexibility in that area. There's certainly areas along the fringes of it and certainly into it, but it is an important asset of the City and the City environs as well.

Now we recognize the value that the state puts on it for their purposes of funding education so they have an entirely different purpose. But the City's role is not that purpose. The City's role is to think about the entire City and how the City develops. So that's all of these kind of place makers and say this is where, this is holding chips and saying this is where the City should start in these conversations and then work with the state and work in what might be the best solution. There are many, many creative ways to think about it and so I anticipate that some of those will come out in that process.

Thomas: Can you point out on the maps the special consideration map 1.3? I know you had it up here a little while ago I think.

Carrillo: Let me see if it's in the next presentation or not.

Thomas: What place types are put on the land that John's talking about?

Carrillo: So in this one of course we're talking about that suburban, traditional suburban growth in this yellow area here and we're talking about more rural neighborhoods and then open spaces as we move into the much closer areas.

Thomas: So it's rural neighborhood and open space or?

Carrillo: Open space, rural neighborhoods, and then sort of more traditional.

Thomas: And then the suburban.

Carrillo: Suburban areas, yes. The area around Centennial, and this was a lot of discussion about it, the area around Centennial was shown in this rural neighborhood. That is because there's natural resources and there's arroyos and things like that in that area. That is certainly one that there's different ways in which that could be arranged. So that's why we felt that that area is a specific study area as well. On the West Mesa the state was also very interested in the West Mesa and the configuration of lands there and certainly we're in agreement that that's an area where we want that kind of growth and certainly growth that if it can bring employment that's certainly a valuable addition, so.

Thomas: So then, yes can you point out what the place types are there?

Carrillo: So the place types there I think essentially are all that industrial area.

Basnyat: It's Business Park Industrial and Civic/Institutional.

Thomas: Is there any residential around there?

Basnyat: There is rural neighborhood to the East which can accommodate residential.

Thomas: Okay. So would you explain again why the, just making it blank for now is not acceptable?

Carrillo: I think again we're looking at the overall City and the entire picture of all of the potential, the future development of the entire City. We're looking at the different places where that development might occur and leaving that completely as a blank slate and in addition to the importance that it serves as the foothills to the mountains, the natural topography, the natural conditions, that all of these are things that say "this area should be developed in a more sensitive context, a more considerate context than perhaps other areas closer into the City." So that's the context for having something that says this is a placeholder of what we think should happen there, again subject to further review and study.

Moscato: But I think it's clear that that's a, that is the major growth corridor in the City and I think we should all be careful about drawing lines on a map. If you go back 30, 40 years ago what if somebody had drawn a line on a map at Telshor and said we're not going to develop east of Telshor or on Roadrunner. 20 years ago there was nothing, not much east of Roadrunner. If you'd drawn a line on the map on Roadrunner 20 years ago similar to a map, lines on the map here where would growth have occurred? Where would growth have occurred in Metro Verde if you would have drawn a line on a map at Engler Road and said, "north of Engler Road nothing is going to be developed?" You can't really anticipate what the needs will be.

We've had meetings with staff, with the consultant, a number of meetings with all of the major home builders in the City and unanimously they have pointed out that just

because land might in theory exist for development elsewhere doesn't mean it's available for development. It might lack infrastructure, it might not be in a preferred area, it might not be for sale, it might be for sale at an unreasonable price. So just because there's land elsewhere doesn't mean it's available. This land being owned by the State, being State Trust Land, the State Land Office is usually ready, willing, and able to enter into leases and eventual sale and that's how a lot of the property in the City's already been developed. That's how much of Sonoma Ranch was developed through an exchange involving the state and with BLM.

It's zoned holding right now so it's not really a blank slate. Holding allows one acre lots. So that's really far from a blank slate. That's the underlining zoning right now. I just don't think it's harmful at all. In fact by having it be a blank slate it would be a more extensive planning process involved than has taken place specifically regarding that land throughout this process. This process involves a 600 page Comprehensive Plan here. There hasn't been that much attention planned to the nuts and bolts of the development of that area that would come into play through a joint planning agreement and the plans for development that would result from that.

Basnyat: Madam Chair.

Weir: Madam Chair. If I just provide some additional input into the development of this. We started with the growth projections for the City. How many households would we need to accommodate? How much commercial land? How much business activity centers? Then we also did the chip game with that. We also did analysis of developments that already had entitlements, number of lots that were created and so all this information, input from the public, all went into the development of this map.

The other thing that took place was you developed the goals for the City and so this map also reflects those goals. And one of the things you wanted to see, that the goals created was a desire for more managed growth to discourage leapfrog or on the edge growth. A little bit more compact to intensify the uses along the corridors. So when you take all of that information into account that's why you have a little bit less area considered for the suburban type of growth. But then to try to balance that thought there was the provisions that there are these special study areas and if development goes along faster, that if you do that analysis you could then bring that in and show the conditions have changed. You know the inventory of lots is small, to get to your comment on not all of the area that's vacant is developable.

The other thing that was taken into consideration is that one of the actions is that the implementation of the Plan be considered and a report provided to Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council on a yearly basis of how that's going, and then a recommendation instead of 10 years for updates, every five year that takes place. And that's the perfect time that the map gets modified and provides those opportunities to expand the growth areas. And then third, the provisions of that there is additional study that needs to take place. Not only is it called out in this manner but under the legend there's also a note that federal and state lands may require additional studies. That kind of addresses where the conversation started but like I said this map kind of reflects the entire process. The public input, the need for land based on your growth trends and what you anticipate, the type of development you want to take place in the City, and then providing you know providing for leeway to expand in other areas. So I just wanted to add that to the discussion of the context of how this map was developed.

Thomas: Russ?

Smith: Madam Chair. Listening to John, we all benefit from his user experience and his education with land use as a developer. So that doesn't go lightly as I hear him talk about his read on the document. My read on the document is that we're creating maps and drawing lines that give suggestion and expectation for a future growth rather than barriers or stops or

restrictions. So I think I view it that way.

Thomas: Say that last part again a little louder and a little more description, okay?

Smith: The map is giving us a way of looking at expectations rather than a way of looking at barriers or restrictions.

Thomas: And so that would lead you to conclude that we should do what with the map?

Smith: I like the public input. I like the staff input. I like the process that has developed this verbiage and it's in place from that input. That we try to distort it in a last minute meeting isn't too critical to me.

Thomas: Thanks.

Gordon: Jim. I think everybody has to remember one thing it's extremely important. As everybody has said here is true and John and David and Russ, this is not etched in stone. Anything that can happen in the future we can amend this and we can change it. All these situations can change drastically considering what happens within the next five, 10, 20 or 30 years. So if something changes, we change the map. Nobody's drawing a line here that says you cannot cross this line. It's not firm. These are all suggestions. All plans. I don't want to use a certain word suggestions, they're all plans and they can all be changed. I don't understand why people are so concerned about the fact that they're being held out of a situation because there's a line drawn on a piece of paper that suggests a particular area.

Moscato: On page 28 there's wording "place type boundaries, etc. should be viewed as fixed and not subject to interpretive adjustment." Also says on the next page because I read before that "the agreements with Land Office, BLM should only be approved where it's determined growth cannot be absorbed by existing land supply." So if we want to add language that these lines are expectations only and not firm boundaries I think that's, that would be an important clarification. But the way I read it, it looks like they are set boundaries. That's what it says here.

Gordon: But that was not the intent when this was done. You know it's like a lawyer says when you're talking about a document that somebody else has prepared they say what was the persons intent? That may not be specifically stated it's exactly what somebody is interpreting. What was his intent when he did this? The intent was when we went through all these exercises was to come up with this and I don't believe that any of this is fixed in, engraved in brass. I don't think engraved in stone or granite. I think it's all here and it's flexible unless I'm reading this the wrong way, and my thinking has drastically changed and what John is saying then.

Carrillo: Madam Chair. I think Abraham had a comment and I'd like to sort of clarify with you.

Thomas: Okay. Abraham.

Sanchez: I just want to clarify first, John. So you referenced page 28 where you noted that part where it says that it's fixed. Where on page 28 are you quoting?

Moscato: Under fixed geographic features.

Sanchez: Okay because that's slightly different than what you're suggesting. So this is place type boundaries that follow defined features such as drainage channels, major roadways, and railroads should be viewed as fixed and not subject to interpretive adjustment. So that's not a blanket statement on every single place type that we're designating.

Moscato: No but there are major road corridors going through that that that would apply to.

Sanchez: Okay but, so that gives you a reason why those are to be fixed then because those things are there. So I just wanted to kind of clarify that.

The second thing though, and I think I would actually just kind of allude to Mr. Gordon's point is they're set in so far as there's a process to amend them. So they can be amended still. What it means is they're fixed so long as you've not amended them yet. Does that make sense?

Moscato: Well, if that would be true with anything.

Sanchez: Sure but that doesn't mean that it's set in stone forever.

Moscato: I didn't say forever but it's set in stone until it's changed.

Sanchez: True.

Moscato: So if it's never changed it's set in stone.

Sanchez: It feels though that your suggestion is that it can't ever change and I think the point is that there's a process in place here where it can change.

Thomas: John will you point out again on page 28 where you were?

Moscato: In the subheading fixed geographic features.

Thomas: Fixed geographic fixtures, okay.

Carrillo: Talking about defined features such as the drainage channel and roadways.

Thomas: All right and then Jim you wanted to say something.

Carrillo: I was going to essentially echo what Abraham just said responding to Harvey. The future development map plan gives guidance but it does give guidance in a sense that if I'm developing in a certain area I want to know that the general context around me. So it is something that's going to give guidance that is generally saying this is what is proposed to happen there. So in a sense that it's not quite, it's not fixed in stone to that degree but there is a process to go through and look at it and adjust it and change it. So it's kind of somewhere in between those. It gives everyone again a graphic picture of this is how the City might develop over the next 20, 25 years. Again based on very sound principals of supply and the anticipated growth that's expected as well as, you know David pointed out very correctly many of the other aspects of this planning process that went into thinking about how the City should grow and where it should grow.

So I think it behooves you as a City to have something on this map that says, "based on this process this is the strategy that we're looking at for this area." Again subject to more detail coming down from that very high level. And John you're absolutely right, you know a plan like this you can't give that level of detail that you can coming down looking at it. Which then defines more clearly, again with all the expectations of the Plan and especially some of the natural features and that sort of sensitivity in where this property is located that then helps you more to better define how it should be developed. So again call it a starting point because we recognize there will be additional thinking going in there but I believe you need that starting point rather than just sort of a "well we're just sort of walking away from this but we're thinking about the rest of the City."

Thomas: I would like to ask you a couple questions Jim. So one of the things John talked about was that there is no zone change process and so how would these place types get changed? What would that process be?

Carrillo: Comprehensive Plan amendments. That's the process for this.

Thomas: And ...

Carrillo: And again we recommended that this not be one of these sort of plans that you go back and look at every five, 10, 20 years. It's very frequent revisiting of the plan itself. But I will make the point that you, when you look at this you can't look at it just in the context of that you need to look at it in the context of the overall plan and the overall goals and objectives of the whole plan.

Thomas: And John one of your concerns is the statement that not until all available land has been exhausted?

Moscato: Right. That the agreement, it says such agreements, the agreement, "joint planning agreements should only be approved by the City where it determines the growth cannot be absorbed by existing land supply" and I just think that's too high a bar for anybody to overcome. Because you could always point to some existing land supply somewhere.

Thomas: Could you, if you changed it to if available?

Moscato: I'm not sure that would make much of a difference.

Thomas: Existing available land supply because as you pointed out there's maybe a lot of vacant land but it might not be available or useful for ...

Moscato: I just don't see the need for that sentence at all.

Smith: Madam Chair.

Thomas: Russ.

Smith: I agree with John on that. It is a high bar.

Sanchez: John can you read it one more time just so I can hear the language specifically?

Moscato: Sure. "Such agreements" and it's referring to agreements with Land Office "should only be approved by the City where it determines that growth cannot be absorbed by existing land supply and in conjunction with an amendment to the future development map." What I'm focusing on is the "cannot be absorbed by existing land supply."

Sanchez: Yes. When you first raised that concern my initial kind of reaction was well I wouldn't view it that way, right. But that's not really how we decide these things right? I think this is a very valid point and actually is because it depends. That particular statement can be used very politically right, for someone who, I wouldn't use it that way because I would want (*inaudible*) where I'm not just making a developer have to go and develop on wherever we say, right? I wouldn't do that, but I'm not entirely sure that everyone will play that nicely when it comes to that and that they won't make that this incredibly cumbersome requirement on someone who's wanting to develop. So I think either some kind of change in the language maybe but that's about where I fall short because I don't know exactly what to change about the language.

Vescovo: Madam Chair. If I may comment. So in addition to having done business, well I did go to

law school and there's debate even at the Supreme Court level whether intent should even be taken into consideration versus the text and Supreme Court justices like Scalia saying intent shouldn't be taken into consideration. You should only use a good dictionary and the text on the page. And other Supreme Court justices have followed along with that mindset. Others disagree. I'm of the mindset that intent and the document should align as much as possible. I'm also of the mindset that I'm leery of absolute words like "only." That is an incredibly high bar. Actually it's an absolute word so I agree with John that perhaps we should delete or severely modify it or if we're, if our intent is to really have some flexibility here I think we should make that clear.

Carrillo: I will make one point in that this language here refers to the discussion between the state and the City. So this is not with private developers. That's subsequent in following with that so this is the agreement with the state. So as that sort of bigger picture plan for this or that more focused plan comes into play that's where this language would have an impact.

Thomas: However, this whole part is about areas of special consideration and so in this case you mean the State Land that we're talking about. It does affect private developers because it is, I don't know I think I would probably agree to take that sentence out.

Carrillo: Can I suggest an alteration to the language of that same sentence that might sort of again fit somewhere in between both perspectives on it? And I'll say this it may not be crafted exactly right but I think you'll get the intent with it. Such agreements shall take into account the availability of existing land supply that can absorb the projected growth and with an amendment to the future development plan. So in essence as that planning process goes through there is consideration of how this impacts the supply of land. Because again I think there's a desire that we're not just going to have exponential growth in that direction and there is no growth anywhere else in the City because that's sort of the, everyone's just going there. And so I want to make sure that there is consideration when state and the City are visiting this and working through this process that there is consideration. That consideration of what's available and where those other pockets are or other parts of the City where it may be desirable for growth to occur and maybe that's sequential growth. All of that should be considered as part of this thinking and I think that's customary planning at any rate if you think about that.

Thomas: Can you say again what your suggestion was?

Carrillo: I have to make sure. Such agreements shall take into account the availability of existing land supply that can absorb projected growth and in conjunction with an amendment to the future development map.

Vescovo: Madam Chair. If I may make a comment on that?

Thomas: George.

Vescovo: I like that language just should consider, not shall. Shall is an absolute word in legal terms. But should consider availability and economic feasibility because to John's point if somebody has it and they're asking a ridiculous amount of money, 10 times the market rate for something, it's technically available but it's not economically feasible.

Thomas: Do you have a response to that, John?

Moscato: I just think that's still way too restrictive. What if somebody just preferred to develop elsewhere? What if somebody, what if land is available but it doesn't meet the development type or the housing type that the developer or builder wants to move forward with? I just think the whole idea of availability of land supply is too malleable to have any real meaning.

Carrillo: But that's where that planning process comes into play with the state in getting again zooming down and figuring out a little bit more about exactly what, how that would be changing.

Moscato: I don't think the availability of land elsewhere in the City should have anything to do with the agreement with the Land Office. Why would the Land Office care what's available elsewhere?

Thomas: Do you want to say something?

Weir: For discussion purposes only. What if it were modified 'such agreements should be approved by the City where it determines that growth cannot be reasonably absorbed by existing available land supply in conjunction with the map?' It takes out the word only. It also interjects people's thoughts were the reasonableness of can you acquire land or not. Is it even truly available?

Moscato: So someone who wants to develop or if in order to change any of those place types you would have to inventory the entire land supply in the City and determine what's available and what's not? I think we're making this a lot more difficult than it needs to be.

Smith: Madam Chair.

Thomas: Russ.

Smith: If I'm hearing John and I'm hearing other recommendations which are all smart and meaningful but I'm going back to where John is thinking it's just not a necessary statement. Need not be there, need not be a restriction that has to be measured or interpreted. John am I hearing that correctly?

Moscato: You are.

Thomas: Did you have a response?

Weir: I was just saying that this doesn't necessarily address place types it's just saying when federal or state land is being proposed for private development that it should be planned and that that plan should be reflected on the map is the way I read the entire section. It's not dictating what type of place types should be placed on there. It's really directing that these are unique properties and that before they're released for private development there needs to be some additional studies on it. And the development process requires master planning and initial zoning of these properties and so this really just aids you as you go forward in development. You can use the planning agreements and whatever plans come out of it as the first step towards your master plan to go forward with your subdivision and your justification for the zoning being placed on those properties.

Moscato: I don't disagree with any of that. That's normal planning process. But normally in normal planning process you don't have to prove that there's no other land that you could possibly develop other than this.

Carrillo: Again I reiterate this is in the consideration between the state and the City so this is before that is turned over to private development interest to begin to look at that. So the expectation is on the part of the City and the state that they consider that that how it fits into the bigger picture of what's available and how the City grows.

Thomas: So you say such agreements between the City and the state should be approved by the City?

Basnyat: Madam Chair. So this is going back to the intent and the actual language and if we're to match it I, just for discussion purposes, I'd like to submit that we could change it to say something like 'such agreements should be based on sustainable growth principals and on furthering the vision of this plan'. That is the intent of this. It is any time that the state and federal governments go into a planning agreement with the City that there should be a reason and some sort of foundation on which that planning occurs and we should establish that intent. And so make it known but perhaps not be so specific as to exclude certain situations. The other thing I would like to point out is 50% approximately of land in Las Cruces is undeveloped and to not plan for that would be a disaster.

Thomas: Could you say the first part that you said the language you suggest?

Basnyat: Sure. Such agreements should be based on furthering the vision of this plan and on sustainable growth principals or something to that effect.

Thomas: Further, what was further something of this plan?

Basnyat: The vision of this plan.

Thomas: Okay, vision. What's your response to that, John?

Moscato: Well to the extent that the vision includes the place types that are imposed on that land now I think it's problematic. If it didn't, if it weren't tied specifically to those place types and it could be a more open ended process.

Basnyat: Madam Chair. So the vision itself is not, does not specify place types and the vision is something that this body has voted on so it is official. It does not reference place types.

Thomas: Well George.

Vescovo: I want to hear, I think each one of us is here for a reason. We all have our individual expertise and we are here to try and come together and build consensus but each one of us has a unique background and that's why I'm eager to hear what John has to say. He comes from a background of development and homebuilders so I defer to his expertise but I think that what Srijana said was, I liked what I heard. Now I want to hear John's response to that. I know he doesn't want to be restricted and if we could clarify that there is a level of flexibility for him that, I like what I heard but I'm not a developer.

Moscato: Well I understand what you're saying but according to your interpretation of what you're proposing it's not tied to any place types. My concern would be that someone in the future might, or well interpret it that way because the place types are part of the plan.

Weir: I think if you read the sentence before though this is kind of the (*inaudible*) of adjustment for the Comp Plan. It says that if you go through these plans you get to determine what the appropriate place type is. It's kind of a process.

Basnyat: Yes, Madam Chair. I just wanted to point out just the sentence before that it actually talks about while the City should determine the suitability of proposed development based on the future development map it may enter into joint planning agreements with federal or state entities that permit alternative development patterns for select tracts. That's the point of this paragraph and in doing so it is recommending that those agreements be cognizant of what this plan is trying to do and I'll just (*inaudible*). Does that help?

Moscato: That does.

Thomas: So in terms of process here are we going to try to get some language here we can agree on

and go on and do everything else or are we going to need to vote on this part separate?

Basnyat: You can do it however you want. I would recommend going (*inaudible*).

Weir: Madam Chair. Just as a point of order, Mark is taking notes and so he can add that to the bottom of the recommended changes we already have and so if you reach consensus we'll put it on to that list and then at the end of the meeting if you can just endorse it all at one time.

Carrillo: And it'll be read at that point in time too to make sure everyone recalls it.

Thomas: Okay so let's hear Srijana's language once again.

Carrillo: Do you want me to read it since I think I wrote it down.

Thomas: Okay.

Carrillo: Such agreements between the state and the City should be based on sustainable growth principals and furthering the vision of this plan. Did I get that right?

Basnyat: Sure except there might be some English language considerations there. Okay, I would not specify the state because it's already specified earlier. It says federal or state. So how about just such ...

Carrillo: Such agreements shall ....

Basnyat: Such agreements should be based on sustainable growth principals and should further the vision of this plan.

Thomas: Do we have some consensus here?

Gordon: So everything from such agreements to the word encouraged is to be deleted and what you just said is to be added?

Basnyat: No. Okay, so the part that starts with such and ends in supply will be replaced by that wording. We will still keep 'and in conjunction ...

Gordon: Okay.

Basnyat: 'With an amendment to the future development map. Master planning in these areas should be encouraged.'

Gordon: Okay.

Smith: Madam Chair. Point of order.

Thomas: Yes Russ.

Smith: I think we're at a point of discussion. Would it be proper to have a motion on the table then discussion, or motion and a second and then discussion? A motion that would house all of our discussion about amendments?

Thomas: That's what I was just asking about, do we want to actually make a decision about this particular piece or do we want to wait and put it at the end? I'm fine with making the decision about this particular piece if somebody wants to make that motion.

Gordon: How many do we have now? We had one before this and then we have this one?

Thomas: Right.

Gordon: I think probably better off just continuing the discussion and then we'll vote on them at the end, right.

Thomas: I think this is one of the most difficult ones that we've probably would ...

Gordon: Okay, so you're Chair. Fine we can vote on it.

Thomas: Talking about it now. Okay, can somebody make a motion that we accept Srijana's language?

Gordon: I'll make a motion that we accept Srijana's recommended changes to this paragraph.

Smith: Second.

Thomas: A Second, okay. Discussion.

Smith: We're in discussion now.

Carrillo: Officially.

Thomas: If there's no discussion then we're going to vote. Everybody ready to vote? Okay, Becky will you call the roll?

Baum: Sure. Board Member Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Moscato.

Moscato: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Watenpaugh. I'm sorry.

Watenpaugh: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Ainsworth.

Ainsworth: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Sanchez.

Sanchez: Yes.

Baum: And Board Member Vescovo.

Vescovo: Yes.

Baum: Thank you.

Thomas: It passes whatever we have to zero. Okay, so let's go on to see if we can move a little more quickly through the others. So can you just go to your next list of items. I didn't see very many problems but, yes that's all part of what we're talking about now. What else were your changes that we're voting on? Okay, this is about reclassification of some of these streets. Any issues with any of that? Okay.

Carrillo: This is just a placement of the active (*inaudible*).

Thomas: Yes and this, addition of these maps, although if it won't be these it'll be the actual maps. Is everybody okay with that? And those maps continue to change too, but we won't understand that by (*inaudible*). Okay, planning size. If the incomplete infrastructure is a really big issue for some people on the Council so that will, they will I'm sure discuss that. Public engagement, that's something they're interested in. Neighborhoods. Alternative designs with (*inaudible*). Anything there that anybody wants to comment on?

Watenpaugh: On that first one is that supposed to be East Mesa or West Mesa? It's at the area by the airport.

Carrillo: Specifically in this context it was the East Mesa.

Watenpaugh: Okay.

Carrillo: But there is in that big picture there are state lands on the East Mesa.

Watenpaugh: Okay. Just wanted to make sure it was right.

Carrillo: And I think it is one of the first item that we talked about whether this should be expanded to include bigger references.

Thomas: Federal and state land, any federal and state land. You know more than just those two pieces because there's quite a bit within the City limits. So is that okay?

So there are a couple things here I don't know if we want to talk about it here but the Crisis Triage Center there also, the City also has under their request to the state legislature the construction of a health, mental health facility. Do we want to have anything in here about that?

Basnyat: I thought it was in there. No?

Thomas: Support an opening and utilizing the crisis triage center but, this is about actually

establishing a hospital because it's different than the triage center.

Basnyat: Should we just add 'and hospital' or other *(inaudible)*?

Thomas: Maybe. The crisis triage center to provide response to mental health issues. Opening of the crisis center.

Carrillo: Do you want to be so specific and say hospital or do you want to say *(inaudible)*?

Thomas: Well I think it needs to say 'support opening of the crisis center and other mental health facilities' because this, if the City's at the legislature asking for this there should be something in here about it and, but we could make it general. And the crisis triage center and other mental health facilities.

Smith: Madam Chair. Are you saying the City is actively asking or thinking of asking?

Thomas: They're actively asking. It's in their, you know we were just all in Santa Fe for the Las Cruces Day and everybody reported on what their Capital Outlay requests were and this was one of *(inaudible)*.

Smith: So this would serve to give basis to that ask. Got you.

Thomas: Yes my concern always is that whatever's in this plan is general enough that, I mean for example I talked to quite a few mental health people over the weekend and they want to know when they come to the City to ask for stuff that there's something in the general in the Comprehensive Plan so that that allows them to do that.

Smith: So Madam Chair does the statement that talks about the triage go far enough if we say, 'and mental health facility?'

Sanchez: I think that goes as far as we probably want it to go. Any further than that is going to get too specific. I mean the reality is we may not even get those TIP funds right in the first place for this.

Thomas: Right.

Sanchez: But it needs to be general enough that, with the triage center I think that's okay because the physical building is actually already constructed and we've got to figure out how to get it open. But with anything else I think it needs to be a little bit more open ended.

Smith: And maybe to Srijana in all public input, in discussions, in developing the Comprehensive Plan, has that been discussed? Has it been brought to the table or is it just now coming?

Basnyat: So we haven't really discussed a hospital necessarily but the crisis triage center and facilities in general have come up during the subcommittee discussions for sure.

Vescovo: Madam Chair. if I may make a comment. I support expanding that and I did read the legislative priorities when I was up at Las Cruces Day in Santa Fe. I would, another ask that's been on the table for quite a while is to have an autism diagnosis center here. The only one in the state is at UNM and considering that I think it's like one in 60 children are diagnosed with autism and having the only diagnosis center being at UNM there's been a big push and a big ask to have a diagnosis center at New Mexico State University for a while. So I would support not only expanding the language beyond the crisis triage center to provide crisis triage center and whatever additional language which support facilities to provide response and diagnosis for mental health issues. So to add the 'response and diagnosis' I think that would also encompass.

Thomas: So autism comes under mental health?

Vescovo: Absolutely. It absolutely does.

Thomas: So the other ask that I got this weekend when we were up in Santa Fe was some language that said the City will work with regional mental health professionals and organizations. Could we take some, that kind of a statement and make it so it includes what you're talking about? We do have some language in here somewhere about the need to attract more health professionals. My husband has Parkinson's. The only neurologist who do movement specialties are both in Albuquerque so there's a whole cluster I think of things that we don't address here and so we need to be kind of general about it. I don't know if the attracting other health professionals helps.

Smith: Health services?

Thomas: If that covers it or we want to try to put something in here.

Smith: Health services?

Thomas: Russ.

Smith: Health services in general?

Thomas: The title of this is health, there's a whole paragraph that's health services and mental health right?

Carrillo: Yes. One of the previous actions does talk about support state health and human service programs and facilities. That talks about the state. Perhaps that's one where you could interject something about regional.

Vescovo: And what about other providers? I'm thinking providers like Aprendamos and Tresco.

Thomas: That is in here someplace. It's in *(inaudible)*.

Basnyat: Page 216.

Thomas: Okay on 216 that's where this "support opening using the triage Center is in here. Coordinate with Doña Ana County resilience leaders to establish a group that oversees provision of services to address mental health issues." But that's just one specific group so that's probably not. Is there one in here?

Carrillo: 18.1.2.

Thomas: "To support the attraction of primary care physicians, specialists, mental health professionals, and urgent care facilities."

Miller: Madam Chair. There is action CP-10.1.3.

Thomas: *(inaudible)*.

Miller: 10.1.3 on page 173 that does mention "attracting diverse mental health practitioners."

Smith: Could you repeat that again Mark? Page.

Miller: 173.

Thomas: In Volume I?

Miller: Yes.

Thomas: I'm going to wear out the things on this notebook.

Carrillo: 10.1.3.

Thomas: Back and forth. Okay, 173.

Carrillo: 10.2.2 also talks about public and private agencies and volunteers so I think there's multiple places where it's covered.

Smith: Madam Chair. My read on page 216 would suggest it's covered.

Thomas: Well the one on page 216 is very specific about crisis triage and resilience leaders. The language on 173 is more general.

Basnyat: Does the policy cover it?

Thomas: To facilitate the seamless delivery of ... trauma in the City.

Smith: Triage is not ongoing service so you see that is sort of different worlds.

Thomas: Well the crisis triage center as Abraham puts it is a specific building that's already been built and it's trying to get staffed and operational.

Smith: Is that consistent with how the City is asking for support?

Thomas: Say that again.

Smith: Is that consistent with how the City is asking for support? The 216 statement.

Thomas: Yes the crisis that came up at the, was the County right George, that talked about it at the brunch?

Vescovo: Yes.

Thomas: It is a County, City/County facility.

Smith: You said there was another ask.

Thomas: It wasn't from the City. It's from the County.

Smith: On the same topic?

Thomas: Because it's a joint facility. Okay, I think we're okay. Are you okay if we don't have to be that specific?

Vescovo: I just wasn't sure if we want to just broaden this to say, 'support opening and utilizing mental health facilities to provide response, diagnosis, and services for mental health issues' and then that gives a lot of flexibility to this. And that would encompass the triage center and encompass the autism diagnosis and encompass whatever needs that we're going to see if

we end up having needs with other mental health issues. I think that this might be a little narrow unless there's flexibility elsewhere that's covering it.

Thomas: I think there is some flexibility elsewhere but if we want to broaden this a little bit I'm okay with that as well. Anybody else?

Guerrero: I like George's response. Definitely.

Thomas: Want to give your language again and see if we can get it down?

Vescovo: Support opening and utilizing mental health facilities to provide response, diagnosis, and services for mental health issues.

Smith: I would second that motion.

Carrillo: This is 18.1.5.

Vescovo: Oxford comma them.

Thomas: So it should, all right since we voted on the last one we'll vote on this one too. Was that a motion George?

Gordon: Might as well vote on it first on. Might as well vote on the first one at the same time.

Thomas: We didn't. Right.

Smith: We're doing these one at a time I think.

Thomas: That's how it's coming out isn't it?

Smith: But I did second.

Thomas: Okay. Anymore discussion? Okay, roll call.

Baum: Board Member Vescovo

Vescovo: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Sanchez.

Sanchez: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Ainsworth.

Ainsworth: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Watenpough. It's not going to come out right.

Watenpough: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Moscato.

Moscato: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chairperson Thomas.

Thomas: Yes. Okay, the next one.

Carrillo: Next page.

Thomas: It's the University Avenue corridor, educational materials for curbside recycling, etc., water desalination, and this is registration. Yes I opened a business without registering in the City because I didn't know I had to. I don't see anything there. Anybody, anything else? Keep it flying. What's the first one on that? Progress of key performance indicators in regard to what?

Carrillo: The end of the plan indicates that you should look at performance indicators and performance measures and the just keep tracking those.

Thomas: So it's a.

Carrillo: Develop a system of comparing them and who you compare them to.

Thomas: George.

Carrillo: Do you want to talk? Srijana's going to *(inaudible)*.

Basnyat: Sorry. I think that might have been a reference to the *(inaudible)* and that performance measures that were in the document.

Vescovo: No. I know exactly what that.

Thomas: Where is it?

Vescovo: So Madam Chair if I may there are two issues that I'm absolutely passionate about and this.

Thomas: Is one of them.

Vescovo: One of them so I know it very, very well. What it refers to are key economic indicators such as GDP, GDP per capita, unemployment rates. And so these are basically objective and measurable economic performance indicators and we want to make those where we're competitive both with the nation and the region. So one of the problems that I see as the plan's written is we can't achieve the goal with the actions that are enumerated under the

policy. The 4.4.1 talks about tracking these indicators and 4.4.2 talks about reporting them. So we're going to track and report them we need to replace, and this is the fourth time I've asked for this change and I am absolutely passionate about asking for this change because simply tracking and reporting on economic indicators will be ineffective at achieving the policy goals stated in 4.4. We need to.

Thomas: We're on page 276 if anybody wants to look it up.

Vescovo: We need to do something if we're going to move these economic key performance indicators. I'm going to once again strongly recommend changing this to say, 'develop and implement a plan to improve the key performance indicators to be competitive with the region and the nation.' This is something where we need to take action, we need to make a plan. If we make this change, and I actually have made this note on my change sheet, if we make this change I think it is going to be one of the most impactful actions in the entire Comprehensive Plan.

Thomas: On page 276 where there are six statements are there other statements that you want to change or just the first one?

Vescovo: So what I'd like to change is 4.4.2 to state, 'develop and implement a plan to improve the key performance indicators to be competitive with the region and the nation'. The other thing that I would recommend, the second ask for this Committee is to add a new action to empower City staff to recommend improvements to the existing policy framework to make Las Cruces more competitive in attracting new businesses, growing existing businesses, fostering entrepreneurship, and increasing job opportunities. So my first ask is to change the language in 4.4.2 to develop and implement a plan to make us competitive and if City staff finds the existing policy framework too restrictive that they have the empowerment to make recommendations. Obviously they cannot change the policy framework themselves but give them the opportunity to make the ask to make the policy framework less restrictive and to achieve the goal of 4.4.

Thomas: And 4.4.7 that you want to add?

Vescovo: Correct.

Thomas: Okay. Would you put that in a motion and then we'll discuss it? You can just say I so move.

Vescovo: I so move.

Carrillo: To both statements, the modifications and addition.

Thomas: Is there a second?

Smith: Second.

Thomas: Discussion of George's suggestions. I will only say that George and I have talked about this a lot and we've also talked to Economic Development people about it and I feel strongly too that we need more directive language in here than not just track and report but actually get things done.

Smith: Madam Chair. My second is there because I'm comfortable with the language but my second is there more because of his passion for it, that verbiage and I get it.

Thomas: Okay. All right, roll call. Abraham.

Sanchez: The only thing I would ask is I think it's spot on and I think it's great and the limitation here is just we're just tracking and reporting things right? What do we do with the information once we have it? So I'm just curious as long as we're not duplicating it. That's not addressed anywhere else in the plan that we're aware of right? So I'm going to trust you on that for sure.

Vescovo: All I'm going to say is again we have John Moscato here. I am the Economic Development PRC so this is the area where I've focused most of my attention is reading the nuances in this prosperity section here and I don't, my personal opinion is it's not addressed anywhere else in this Comprehensive Plan.

Thomas: If you've ever had a discussion with George about these issues he will whip out graphs, you know charts, even in the middle of a what was that? Saturday night? It was a.

Vescovo: Reception or networking.

Thomas: You don't get to reception. You get to know people and George already has his charts and graphs.

Vescovo: Yes.

Thomas: So I trust him.

Sanchez: Thank you for this.

Thomas: Roll call.

Carrillo: Could I ask one favor so that Mark can get it down could you repeat it? Because he's struggling to type it in.

Vescovo: Absolutely. Okay, so the first is to change 4.4.2 to state 'develop and implement a plan to improve the key performance indicators to be competitive with the region and nation.' And then the adding the action 'empower City staff to recommend improvements to the existing policy framework to make Las Cruces more competitive in attracting new businesses, growing existing businesses, fostering entrepreneurship, and increasing job opportunities.'

Thomas: Okay. Do you have anymore comments Jim? You got it Mark? Roll call.

Baum: Board Member Vescovo.

Vescovo: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Sanchez.

Sanchez: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Ainsworth.

Ainsworth: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Ms. Heather.

Watenpaugh: Yes.

Baum: I'm going to lose no matter what I do. Board Member Moscato.

Moscato: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chairperson Thomas.

Thomas: And I have to say Mr. Luis because I can't get his last name.

Guerrero: That's true. That's okay.

Thomas: Okay I don't see anything else here. Does anybody else see anything? No? And that's the part he took out and I think we're all okay with that. We understand we're waiting for the state. So we've said okay on several pages of all the lists and so the ones that we actually made changes to we talked about as a group and voted on but now we also have on the floor the motion to accept everything. So we probably, who made that motion? We probably need to modify that we accept what's been presented here plus the changes that we've recommend.

Basnyat: So endorse the final draft as presented with modifications.

Thomas: Yes, can you go back to that language that was up there? Who made that?

Baum: Gordon made the motion first and Ms. Ainsworth seconded and that was for the whole action item.

Thomas: Okay, all right. Yes John?

Moscato: So we talked about what was presented but there hasn't been an opportunity to talk about other points. Is there an opportunity now?

Thomas: So before we go back to this motion that's on the floor you want to bring up some other *(inaudible)*.

Moscato: Well if you're going to vote on endorsing the entire plan I wanted to point out just a couple map inconsistencies.

Thomas: We should do that, yes.

Moscato: Should I do that? Okay. So this is appendix III-A, page 52. What I'd like to point out is that this talks about future land use. This is development conditions map, future land use and it

shows the entirety of the East Mesa area that we discussed at length before, shows the entire area as open space preserve which is not consistent with the future development map.

Thomas: What page are you on again?

Moscato: 52 of Appendix III-A. It's in Volume III appendices.

Thomas: Okay, so say that again.

Moscato: The entire East Mesa area is shown as open space preserve and that does not align with the future development map that shows some open space preserve, some rural neighborhood, some rural preserve, some suburban. It's just a minor change that needs to be made to the map.

Thomas: Jim.

Carrillo: My suggestion.

Miller: That map in Appendix III-A is actually referenced on page 10 of Volume III. It's just a part of the process. It doesn't need to be amended or for future development in its current state.

Thomas: Okay can you explain that? Why does it not?

Miller: It was part of the process that was used for the scenario planning.

Thomas: So it was one of the scenarios but it was not, did not end up in the final consensus?

Carrillo: Some of the background that went into the initial (*inaudible*).

Miller: That map, the application of it was used around Las Cruces to enable scenario models to anticipate future development intensities. So it was used in the modeling for the scenario planning. It's not reflective of the current future development map.

Thomas: Is that okay John?

Moscato: It says future land use on the map.

Thomas: Do we need to say where this came from or what?

Basnyat: It doesn't, that section explain that... (*inaudible*).

Miller: Yes and I'm on page 10 of Volume III where it's explaining the process for the scenario planning process and figure 3.4 future land use maps. This was created and applied to enable the scenario models to anticipate future development intensities.

Basnyat: Does that clear things? It's a working map basically. It's just documenting the process.

Moscato: Okay.

Thomas: Do you want something added to the title for the map on page 52?

Watenpaugh: For reference only or?

Thomas: Because it says development conditions map. In your, what makes you uncomfortable is

then underneath that it says, 'future land use.'

Moscato: Right.

Watenpaugh: It's an enlarged map for reference only.

Thomas: Say that again Heather?

Watenpaugh: Enlarged map for reference only.

Carrillo: My suggestion is that it is just background information and it's part of the process but I would say to the legend on that map and on the one that appears in Volume III where it says 'open space preserve' we could just say 'undeveloped/open space' and leave it at that. Because it does cover a lot of different things throughout the City so there is some arroyo's open spaces that are considered in that calculation, some of it is undeveloped too as well. So I think that clarifies the point that John is making.

Thomas: Would that work John?

Moscato: Yes.

Thomas: Okay and then we don't need to change the future land use map. Just change the.

Carrillo: It would change in both Volume III on that map as well as the Appendices.

Thomas: And you're changing the what?

Carrillo: Just get, add the word 'undeveloped/' and then taking out the word 'preserve.'

Moscato: Then the next, same Appendix, page 55. Again I'm not sure what the context is to this development constraints 2019 but it labels the entire East Mesa area as 'other protected open space.' Obviously it's not.

Carrillo: Same change there, other undeveloped/open space.

Moscato: Okay. The last item, turning back to Volume II, page 17, there's an existing land use map and I had sent in a couple of comments about this and there had been a response that changes were going to be made but changes weren't made. So the entire East Mesa area, half of Metro Verde, a significant portion of Sonoma Ranch, a significant portion of the Rinconada Boulevard area are all shown as open space and detention but rather they should be shown as vacant.

Carrillo: Could you repeat the page on that again John?

Moscato: 17 of Volume II. And then that map is connected with the preceding page 16 which has a table and it talks about 42.3% of the City's total area is open space and detention but it's really not. I can tell you there's a 1,000 acres of Metro Verde here designated as open space and detention when there are homes built there already. So unfortunately I pointed these discrepancies out before but nothing has been done. So really just needs to be labeled as vacant and then changes made to page 16 to correspond with the updated or corrected map.

Thomas: Is that okay Srijana? Okay Jim, your suggestions?

Carrillo: One suggestion might be to combine vacant into, to combine it with the other one and just say it's put it together with it's undeveloped/open space, and detention all as one combined

and so the vacant one would go away. The alternative is to take the vacant parts out of it and put it, at this point in time I think this map it's an exercise that's it's been part of this process but its value is diminished at this point in time.

Thomas: So say what you said again at the beginning? Combine vacant and?

Carrillo: What I'm looking at is changes to the legend and so it's, because John is correct. In some parts of these they are essentially undeveloped and so we take the vacant component and build that into the open spaces and detention and just call it undeveloped.

Moscato: How much of it do you think is detention? Not very much.

Thomas: You have a different suggestion?

Moscato: My suggestion is eliminate the category open space and detention and list all of that as vacant which it is.

Basnyat: David do you want to define vacant in terms of land use?

Weir: I'll take your suggestion.

Basnyat: These are very specific definitions.

Moscato: Well that's my concern about the open space and detention. Open space is very specific. I'd be happy if vacant is a problem call it undeveloped. That's fine too.

Carrillo: Existing land use is never static so it's always changing and so this map will continue to be updated.

Weir: So John are you saying that just say open space, detention, and undeveloped?

Moscato: No actually just call it undeveloped.

Thomas: All of it? Both the vacant and the open space and detention?

Moscato: Sure.

Weir: I think we would keep vacant because that's probably property that have been platted for development and just don't have lots on it yet.

Basnyat: And if there's a detention facility then that land is essentially developed so we can't qualify it undeveloped necessarily and if it's dedicated open space that is also not considered undeveloped.

Moscato: Okay what's designated open space within the area that's shown as open space and detention? I'm not aware of any.

Carrillo: A lot of this is built on the existing data that was available and some of the data was good and some of the data was, let's just say incomplete. So it was not, we were using the best data that we had at the time. So to go back and to split it out to that level of detail, while it would be a good exercise I don't think the data is quite there yet.

Thomas: Well it does say existing land use 2018 so it's not really what, it's not what we're considering in this plan.

Moscato: I'm not saying that it's terribly meaningful I'm just saying it's inaccurate.

Carrillo: And I agree that there's parts of it or it's just. The things should be just combined as a solution for it.

Watenpaugh: Could we add the definition of the land use types somewhere in the glossary or someplace else so it's a little more defined for what we are doing?

Thomas: Open space, detention. We can't just put it all together, open space, detention, vacant, and undeveloped.

Weir: A miscellaneous line.

Thomas: Miscellaneous, yes actually.

Carrillo: In a perfect world you'd have them all very specifically described and you'd break out in a great level of detail. When you get into this it is very complex because it's in GIS and you're trying to tag each piece of property and define the limits of it so it gets very complex. In the bigger picture of a Comprehensive Plan you're looking for broad uses. So it's not something that's critical to this process. From the standpoint of accuracy I agree with the John that from the standpoint of the way it's labeled right now it's not accurate. So that's why I'm suggesting that we just take the titles and just adjust the titles. For the one that says open space just add undeveloped. But it's kind of a broad lumping together of different things.

Thomas: The one that says open space, say that again Jim.

Carrillo: Undeveloped.

Thomas: Just take that out and call it undeveloped?

Carrillo: No, just add it comma open space.

Miller: Just add undeveloped to it.

Carrillo: This is putting all of them together. Some pieces are undeveloped, some of the pieces are open space, some pieces are detention.

Thomas: And then leave the vacant what it is.

Basnyat: As long as they add a note.

Thomas: That okay. That close enough?

Carrillo: We can add perhaps a note of some sort that clarifies that, that there is a combination of these things all put together.

Moscato: I think it should say undeveloped, open space, or detention.

Thomas: Okay. We got that language? All right was there anything else John that you had you wanted us to?

Moscato: No.

Thomas: I have one thing and that is the El Paseo corridor. May I ask you about the difference

between forecasted corridors and emerging corridors? And El Paseo is listed as emerging. And forecasted means already developing or likely to develop. And I ask about this before because there is a plan for El Paseo and it is a corridor plan, right not a neighborhood plan. So I really think that it ought to be forecasted as well.

Carrillo: Okay what page are you on?

Thomas: Well I'm on the map on 27 right now, strategic centers and corridors scenario. What?

Weir: What volume is it in?

Thomas: It's Volume III. It's an area planning and it's that map. You know there's a better map. I don't know where it is though. The one that, oh yes look on page 31 in that same section, Volume III.

Carrillo: Sherry. so this is part of that process of the scenario planning. You know again it's part of that process. I'm not sure how critical it is on that Volume III. Now when you're going to the Volume I and where it talks about corridors and how it's designated in those place types and those corridors that's where I think we want to make sure.

Thomas: That's where we want to make.

Carrillo: This is, helps us get to that point.

Thomas: This is where it.

Carrillo: There's one or the other I think it still emphasizing.

Thomas: Yes but I think there's going to be a work session on the El Paseo corridor coming up next month and I think it's important that it be, have the right label here in this wherever we need to put it. I'm not sure where it needs to go but I think it should be forecasted because it is already developing in there. Quite a bit of work going on for that Council meeting coming up.

Carrillo: It's a legend change or just a note change?

Thomas: Well and it's also the map on page 31.

Carrillo: The issue is again this is part of a process. It was part of that development.

Weir: So this was the map that was used from the scenario planning process.

Carrillo: So I hesitate to change it from what was actually viewed during that process. That's why I'm referring back to Volume I which is the place where.

Thomas: So where should we go in Volume I?

Carrillo: Let me go back.

Basnyat: It's page 35.

Thomas: Major thoroughfare program?

Basnyat: Yes. Madam Chair if I may, on page 35 of Volume I you're going to see the future development map place types overlays. That's going to indicate corridors or mixed use

corridors. I think that is what needs to be used in terms of looking for planning policies.

Thomas: What page is it?

Basnyat: 35.

Thomas: Pardon?

Carrillo: Of Volume I.

Thomas: Oh I'm not there.

Carrillo: It's a map.

Basnyat: What you're referring to in the Appendices, those are documented working maps that were used. I would hesitate to change those.

Thomas: Okay. Anything else? Okay, Mark have you got everything? Okay so now can we go back to the motion that's on the floor?

Basnyat: So if you give us a minute he'll put up all of the modifications on the screen.

Thomas: Okay.

Basnyat: So we can just go over them.

Thomas: Mark can you put up the modifications, but we still would like to have, I think that text for the motion.

Carrillo: He took it away from me.

Miller: If I may I did have one question on the Appendix with other protected open space should that be changed? Because I know that unprotected open space will also include some of the monument land.

Carrillo: Yes that was the one we were talking about.

Miller: So I can delete that one out. Page 55, Appendix III-A.

Carrillo: So we should leave the word protected, other undeveloped or protected open space I think should cover giving more generic general statement. It really covers some open space too. For example, the area around the dam is part of that as well. So it really is a broad category that covers a lot of things. So other undeveloped, protected open space or open space.

Thomas: You want to say other undeveloped and protected open space.

Carrillo: Yes. Or.

Thomas: Okay.

Moscato: Question.

Thomas: John.

Moscato: The very last one, it's not undeveloped open space it's undeveloped comma open space comma or detention.

Thomas: Go back to open space.

Miller: I can actually see it.

Carrillo: He's trying to go too fast to get us out of here.

Thomas: Yes go over one space and then put the comma in. John has a degree in English, right? Do you somewhere in your past?

Moscato: Yes.

Thomas: Okay. So we need to go back to the text, the motion. Endorse the final draft of the proposed Comprehensive Plan with modifications as presented. Are we all okay with that?

Smith: Still in discussion or is that an act of motion or are we in discussion?

Thomas: That's the motion we had on the floor before we went back and did all of those changes.

Smith: One question Ms. Chair.

Gordon: I have a question. I'm sorry Russ.

Thomas: Yes finish up Russ and then.

Gordon: I thought he was done.

Smith: It's a great document. It's a great book. So Srijana and David and Larry and staff is this book improving life as a user, staff user?

Weir: Yes.

Thomas: You've been looking for this for years, right?

Nichols: I'll comment on that as well, Mr. Smith. One of the objectives that we had in our strategic business plan for Community Development we called it an issue and we said that the issue was that the current Comprehensive Plan was difficult for folks to use and to understand. So that was one of our primary goals in working with Halff Associates, that we would come up with a Comprehensive Plan that would not only be meaningful for our future use and for all the citizenry but it would be one that would be easy for people to use. And so in my opinion this Committee and I want to thank you extensively for all of the effort that you put in and to also Jim and his staff and the City staff that you have come up with a plan that has achieved that goal. And the plan is easy to use. People will use it. So I think that we're well placed.

Gordon: I have a quick, Chair I did have a question. This evening at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting we will have this document, we will have these changes, of course we won't have them in written text, and we will vote on it. What happens if somebody from the public who comes tonight wants to make additional modifications and changes? CPAC will not have had the opportunity to review it but it will only be reviewed by Planning and Zoning. Will, we would have to look at those modifications and then vote again as an amendment or is this going to be as it is and nobody will have a chance to change it unless, until it goes to City Council for their approval? Is that the mechanics?

Weir: I'll start and then Srijana can help me (*inaudible*).

Gordon: I just want to know where we are tonight.

Weir: From a procedural standpoint the Planning and Zoning Commission makes the recommendation. So if you feel that's a modification you want to make you can make, the Planning and Zoning Commission can make that modification and then it will be changed and that's what will go to City Council. We're not required to bring it back to the CPAC.

Gordon: But what I'm saying is what happens if somebody from the public wants to make a change. Do we have the opportunity to say no or yes?

Thomas: Yes, that's what he's saying.

Weir: You'll have to make a motion to make that amendment and vote as a body.

Gordon: Okay. So anything that we've done today is still subject to Council approval.

Thomas: Well first it's still subject to Planning and Zoning.

Gordon: Yes I understand. What I'm saying is if we approve it as such it'll go to City Council in February and they will have the opportunity to say yea or nay or make any further changes.

Thomas: If somebody comes tonight like public or State Land Office and you know we'll talk about what we've done and see if that's okay with them but there might be some tweaks.

Gordon: So you'll have to at tonight's meeting if anybody's had this document to change, to explain to them what the modifications were that were done today other than the fact that there just were some modifications because nobody will know what they are unless you describe to them or repeat what has been voted upon.

Basnyat: So we can call out the modifications on record or we were intending to pass out the copy of the written modification.

Gordon: Okay, that's fine.

Basnyat: The final vote of the P&Z would be captured in the meeting minutes and the modification document would be attached as a reference when it goes to City Council to just note that we have basically a two day turnaround between the Council packet and the vote tonight.

Gordon: Because someone will say this evening that the CPAC has voted upon this with modifications and so got asked what were those modifications.

Thomas: And we'll be able to show them right if they want.

Gordon: Okay, that's fine. I just want to know where we're going to be tonight.

Thomas: I know. We just haven't done this before. (*inaudible*). Okay so are we ready to vote on this?

Nichols: Madam Chair if I may. On the language that's presently on the screen there I guess it just but would be for clarity's sake and be specific and Mr. Gordon did it earlier in the day but I think you should include the word Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan not just that this is any Comprehensive Plan.

Thomas: Yes.

Nichols: And that maybe over the top but I think it's.

Thomas: No I think it's fine and necessary. So who made, you made this. Do you want to modify your motion?

Gordon: Okay I'd like to modify my motion to include now to read vote to endorse the final draft of the proposed Elevate Las Cruces Plan, taking out the word Comprehensive?

Thomas: No I think we need Comprehensive. You could say proposed Comprehensive Plan, Elevate Las Cruces.

Gordon: That's fine. Okay.

Thomas: I have an English degree too.

Gordon: Comprehensive, Elevate Las Cruces, Plan with modifications presented.

Thomas: Comprehensive Plan, Elevate Las Cruces,

Gordon: Fine. Thank you. I failed English. I'm an accountant, what do you want? I only know numbers.

Thomas: With modifications as presented. Who was the second?

Baum: Ms. Ainsworth.

Ainsworth: I'll reiterate my second.

Thomas: All right. Any more discussion or comments? How are we doing? 4:20 Okay..

Baum: Board Member Vescovo.

Vescovo: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Sanchez.

Sanchez: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Ainsworth.

Ainsworth: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Heather.

Watenpaugh: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Moscato.

Moscato: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chairperson Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

#### MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Thomas: Well I just want to tell you my story again that I started working on changing the City's Comprehensive Plan about 12 or 14 years ago.

Guerrero: I need to run but I'll see you guys back at six.

Thomas: Okay, I'll see you. So it's been a long trip getting here and I just want to say I appreciate all the work of the consultant, City staff, and especially this Committee. It's been really delightful to work with you. The way we've been able to work together and compromise and wordsmith and everybody brings their particular background. I think it's been really very enjoyable. I appreciate all of you.

Carrillo: I just can't tell you from the work that I've done with other similar Committee's you are at the top of the list in terms of your discourse, the intelligence of your discourse, the ideas that you brought forward and this is truly a very good plan based on that because of that so your efforts are much, much appreciated.

Smith: And to Sherry's leadership.

Carrillo: Absolutely.

Thomas: Any other comments people want to make?

Vescovo: I just want to say it's been an honor to serve on this Committee and so I just feel it was a great opportunity and I appreciate the, you know having this opportunity to meet with each one of you and how intelligent each one of you guys are and the backgrounds that you guys bring together. I really believe it all came together in this Comprehensive Plan. I appreciate everything.

Thomas: I've enjoyed working with George but I'm still mad at him for swallowing that whole hot dog.

Vescovo: Hamburger.

#### 4. Adjournment

Thomas: Any other? Well if not if there are no objections then we're.

Gordon: I make a motion that we adjourn.

Thomas: Okay.