

1                                   **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2  
3   The following are the summary minutes from the Comprehensive Plan Advisory  
4   Committee (CPAC) Meeting held on Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., at the  
5   East Mesa Public Safety Complex located at 550 North Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, Las  
6   Cruces, New Mexico.

7  
8   **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

18  
19   **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

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

24  
25   **STAFF PRESENT:**

26      Srijana Basnyat, Community Development  
27      David Weir, Community Development  
28      Debra Fuller, Community Development  
29      Mark Miller, Community Development  
30      John Castillo, Community Development  
31      Griselda Martinez, Economic Development

32  
33   **OTHERS PRESENT:**

34      Jim Carrillo, Halff Associates  
35      Christian Lentz, Halff Associates

36  
37   **I.     Call to Order (1:10 p.m.)**

38      Chairperson Thomas called the meeting to order.

39  
40   **II.    Approval of Minutes**

- 41      1.   May 29, 2019  
42          Motion passed unanimously (9-0).  
43  
44      2.   August 13, 2019  
45          Motion passed unanimously (9-0).

1 **III. Project Status and Update:**

2 Mr. Carrillo, with Halff Associates, discussed tasks that are ongoing for the Elevate  
3 Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan, as well as a general timeline of what is to occur  
4 in the upcoming year. Mr. Carrillo explained the City Council Special Work Session  
5 will be held on January 8th, 2020, in the City Hall Council Chambers. Mr. Carrillo  
6 encouraged the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) members to  
7 attend.  
8

9 Mr. Lentz, with Halff Associates reviewed the structure of the Elevate Las Cruces  
10 Comprehensive Plan in terms of physical framework, vision framework, and policy  
11 framework. Mr. Lentz explained that regarding policy framework, the organization  
12 of themes is meant to ensure each topic is properly addressed and not isolated  
13 from other topics. Mr. Lentz emphasized the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive  
14 Plan is an ambitious comprehensive plan with approximately 500 actions;  
15 however, he asked members to keep in mind that this is a 25-year plan and some  
16 actions are not meant to be implemented immediately upon adoption. Mr. Lentz  
17 explained that the next step of the project is to prioritize specific actions in order to  
18 allocate resources for initial short-term actions. Mr. Carrillo discussed in greater  
19 depth the varying timeframes of actions and how there are intended redundancies  
20 between actions. Mr. Carrillo explained in detail how the themes and actions work  
21 together to avoid the segregation of topics.  
22

23 **IV. Elevate Las Cruces Work Program (Policies, Timeframe, and Partners):**

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

25 Mr. Lentz elaborated on the policy framework of the comprehensive plan by  
26 discussing the types of actions, the timeframes for actions, and the coordinating  
27 agencies. Mr. Lentz stated that members of the CPAC and Subcommittees will  
28 be asked to provide names of any additional coordinating agencies. Mr. Lentz  
29 stated that member feedback is also greatly needed to prioritize the policies  
30 and actions. The role of coordinating agencies was clarified, as agencies listed  
31 are not the only agency which may work with the city, rather the listed agency  
32 or organization is representative of the type of agency which could coordinate  
33 with the City. Mr. Lentz further stated that the listing will serve as a reference  
34 for resources in the community, not to exclude agencies that are not listed. Mr.  
35 Carrillo stated that the Interdepartmental Work Group (IWG) has provided  
36 extensive feedback and the Implementation Work Program has been revised  
37 accordingly. Mr. Carrillo asked that CPAC members provide their feedback to  
38 Planning staff by Monday, December 16, 2019.  
39

40 2. Review of Policy Prioritization by Theme:

41 Mr. Carrillo stated that policies within the comprehensive plan were ranked and  
42 prioritized based on responses from CPAC members and Subcommittee  
43 members. Mr. Carrillo requested that CPAC members provide feedback on  
44 how each theme's policy was ranked and prioritized.  
45

1 A. Community Livability Theme:

2 Mr. Harvey Gordon stated that with talking to senior citizens in the  
3 community, there is a great concern for more local healthcare providers  
4 available in Las Cruces, so citizens have assistance within close proximity  
5 and are not required to travel to receive treatment. Mr. Gordon stated that  
6 the downtown area needs a mixture of housing and retail. Mr. Gordon  
7 further stated that he fears that the growth taking place is attainable only to  
8 upper class; affordability is greatly needed. Mr. George Vescovo stated that  
9 he would expect Policy CL-1.2 to be a greater priority. Mr. Vescovo stated  
10 that investing in our neighborhoods leads to a stronger community. Mr.  
11 Abraham Sanchez stated that regarding Policy CL-1.2, he has not  
12 witnessed a prevalence of “neighborhood identity” in Las Cruces. Mr.  
13 Sanchez asked if growth will create more compartmentalized areas which  
14 will ultimately lead to the need and/or desire for neighborhood identification.  
15 Mr. Lentz stated that Policy CL-1.2 is more applicable to areas in need of  
16 redevelopment or neighborhoods that are more vulnerable, such as older  
17 areas of the community. Mr. Lentz stated that newer subdivisions are more  
18 likely to have this type of support in the form of a homeowner’s association  
19 and planned community events. Ms. Srijana Basnyat stated that the  
20 neighborhood identity policy addresses the need for support in maintenance  
21 and establishment of neighborhoods. Ms. Christina Ainsworth stated there  
22 is also a need to promote redevelopment of vacant properties. Chairperson  
23 Thomas stated more neighborhood associations and watch programs  
24 affiliated with the City should exist. Chairperson Thomas stated that she  
25 would like the City to develop a council of neighborhoods.

26  
27 There was a consensus from CPAC members that Policy CL-3.2 is a high  
28 priority as the City’s trail system is currently disjointed. Mr. Luis Guerrero  
29 stated that Policy CL-4.2 should be ranked higher as there is a need for  
30 more family orientated events and a better promotion of those events  
31 citywide. Mr. John Moscato stated his comment pertains to an action item  
32 under the multi-use trail policy. Mr. Moscato stated it is his understanding  
33 that there are current requirements for arterials and collectors to include  
34 multi-use trails. Mr. Moscato asked if this action item is necessary as it is  
35 already a requirement. Mr. Lentz stated that these action items are needed  
36 to support the previously adopted Active Transportation Plan (ATP). Mr.  
37 David Weir explained that the comprehensive plan is changing the  
38 paradigm and level of street improvements based on the character of areas  
39 in the City. Mr. Weir stated that providing these action items is practical as  
40 codes will be amended to accommodate these changes. Chairperson  
41 Thomas stated implementation of the ATP is not sufficiently referenced in  
42 the action items whereas there is ample mention of implementing the Parks  
43 and Recreation Master Plan. Mr. Lentz stated that within the Parks and  
44 Recreation Master Plan, the ATP is referenced for the location of trails. Mr.  
45 Lentz stated that the ATP is individually referenced in another section of the

1 comprehensive plan. Chairperson Thomas stated the importance of  
2 specifically referencing the ATP within the action items as well.  
3

4 Chairperson Thomas stated she has received feedback from citizens  
5 regarding the need for all sports' facilities to have equal accommodations  
6 for participants. Chairperson Thomas stated that "facilities" should be  
7 added to Policy CL-4.2. Mr. Gordon asked if the City can subsidize or waive  
8 fees for leagues that cannot otherwise afford to utilize certain facilities. Dr.  
9 Griselda Martinez stated that due to New Mexico's anti-donation clause, it  
10 would be a challenge for the City to subsidize anything. Dr. Martinez stated  
11 if referenced in the comprehensive plan, it would need to be carefully  
12 worded so as not to violate the anti-donation clause. Mr. Lentz stated there  
13 are actions in Parks and Recreation Master Plan to cover funding for  
14 facilities. Mr. Lentz explained that the comprehensive plan is more of an  
15 overview; details are properly addressed in lower level strategic plans. Mr.  
16 Weir informed CPAC members that Parks and Recreation reviews their fee  
17 schedule annually to evaluate participation of each sport and they are  
18 impacted by fees. Mr. Weir stated there is also a stipend system for  
19 specialized leagues to make them more affordable to participants.  
20

21 Mr. Carrillo inquired about CPAC members' perspective on mobility. Mr.  
22 Todd Stuve stated that he would like to see better connectivity with the trails  
23 system in the City, Dona Ana County, and the Town of Mesilla. Mr. Stuve  
24 stated that Policy CL-8.1 is crucial as retrofitting the existing roads is greatly  
25 needed. Mr. Guerrero stated that there needs to be ample connectivity to  
26 public transportation. Heather Watenpaugh stated that Policy CL-8.3 is very  
27 important as our citizens need accommodating transportation to job  
28 centers. Mr. Moscato inquired about street cross sections for new bicycle  
29 transportation and what is anticipated with that requirement. Ms. Basnyat  
30 stated that context must be considered as not every road will be the same.  
31 Ms. Basnyat stated that the Comprehensive Plan will include an improved  
32 road design, but specific requirements will be determined in future code  
33 revision processes. Chairperson Thomas stated that Policy CL-8.3 should  
34 be expanded beyond job centers to include workforce training and  
35 community resources. Mr. Gordon stated he would like the Comprehensive  
36 Plan to require a better road layout for new development; there are currently  
37 only two ways to go east and west and improvements are greatly needed.  
38 Mr. Gordon stated that traffic signal timing and synchronization as  
39 referenced in Policy CL-6.1 is important. Mr. Gordon further stated that  
40 much of the City's traffic congestion due to significant construction occurring  
41 in close proximity. Mr. Weir stated that the City's anticipated technology  
42 investments will make commutes more efficient. Mr. Vescovo stated that  
43 he ranked Policy CL-9.1 lower than others due to the wording "all new  
44 roadways or roadway reconstruction". Mr. Vescovo stated that there is a  
45 need for an interconnected system, but bike, pedestrian, and multi-use trails

1 are not needed on every roadway. Ms. Basnyat stated that techniques will  
2 not be equally applied to every roadway. Mr. Vescovo stated he would  
3 prefer to have “all” removed from the policy. Ms. Basnyat stated that City  
4 Council previously adopted a Complete Streets Resolution which requires  
5 all streets to accommodate all users. Ms. Basnyat stated that street design,  
6 the required infrastructure, and prioritization of implantation will vary based  
7 on context of roadway. Mr. Lentz stated that use of the word “all” may be  
8 problematic; Halff will consider rewording Policies CL-9.1 and CL-8.4.  
9

10 Mr. Guerrero stated that trust with law enforcement is a top priority. Mr.  
11 Guerrero stated that he is pleased to see the City moving forward with  
12 Historic Preservation. Mr. Guerrero further stated that citizens need better  
13 access to public health. Mr. Sanchez stated that language of the  
14 Comprehensive Plan should be mindful of the potential and reality of  
15 gentrification. Ms. Watenpaugh stated that Policy CL-18.2 is important as  
16 it ties to crime and public safety. Ms. Ainsworth stated that Policy CL-11.2  
17 is important for crime prevention instead of just increasing security.  
18

19 Chairperson Thomas stated that the Las Cruces Urban Agriculture and  
20 Food Policy Plan should be mentioned. Chairperson Thomas stated that  
21 the reference to public health should include mental health. Chairperson  
22 Thomas stated that mental health access is a priority, and focus should  
23 begin with the crisis facility. Mr. Stuve stated that there is a lack of services  
24 with mental health for inpatient treatment as it is not profitable. Mr. Stuve  
25 stated that Policy CL-18.1 is very important as Las Cruces needs to attract  
26 more health care providers. Mr. Stuve further stated that he agrees there  
27 should be mention of creating a positive relationship with law enforcement,  
28 and then the implementation of neighborhood watch associations that  
29 works in conjunction with law enforcement.  
30

31 **B. Community Environment Theme:**

32 Chairperson Thomas stated the West Mesa is referenced regarding  
33 industry and business growth, but there is little to no mention of job  
34 opportunities in north and east areas of Las Cruces. Chairperson Thomas  
35 stated that there needs to be the mention of employment opportunities in  
36 other areas of the City. Ms. Ainsworth stated that Policies CE-1.1 and CE-  
37 2.1 should be more of a priority. Mr. Moscato stated that Policy CE-1.1 and  
38 its actions reference a compatibility matrix and adhering to complementary  
39 place types with surrounding areas. Mr. Moscato stated he is concerned  
40 these requirements are too restrictive for new development as while the  
41 proposed development may not be complementary, it could be a significant  
42 improvement. Mr. Carrillo agreed that is a valid point and the  
43 Comprehensive Plan addresses land uses differently as compared to how  
44 it has been defined in the past. Mr. Sanchez stated that he would prioritize  
45 Policy CE-1.2 over CE-2.2 as we should be considering all of Las Cruces

1 and not focusing more on the downtown area. Mr. Guerrero stated he would  
2 like to see more growth in the University District and the surrounding  
3 neighborhoods. Mr. Guerrero stated the City should work more closely with  
4 NMSU to ensure a better college and campus experience for students and  
5 the community as a whole. Mr. Stuve stated that because the  
6 Comprehensive Plan begins with Policy CE-1.1, he is perplexed as to why  
7 it is not ranked higher. Mr. Vescovo stated that Policies CE-1.2 and CE-2.1  
8 are very similar and should be reworded to better align with the different  
9 goals. Mr. Gordon stated that he agreed with Mr. Stuve that Policy CE-1.1  
10 should be top priority as implementation begins with this policy.

11  
12 Ms. Ainsworth stated that regarding community form and character, Policy  
13 CE-3.1 is crucial as residents should not be required to drive across town  
14 to obtain many of their goods and services. Mr. Moscato stated that Policy  
15 CE-4.1 and its subsequent action items requires a mixture of housing types.  
16 Mr. Moscato stated that the requirement for different types of housing may  
17 not be what the market calls for at that time. Mr. Moscato stated that he  
18 can understand if there are incentives for different types of housing, but a  
19 requirement may discourage development in the City. Mr. Moscato stated  
20 the word “requirement” should be modified in the action items. Ms.  
21 Watenpaugh stated she is surprised Policy CE-5.1 is not ranked higher. Mr.  
22 Sanchez stated he is glad the Comprehensive Plan addresses the need for  
23 affordable housing and suggested additional wording throughout Volume I  
24 so it can ultimately be implemented in the City. Mr. Guerrero stated that  
25 citizens should have better access to their basic needs. Mr. Stuve stated  
26 regarding Action Item 4.1.3 within Policy CE-4.1, we should consider  
27 replacing “encourage”, not “require”. Mr. Stuve stated that affordable  
28 housing and a variety of housing is crucial as it allows for aging in place.  
29 Ms. Basnyat stated that the term “provide” also applies to City requirements  
30 and permitted uses. Ms. Basnyat stated that, currently, homes of a different  
31 capacity are not necessarily permitted next to a single family detached  
32 dwelling. Ms. Basnyat explained that this allows for the uses, such as a  
33 casita behind their home, to be allowed by right. Ms. Basnyat further  
34 explained that this is one solution to address the need for more affordable  
35 housing. Mr. Vescovo stated that the Comprehensive Plan should be  
36 cognizant of nonbuilding costs associated with development as that can  
37 affect affordable housing. Mr. Gordon inquired as to why Policies CE-4.1  
38 and CE-5.1 are not combined as they serve the same purpose. Mr. Carrillo  
39 stated that they will examine with one, but one policy addresses form and  
40 scale while the other deals with type. Chairperson Thomas stated that the  
41 requirement of distance between mixed-use centers in action item 3.1.3 is  
42 too restrictive and does not allow the City to grow organically. Chairperson  
43 Thomas stated that Policy CE-5.3 should be a higher priority and more  
44 pedestrian and bicycles facilities are needed. Chairperson Thomas stated  
45 that a mixture of housing types is a successful concept as it provides an

1 affordable option for families that have different housing needs but want to  
2 remain in close proximity.

3  
4 For infrastructure, utilities, and energy, Mr. Guerrero stated that adequate  
5 infrastructure for water, recycling, and solar facilities are important for Las  
6 Cruces. Mr. Vescovo stated that renewable energy that is affordable and  
7 protects the consumer is crucial. Mr. Gordon requested that the word  
8 “preference” be removed in Policy CE-8.1. Regarding natural resources,  
9 Mr. Stuve stated that Policy CE-13.1 regarding natural drainage corridors is  
10 necessary to address the current drainage issues in existing  
11 neighborhoods. Mr. Gordon stated that water conservation is very  
12 important and should be a priority when referenced in the Comprehensive  
13 Plan. Chairperson Thomas stated that it has been made clear that the city  
14 has adequate water at this time, but there are many unknowns due to the  
15 pending Supreme Court case. Chairperson Thomas stated that Policy CE-  
16 13.2 should include wildlife habitat and corridors. Mr. Moscato stated that  
17 the requirement for open space as referenced in Policy CE-14.1 and the  
18 action items that follow can be detrimental as it leads to a greater cost to  
19 the City and the developer. Mr. Moscato stated that this will restrict the  
20 ability to utilize developable land and will just accumulate trash and  
21 overgrown vegetation if not maintained at the cost of the City or the  
22 developer. Mr. Moscato further stated that the requirement to protect  
23 mountain views are unnecessary; the elevation of the mountains allows for  
24 visibility everywhere in the City. Mr. Carrillo stated that mountain view  
25 corridors should be considered and protected if possible. Ms. Basnyat  
26 stated there will be an action under Policy CE-14.2 to include a study of  
27 ways to protect mountain views without infringing upon property rights.

28  
29 Chairperson Thomas stated that regarding regionalism, border areas and  
30 regional areas that are participating in the Comprehensive Plan should be  
31 listed, to include applicable policies and plans. Dr. Martinez stated that  
32 while Economic Development has the desire to do that, a balance powers  
33 is required. Dr. Martinez explained that the Borderplex Alliance does not  
34 contribute towards the City’s budget; therefore, a careful negotiation would  
35 be required.

36  
37 **C. Community Prosperity Theme:**

38 Ms. Ainsworth stated that Policy CP-4.1 should be ranked higher. Ms.  
39 Ainsworth stated she appreciates the wording “focus and coordinate efforts”  
40 and recommended the policy include regional efforts. Mr. Vescovo stated  
41 that he mentioned Policy CP-4.2 in the previous Subcommittee meeting and  
42 would like to note its importance with CPAC members. Mr. Guerrero stated  
43 that local businesses who are committed to the growth and success of Las  
44 Cruces deserve to be mentioned. Mr. Sanchez stated priority should also  
45 be given to retention of individuals who receive education or workforce

1 training in Las Cruces. Mr. Sanchez stated citizens should have ample  
2 opportunity for employment within city limits. Mr. Stuve stated that  
3 individuals employed as an intern or co-op should anticipate eventual  
4 employment with that workplace. Mr. Carrillo agreed that workforce  
5 development is very important. Chairperson Thomas stated that the  
6 Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act should be referenced in the  
7 Comprehensive Plan.  
8

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

10 1. Review of Final Adjustments:

11 Mr. Carrillo discussed recent revisions to the maps and provided an overview  
12 of place types. Mr. Carrillo stated that the scenario planning process informs  
13 Future Development Map (FDM). Mr. Lentz stated that Future Thoroughfare  
14 Map (FTM) is tied to the FDM. Mr. Lentz stated that the FDM evolves with the  
15 community and changes with a reassessment of needs. Mr. Lentz stated there  
16 will be an annual review process and guidance for updating the Comprehensive  
17 Plan is provided in Volume I. Mr. Lentz stated there is potential for joint planning  
18 agreements with the State Land Office and Bureau of Land Management. Mr.  
19 Lentz further stated that the FDM reflects Scenario Planning.  
20

21 2. Review of the State Land Office Considerations

22 Mr. Moscato stated he would like to express his concerns with the East Mesa  
23 area and its designations on the FDM. Mr. Moscato stated that this area is  
24 virtually undevelopable due to the proposed place type designations. Mr.  
25 Moscato stated that 1/3 of the land is designated as open space which does  
26 not allow for any development. Mr. Moscato stated that the remaining land only  
27 permits low density development. Mr. Moscato stated that, historically, the City  
28 has developed eastward, but the FDM heavily restricts future development in  
29 the East Mesa area. Mr. Moscato stated that the FDM essentially rezones  
30 State land from "Holding" which by right allows development with a minimum  
31 lot area requirement of one acre to an open space place type which allows  
32 nothing. Mr. Moscato stated that this designation eliminates current  
33 development rights of State land. Mr. Moscato stated that this is not the role of  
34 the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Moscato stated that innovation, as mentioned  
35 multiple times in the Comprehensive Plan, will only occur in large scale  
36 developments, not a development of just 20 acres. Mr. Moscato stated large  
37 developments allow for mixed use, affordable housing, and commercial uses  
38 to include employment centers. Mr. Moscato stated he does not agree with a  
39 previous statement that the FDM can be amended yearly if needed as there is  
40 language that states agreements shall only be approved when it has been  
41 determined that such growth cannot be accommodated by current land supply.  
42 Mr. Moscato stated that smaller areas of existing, available land should not  
43 prohibit a large development in the East Mesa area. Mr. Moscato stated that  
44 this land is State trust land, not public land. Mr. Moscato stated that the State  
45 Land Office estimates this land to be worth approximately 300 to 400 million

1 dollars when fully developed. Mr. Moscato stated that much of this money goes  
2 to New Mexico's education system. Mr. Moscato stated that by eliminating the  
3 ability for that land to be developed, we eliminate the ability to give money to  
4 our schools. Mr. Moscato stated that while he understands the importance on  
5 the consensus scenario exercise, an unnecessary hardship has been placed  
6 on perfectly developable land because of recommendations made by  
7 individuals who may not fully understand land use and development. Mr.  
8 Moscato further stated that those responsible for making these decisions are  
9 getting it wrong and in a very big way. Mr. Lentz stated that the FDM represents  
10 the collective feedback from participating citizens. Mr. Lentz stated that while  
11 participants may not have extensive experience in land use development, their  
12 opinions as to where they would like to see future growth and development is  
13 equally valid to those of developers. Mr. Moscato asked why opinions are  
14 considered for those who have no stake in the future development of that area.  
15 Mr. Lentz stated although participants may not have had a monetary stake in  
16 that land area, they have a stake in what occurs in their community. Mr.  
17 Moscato inquired as to the reasoning that anyone would want to prohibit  
18 development in that area. Mr. Lentz stated that the FDM is more than a  
19 designation of place types; it is a statement on behalf of the City that conveys  
20 where its citizens would like to invest in new and existing infrastructure,  
21 development, and redevelopment. Mr. Lentz stated that investing within the  
22 city limits eliminates the additional financial burden of further expanding city  
23 boundaries. Mr. Moscato stated that the City currently has the required  
24 infrastructure and services up to the boundary. Ms. Basnyat explained that the  
25 designation at the boundary is suburban place type which allows for a great  
26 deal of uses. Ms. Basnyat stated that expanding infrastructure beyond the  
27 boundary would not be fiscally responsible. Mr. Moscato stated that  
28 development occurs incrementally. Mr. Moscato stated that the City does not  
29 want development to occur two thousand acres from the boundary to preserve  
30 the open space place type designation. Ms. Basnyat stated the appropriate  
31 term is leapfrog development and it has occurred in Las Cruces. Ms. Basnyat  
32 explained that is why the Comprehensive Plan is taking a proactive approach  
33 with development in the City. Mr. Moscato stated that a suburban place type  
34 does not necessarily discourage leapfrog development. Mr. Moscato stated  
35 that it is not feasible to develop land that way. Ms. Basnyat agreed and  
36 explained that, projection-wise, the designation at the boundary is sufficient to  
37 accommodate the growth within the planning horizon. Ms. Basnyat stated that  
38 this would be re-assessed at the five year update to ensure incremental growth.  
39 Mr. Moscato stated that he and other developers and builders also disagree  
40 that there is enough existing land to accommodate the projected 16,100 units  
41 that are projected. Mr. Moscato stated this is not possible without developing  
42 the East Mesa area. Mr. Carrillo stated there is enough existing land. Mr.  
43 Carrillo stated that building outward results in the fiscal impact to maintain  
44 infrastructure. Mr. Carrillo stated that the necessary services for citizens to  
45 thrive are already available within city limits. Mr. Moscato stated that the City

1 needs redevelopment and has the land to accommodate within its boundaries.  
2 Mr. Carrillo stated he understands the State does have a fiscal interest in this  
3 area, and the profits support a worthy cause. Mr. Carrillo agreed that the  
4 projected amount is significant; however, the City has a responsibility to  
5 determine the location of sustainable growth before anything else. Mr. Carrillo  
6 further stated that the FDM is currently supported and as previously mentioned  
7 by Ms. Basnyat, the Comprehensive Plan will be reassessed in the future to  
8 address how the City is growing and changing and amendments will be made  
9 as needed. Mr. Moscato inquired about the analysis of units available within  
10 the Infill area. Mr. Lentz stated that the dot density map utilized for Scenario  
11 planning located units using computer modeling. Mr. Lentz stated that  
12 modeling was based on current conditions to demonstrate available land. Mr.  
13 Lentz ensured Mr. Moscato that scenario planning will be clearly explained in  
14 the Comprehensive Plan. Chairperson Thomas inquired about the outcome of  
15 a previous public meeting at Dona Ana Community College that included the  
16 State Land Office. Ms. Basnyat stated it was a visioning meeting where the  
17 public addressed their desire for open spaces, trails, and some development;  
18 however, there was no specific discussion on the number of dwelling units at  
19 the meeting.  
20

21 **VI. Public Comment**

22 None.  
23

24 **VII. Next Steps**

25 Mr. Carrillo notified CPAC members of the upcoming City Council Work Session  
26 and encouraged their attendance. Mr. Carrillo stated that further revisions will  
27 occur following completion of the current round of open houses and meetings.  
28

29 Mr. Stuve asked to address the Committee. Mr. Stuve stated that his wife was  
30 recently elected to serve on City Council and her term begins in January 2020. Mr.  
31 Stuve explained that because CPAC members are appointed by City Council, he  
32 is concerned about a possible conflict of interest if he remains with CPAC.  
33 Chairperson Thomas stated that she appreciates his transparency, but she does  
34 not believe his service on CPAC is a conflict. Chairperson Thomas explained that  
35 CPAC members should abstain from participating in discussion or voting if the  
36 subject matter directly affects the member's personal financial interest. Mr.  
37 Vescovo stated that Mr. Stuve has served on the Committee since the beginning;  
38 it would be a tremendous loss if he were to resign. Mr. Vescovo stated that if there  
39 was a specific case involving a financial conflict of interest, Mr. Stuve has the ability  
40 to abstain from discussion or recuse from voting. Mr. Weir stated that CPAC is a  
41 recommending body to Planning and Zoning Commission; it is policy committee,  
42 not quasi-judicial authority. Mr. Stuve thanked members and City staff for their  
43 input. Mr. Sanchez stated that since the subject has been mentioned, he should  
44 also disclose that his supervisor has also recently been elected to City Council.  
45 Mr. Sanchez stated that no conflict of interest exists, but he wanted to be fully

1 transparent to fellow members. Chairperson Thomas thanked Mr. Stuve and Mr.  
2 Sanchez for their transparency and their service as members of CPAC.

3  
4 **VIII. Adjournment (4:10 p.m.)**

5  
6 A motion was made by Mr. Gordon and seconded by Mr. Stuve. The motion  
7 passed unanimously (9-0).  
8  
9  
10

DRAFT