Chair Beerman called the regular meeting to order at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Chair Beerman: We're going to hear from the consultant Tischler-Bise who has done a pretty extensive study on the Impact Fee and made recommendations. We'll go through a couple of other things on the agenda and then I think it would be best if we let everyone hear what Tischler-Bise has to say and then we start taking comments from the people who have come to the meeting to speak. Can I have a show of hands of how many people would like to speak today, just to get an idea? Okay, it looks like we have a few people speaking, but most of the people are listeners. I was thinking if someone had a prepared presentation, we would cut them a lot of slack on time and then if we had others who wanted to speak we would ask them to try to limit their comments to about five minutes, but that might not be a problem. We'll just go ahead.

1. **Conflict of Interest:**
Chair Beerman: We're supposed to open each meeting with a statement about Conflict of
Interest, and ask if any Member of the Committee or any member of the City staff has any known conflict of interest with any item on the agenda?

There were no Conflicts.

2. **Acceptance of the Agenda:**
Chair Beerman: We'll move to Acceptance of the agenda. Do I have a motion to accept the agenda?

Suttmiller: So motioned.

O'Neill: I'll second.

Chair Beerman: All in favor.

The Agenda was Accepted Unanimously 4-0.

3. **Acceptance of the Minutes:**
   a. **Regular Meeting on January 17, 2019.**
Chair Beerman: The next item is Acceptance of the Minutes. Do I have a motion to accept the minutes?

Suttmiller: I so motion.

Lorenz: I'll second.

Chair Beerman: All in favor.

The Minutes were Accepted Unanimously 4-0.

4. **Approval of 2018 CIAC Annual Report.**
Chair Beerman: The next item is Approval of the 2018 Annual Report from this Committee to the Mayor and City Manager. Has everyone had a chance to read the report? Any comments about it? Is there a motion to approve the Annual Report?

O'Neill: I'll make a motion to approve the CIAC Annual Report.

Suttmiller: I'll second the motion.

Chair Beerman: All in favor.

The Annual Report was Approved Unanimously 4-0.

5. **New Business**
   A. **Presentations by TischlerBise Consultant.**
   i. **Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Update.**
Chair Beerman: Now we have new business and that's the presentation by the TischlerBise consultant. Would the young lady like to step forward?
Good afternoon Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Sonya Delgado, Parks and Recreation Director. Today we have Julie Herland from TischlerBise, who's here to talk about Parks and Recreation Impact Fee study.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. Good to be with you here this afternoon. Apologize for my voice, a little bit of a cold, it probably sounds deeper to me than it does to everybody else.

I have a brief presentation and happy to answer questions once we get through, but just wanted to kind of walk you through what's in the report itself, high-level overview. We have some land use assumptions, our growth projections. The overall Impact Fee summary with the components that are built into the fee, the methods we've utilized, how the costs have been allocated, and then our draft fee amounts. A little more detail on each of the components. I won't spend too much time on those unless there are specific questions, so this is going to be a pretty brief overview.

I do want to start out by saying that our Impact Fee studies are calculated to identify what the maximum supportable fee is. That's all improvements where there's growth pressures and growth needs. Then after that there's typically discussions about what elements should be included, where potentially eliminating some if that makes sense. I understand also that you're undergoing a Parks and Rec Master Plan or starting that process, and so ultimately, you'll want to dovetail this work in with that plan as well.

By way of overview we started with a base year set of assumptions. I should note too that we started this work quite some time ago and so the original scope did not have us updating land use assumptions, so our based year here is 2016. The 2016 population is shown on the screen, about 105,000 population, and a projected population over 10 years of about 122,000, again over the 10 years. That equates to about 17,000 increase for an average annual growth rate of 1.63.

The other key demographic assumption and driver is household size. An Impact Fee schedule is set up to reflect proportionality from the demand for new development, for new land uses that are being built, in this case new residential units. For a single-family unit the driver there is average population. In the City that would occupy that unit, a 2.45, and a multifamily unit which is lower at 1.84. We should note also on the single-family category those units include detached, single-family attached, and mobile homes.

For Impact Fees for the City we're just looking at Parks and Recreation at this point in this plan. The service area for the improvements is a City-wide service area, and there's quite a number of components included in the fee. The methodology that we've utilized is what's called the Incremental Expansion, also called a Consumption Based approach, that's basically saying you know the level of service today of so many acres per person or per 1,000 people as you grow by the next 1,000 people, you'll maintain that same level of service
by adding and improving additional land, parks, and park facilities again at that same level of service. You'll see here we have identified the incremental expansion approach for all of the components that included here; neighborhood park land, community park land, special facility land, athletic facility land, park improvements, which is the developed equipment and improvements on the parks on the land, trail development, recreation centers and aquatic center. Then the cost allocation here, the driver here is population, population growth.

With the current levels of service and the amount of infrastructure in place today in the City, the draft fee with all of those components combined is shown here. What you're seeing at the top of this slide is the summary cost per person for each of those components, and then the percentage distribution for each of those components. I think that was a question that was asked along the way of whether you could see that piece of information. In total, about $2,900.00 per person, $2,887.00 per person. Using again the drivers from a single-family population in a single-family unit that's multiplied by the cost per person to get $7,073.00 impact fee, and for a multifamily multiply by 1.84, $5,312.00, for an increase over the current fee. Again, our objective in doing an Impact Fee study is to identify what the maximum supportable amount is and then go from there.

We had a couple of questions along the way about the increases, how these new amounts compared to the previous study, the 2012 report, and so what you see here is by each component the 2012 cost per person and then the updated report which is this current report that we're looking at now for each component. Whether there's an increase that's shown in black under the difference column or a decrease shown in red, again under that difference column. Overall with combining all of those elements the increase from the previous report to this report per person is $1,330.00. The majority, the bulk of this increase really, if you drill down into each of the components is that special facility land component and we can talk some more about that one as well.

There are some notes here about this relatively large increase and the note here again drilling down to the special facility land component, that that level of service has increased pretty dramatically from 2.0 acres per 1,000 persons to 11.48 acres, given the addition of some significant new parks. There are some ways to address this within the fee structure. We can address individual components and modify and remove them if necessary and we can walk you through that process if that's desired.

I'll just kind of hit the high notes on each of the components. We talked about neighborhood park land, so this is just the land element. We do have park improvements as a separate item. On each of these sides there is this call out box in the pale-yellow color that does show what the difference is between the last study and this study. Since the last study there's been increase of 44 parks
and 120 acres in the neighborhood park land category. You’ll see here the level of service summarized and the cost per person shown.

On community park land, the parks that fit into that category are shown on this slide. The acreage has decreased by 36 acres since the previous fee study and this is due to classification, so six neighborhood parks were previously classified as community parks and shifted over, and that's not uncommon as we go through Impact Fee studies for a few clients. Sometimes classifications and uses of different parks change and evolve as growth occurs.

For athletic field land, there's been a slight increase from the last, very minimal increase from the last study of about a quarter of an acre. Again, a level of service shown and the cost per person.

Special facilities land, this is where there's been an increase of five parks and almost 1,000 acres since the last Fee study, so this is a pretty dramatic increase in level of service and cost per person. This is again an area we can discuss further in terms of either potentially shifting the methodology to a cost recovery methodology if this amount of acreage is sufficient to serve population in the future. Again, sort of matching this up with the Parks and Recreation Master Plan will be beneficial to identify what those perfect levels of service are. This is current levels of service today, this is what you have in the ground for your population at about 11.5 acres per 1,000 people.

Then on park improvements, this is again, I mentioned the stuff that's in the parks, that's built in the parks, the fields, the playground equipment, the courts, and there has been an increase from the last study of about 500 park improvements. We talk about them as sort of individual units and basically as you grow, and you develop existing and future purchase land this is the type of stuff that gets built. Again, showing a level of service and the cost per person for those improvements.

The trails, the trail system here is increased by over 16 miles since the last Fee study. Again, level of service shown, cost for improvement of those trails, and the resulting costs per person.

On recreation centers, these are actual buildings identified were described in square footage, so we get to as opposed to acres. There has been a decrease of the rec center since the last Fee study, so this reflects then the current level of service. This is both actual square feet and acreage, we combined a little bit there so you can sit on actual land.

Then on the aquatic centers, there has been an increase two aquatic centers since the last Fee study and so the cost per person here is shown, again for your current level of service. As you grow if the intent is to build additional aquatic centers as we understand it is, then this is the level of service to be provided to new growth in the future.
This is the same slide as I started with, but this is then summarizing all of those elements for all of the components in the fee with the cost per person and the draft on proposed maximum supportable fee again if you will. Then taking that fee by housing unit type, by residential unit type for single-family and then multifamily, this is the breakdown. Again, some more specific information in response to some of the questions that the Committee had on the elements within how it breaks down between the two different residential impact fees, the single-family, multifamily and they're proportionate to the demand off of those housing units. Then this isn't meant to be read, but just again kind of overview of looking out into the future, this is the connection between growth, the current level of service, and what those costs may be due to growth for each of these elements combined. This is our projection based on the growth assumptions and the level of service and the costs identified of a need of about $28 million of growth needs.

A summary of matching up since we've done an incremental expansion methodology that's by definition the revenue should equal the costs because we're collecting dollars to provide those growth delayed improvements and the difference here is essentially a rounding, due to rounding through the calculations. That's the end or our prepared presentation. I'm happy to take additional questions.

Chair Beerman: Well thank you very much. I'm here mainly to listen today so I'll first ask if any Members of the Committee have any questions?

Lorenz: I have a couple. I noticed a couple of small numerical differences between the report that I read from May of last year and the presentation you gave today. They're almost insignificant, but the fact that they changed at all made me wonder if there's been work done on this since May?

Herland: We did some tweaks to some of the comments received at that point in time.

Lorenz: Will you be reissuing the report with those modifications or just this presentation?

Herland: Well I think that's the intent once we settle on where this ultimately needs to go.

Lorenz: Okay. Did you do any land cost studies yourself?

Herland: We have the land costs that were included in here are from the previous study.

Lorenz: Okay, so during this process you've not done.

Herland: We were not scoped to do that.

Lorenz: Done the new research on that cost.
Herland: Right.

Lorenz: Okay. In your report, page three or four, it's pretty early on, it talks about if the City were to issue debt for growth related parks and recreation capital improvements that the impact fee methodology would have to change. I'm not sure if you were aware but they did pass a pretty big General Obligations Bond last year for a lot of the items that are included in your report. Do you anticipate needing to redo this with that information?

Herland: Well I think in the questions that was brought up that we received and that was something that again in terms of finalizing, in getting to a final report we would need to consider that. It may be that there are a couple of different ways to go about that; one is if there is to include a credit. If everybody's paying a property tax that's going toward the same facilities and there's potential for double payment, so we would include credit in the fee itself. The other way to look at it is separating the bonded amount that's existing development share versus impact fees paying for growth related shares. It depends on what the intent of the bond funding is, what that's specifically going to go for.

Lorenz: Okay. To make sure I understand what you just said, what that sounded like to me was you would take the items that the bond was issued for and pull those out of your costs and then recalculate your math. Am I correct?

Herland: Well there are several different ways.

Lorenz: The second one of the two.

Herland: There are several different ways you can go about it. If they're wholly growth-related needs, I know the aquatic center was part of the discussions, if that's part of it then that one we would, and that element would want to have a credit on there to avoid double payment. We'd still potentially include it, but again we'd want to have direction from the City, whether it should be included or are you just going to say "Look the taxes are going to pay for it. We're not going to collect any impact fees off of it, from it." If they're projects that are more catering toward maintenance or existing deficiencies, making up existing deficiencies, that's a different equation, a different approach.

Lorenz: On your slide about special facilities land, it says that there's five new parks and almost 1,000 acres and pardon my ignorance because I'm kind of one of the new Committee Members. I think I've been here since June, so probably the month after you made your last presentation. In my recollection those two big parks; the Dam Open Space and the Butterfield Shooting Range, both of those have existed for quite a bit longer than 2012. I'm wondering where the 1,000 acres came from. Maybe it just wasn't classified that way. I don't know.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Sonya Delgado. The Dam has been around for a long time, but it has not been Parks and Rec until this year. They turned
it over to us for maintenance. There's a lot of land back there and not all of it's being used, but it does get counted as part of property. The same thing with the Butterfield Shooting Range, that has hundreds and hundreds of acres, but we only use a very small portion, but it's still counted. The other third area that is also new to us this year is the RC Airport and the Archery Range, which actually sits by the landfill, on the old landfill, or on the landfill now and we get to use that, but that also gets counted, but we can't use all that. Those three things are kind of skewing this, and we've also discussed that with the Parks and Rec Master Plan group as well. We're all going to get together after this and try and smooth some of those out. That specialty number is probably going to come down because those three areas really, really skewed it, because we don't get to use all of that land out there.

Lorenz: That really constitutes almost the entire increase.

Delgado: That's a huge piece. Yes.

O'Neill: Fifty-two percent.

Delgado: Yes. It's a huge piece.

O'Neill: Like it shouldn't be figured in.

Delgado: Once the Dam came on line, once the Dam came over to us and once, we got the RC Airport and the Shooting Range that really kind of tipped it over, but we don't have access to all of that.

Lorenz: Okay.

Suttmiller: Okay and I've got a follow-up question for that.

Chair Beerman: Excuse me. Are you finished?

Lorenz: I am. Thank you.

Suttmiller: I'm sorry, Butterfield Range and the Dam were both BLM property, were they not? They didn't cost us anything.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Yes.

Suttmiller: There was no cost to those.

Delgado: Well yes.

Suttmiller: We're seeing a cost shown here and it sounds like magic.

Herland: However, you got to your level of service, you can have dedicated donated land, you can get it from a converted...
Suttmiller: Once it's dedicated, once we get land for nothing, then it becomes a matter of improving it which is not necessarily a Capital Improvements thing.

Herland: Again, with the park improvements.

Suttmiller: All that needs to be straightened out. One, as my fellow Member said, that constitutes a majority of it. Two, all of it was free, so when you talk about the cost, like I'm looking at the cost per acre here for park land costs of $130,500.00. There isn't an acre of land in this area that cost $130,000.00. If it does, I'd love to own it. Where does that come from?

Herland: There are different levels of parks and so if it's a water and sewer, if there's access or the more heavily utilized active recreation that's a number close to that. The previous study utilized those numbers. I co think that special facility area is where there's some adjustments that need to be made.

Suttmiller: My take is that, for all it's worth Mr. Chairman, it needs to be looked at much more closely.

Herland: I do want to say though, too I just want to be clear that even though, you, the City didn't purchase the land for parks, you got it donated, it got dedicated, it becomes part of your system, that's still your level of service. If you then from this point forward want to continue to provide that same level of service, there's an expenditure to you potentially.

Suttmiller: The expenditure is not $130,000.00 an acre.

Herland: On this level of park, right. I think on the other ones it's probably sufficient. Yes, we'll go back in this.

Suttmiller: Even buying land in the City of Las Cruces, we've got a bunch of experts here, but I don't think anybody's paying $130,000.00 an acre for land.

Chair Beerman: Mark, do you?

O'Neill: I do.

Suttmiller: I'm finished.

O'Neill: I agree wholeheartedly. I feel we need to adjust that figure as far as figuring impact fees, as far as the price per acre. Also, there's a big impact, this Dam Open Space specialty facility land, Airport land. I don't know how we can figure that in and that's why it's raised it 52%. I think we need to look at that. That's land that's just sitting there. I don't think that should be included in our evaluation. If we do, I think it should only be the 10% or so land, maybe Ms. Delgado can tell us how much land is actually developed and being used for Parks and Recreation, maybe 10%, maybe 20%, I don't know, but that should be the only part I think should be figured in these evaluations.
What was my other question? Also, I was concerned also about offsetting, generally offsetting the GO Bond, the amount of the GO Bond. That's pertaining to specific Park and Rec projects which is probably about $40 million. I think that should be $35 million. You shake your head back there. For the trails and all the park...

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. There were four questions, two questions came to Parks and Rec. The first was for new sports fields, park rehab, and dog parks at $16.9 million. The other question that comes to Parks is the walking/biking/jogging trail which is at $2.7 million. All together we're looking at what, $19.6 million or so.

O'Neill: I thought there was one more that pertained to Parks.

Delgado: The other two is the Animal Shelter, that is not ours, and the Fire Station.


Suttmiller: Pretty soon you'll be talking about real money.

Lorenz: I'm sorry Sonya. I must not have heard you correctly, can you give me those numbers one more time?

O'Neill: Seventeen and $2.7 million.

Delgado: Yes, the first question that came to Parks and Rec was $16.9 million, it's for the new sports fields, park rehab, and dog parks. Then the second question for Parks and Rec is the walking/biking/jogging recreational trails, $2.7 million.

Lorenz: Thank you.

Delgado: The other two are Animal Shelter and Fire Station, but those are not ours.

Lorenz: Thank you.

O'Neill: Okay, and none of that was even considered in your report.

Herland: No, and it's an issue of timing.

O'Neill: I understand that. Just was approved very recently.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. The majority of this other than the new sports park, the East Mesa Sports Complex, it's all rehab, because we don't have money to do any of that and Park Impact Fees cannot be used for that.

O'Neill: For rehab.

Delgado: No.
O'Neill: New facilities.

Delgado: They cannot be used for rehab or maintenance and the majority of question number one, other than the East Mesa Sports Complex is all maintenance and rehab. I can't use Park Impact Fees for that.

O'Neill: Right.

Delgado: Just as a clarification.

Chair Beerman: Thank you Ms. Delgado. I think you mentioned that at a previous meeting that the bond issue had little impact on the Impact Fee equation.

Delgado: Right. Other than the new Sports Complex.

Chair Beerman: That's about $10 million, roughly $10 million.

Delgado: That's about half of that. It just depends on how we can make all that work, but yes.

Lorenz: Call it paid.

Chair Beerman: Okay, so we can't just subtract $19 million from the cost to the City for new development.

Lorenz: Seems like $8 million it would be the more appropriate number.

Chair Beerman: I'm sorry.

Lorenz: It seems like $8 million would be the more appropriate number.

Chair Beerman: Any other questions Mark?

O'Neill: The Bond has to be used for new facilities, is that correct? New development, new ball fields, new facilities.

Delgado: The Bond?

O'Neill: Yes, the Bond.

Delgado: The GO Bond?

O'Neill: Yes.

Delgado: No sir. Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. The GO Bond is being used mostly for rehab and maintenance.

O'Neill: Okay. I see.
Delgado: Park Impact Fees can be used for new levels of service.

O'Neill: Right. Thank you.

Chair Beerman: I have some questions. I think the Committee has the May version of the report and there might be, was there a September later version?

Herland: I think May was the last one that had the changes in it. It's the latest one.

Chair Beerman: Okay. The $28 million. I believe the report states that is the fair cost for new development to the City of Las Cruces for the population increase of I believe it's 9,000 over the next six years. Fair share is the terminology. Fair share for new development. The $28 million is divided by the number of new residents that come up with the, or new homes or residents depending how you figure it, to come up with the Impact Fee of $7,073.00. Is that correct?

Herland: Well it goes the other way. The $28 million is the result of the levels of service and the cost to continue to provide that same level of service which is all of those components/elements.

Chair Beerman: It's the cost of maintaining the level of service considering that there are going to be 9,000 more people.

Herland: Yes. If you were to provide the same level of service.

Chair Beerman: As a result of new development. I think one of the versions of the report I saw said that the apparently big increase in the fee to $7,000.00 per home occurred because in the past two fee updates City Council only adopted a fraction of what TischlerBise recommended. Is that correct?

Herland: Yes. That's not uncommon either.

Chair Beerman: Okay. I don't have, actually I think I do have the numbers. Previously TischlerBise recommended a $4,126.00 fee in 2012, but the City instead only adopted $2,600.00 and I think this Committee only recommended $1,300.00. That's part of the reason that it seems to be such a big increase now because the recommended increase is for prior years.

Delgado: Correct.

Chair Beerman: On the specialty use fees, Ms. Delgado might be best to comment on that, but the special use facilities, the park behind the Dam, I think the cost to develop that was actually something like $1.5 million. There used to be a sign down there on that property that it was being developed by I guess the Corps of Engineers. The price tag was, it could have even been over $2 million, I don't remember exactly. That was really not, somebody paid for that. That land has value.
As far as the $130,000.00 per acre that's used. I believe TischlerBise said in the past that they got that number from the City and that's the cost of developed park land not the price of raw undeveloped acreage. I could be wrong about that, but I think I remember hearing that.

Herland: You're asking a question.

Chair Beerman: Where is the $130,000.00 per acre figure come from and what does it apply to?

Herland: Well it wasn't the number utilized the last time and it's developed meaning not the park improvements developed because you have a separate component for that. Developed in terms of whatever would need to be to have it be shovel ready.

Chair Beerman: That wouldn't include the park development facilities that are on it.

Herland: Correct, because those are separate.

Chair Beerman: That is a raw land plus maybe sewer or water. That seems to be a big number. The developers seem to indicate that that's a grossly exaggerated number, $130,000.00 an acre for raw land that only has utilities. If that number is grossly inflated, that would have a big impact on the calculation of the Impact Fee.

Herland: Well any time you change any of those numbers it'll adjust the fee, the amount. We're happy to take other, and I think as part of the, I don't know if the Master Plan will get into costing, but again this was a holdover number, we weren't scoped to do that kind of analysis for land valuation, so any input and feedback we can adjust those numbers accordingly.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We're going to be working with, Half Associates is working with, our Parks and Rec Master Plan and we're also working on the Comp Plan, obviously Elevate Las Cruces, and so we're going to be using some of those same numbers. We're going to be making some adjustments on both plans so that they're all working together and using the same numbers going forward so they're not off and you can kind of look at the whole entire thing together. They all work together and not against one another but together.

Chair Beerman: That could be, I think I was hearing numbers like $20-some-thousand per acre, I'm sorry. Numbers escape me now, but it seems like the development community was saying that the number used for the study is grossly too high.

Herland: Well again there are different areas of the City, so we're getting to one number and not, so there may be areas that are higher, versus others that are lower, different uses, locations if it's more urban environment that you're purchasing land to do more active type parks on the community neighborhood and most
of the other ones, the athletic facilities, you know so that's going to drive those numbers as well. Again, we're happy to take, to get to the final report, take any kind of feedback from development community on, but we would want to have a pretty good sample of geography and use and what kind of those purchases look like.

5. A.ii. **Questions Submitted by CIAC Member.**

Chair Beerman: Okay, we want to get to the comments by the visitors, but we also have on the agenda answers to questions submitted by Committee Members. Did you have a plan for addressing those?

Herland: We don't have a presentation on that. We submitted the memo, so if you have follow-up questions off of that I'd be happy to take those.

Chair Beerman: Okay.

Lorenz: Pardon me. Did you say submitted a memo in response to the questions from the former Chair and the Vice-Chair? Did you guys receive that? I did not.

O'Neill: I got one from my questions.

Chair Beerman: I did. I have one dated October 3, 2018.

Lorenz: Okay. I didn't receive that.

Chair Beerman: Did everybody get those?

Ruiz: That was from a previous meeting, so we didn't.

Chair Beerman: They were included in the agenda package for a previously meeting.

Ruiz: If they were sent in, yes. In October they were submitted. I can pull them up if you'd like.

O'Neill: Mr. Chair. I would like to see the entire Board get those answers to those questions. Is that possible? All the questions that are submitted from the Board I think everyone on the Board should receive those answers.

Suttmiller: From CIAC.

Ruiz: They were probably received at the previous meetings and they were addressed, and you weren't on the Board yet. We offered to give you a full packet, but you just wanted a couple of meetings, or we may have given you a whole packet.

O'Neill: I did get past meetings and so forth. Maybe they're in there. I didn't see some of them but for instance questions that I asked, that I submitted before and
here, the answers I received but I think the Board should also receive those answers.

Ruiz: Correct. Now if they're addressed, some said they were going to give verbal answers and so I can't give the Board something that I do not have.

O'Neill: Okay.

Chair Beerman: Since we have the representative here, she came from Virginia, I have the questions that I submitted and I can briefly, quickly go through them and I see some of them have already been answered here today, so I can skip those. Just in essence one of the questions was TischlerBise has done 900 impact fees throughout the U.S. and Canada and never had one successfully challenged, I think you said on your website. Now is there anything different about this one that would make it more susceptible to challenge other than the things that we brought up here like...

Herland: Other than this part of the process which.

Chair Beerman: If the $28 million cost of new development as a result of the new residents isn't paid through Impact Fees, what happens? Who pays for that $28 million?

Herland: If the intent is to maintain level of service and that's the assumption, then it would come from other sources of funding. I suspect that $28 million is going to be lower given the discussions on if you go forward and take out those pieces, 10% of the land that's in special facilities category and the cost of the land decreases, that $28 million is going to drop.

Chair Beerman: Okay.

O'Neill: I have a piggyback question on one of your questions. Can I ask it Mr. Chairman? Back to the 900 calculations without a successful challenge. I think the more important question is how many were implemented as you recommended. How many were?

Herland: Eight-hundred ninety-nine.

O'Neill: That's what I mean. Every one of those could have been adjusted. So that's the more important question.

Herland: Well, it's a valid point and I said before, it's not uncommon for an elected body to adopt a lower maximum fee. Again, we come in, what is your level of service? What's that cost to continue to provide that level of service for growth? What's the community's philosophy about who should pay for what? Should growth pay for their impacts at 100%, at 90%, at 50%, at 10%? What's that scale? What happens when you continue to grow, and you don't provide those same levels of service? Everybody's level of service decrease. There's a
policy and a philosophical discussion that happens after the fact, but the calculation is that what's your level of service, what's the cost to provide it.

Chair Beerman: We've had people telling us at our recent meetings and there have been articles in the paper about the big building boom, development boom going on in Las Cruces. Since we have the numbers in your report of 9,000 projected new residents, what effect would a development boom have on the impact on what the Impact Fee should be?

Herland: Actually, as counter intuitive as it sounds, not much or if any, not at all given the approach that we're taking which is an incremental consumption based approach. We're saying if "X" number of people today, here's the level of service you're going to continue to provide that for 9,000 people, here's the cost at $28 million, again that's going to change. If you grow by 10,000 or 11,000 it increases commensurately.

Chair Beerman: If more houses are built, more is collected using the same Impact Fee.

Herland: Correct.

Chair Beerman: If the fee is at the right level it should work out.

Herland: Right.

O'Neill: It could help us charge less for the Impact Fee I would think because we're not here to really make a profit on this, you know we're here to cut costs. What we really need.

Lorenz: I mean your approach really is a per person approach. For every person whether it be 1,000, 10,000 or 100,000 your fee would be collected in a proportionate way.

Herland: Exactly.

Chair Beerman: I had I think three more questions, one of them is the City paid the developers of the large housing development $1.4 million as the cost of building parks in that particular development. Is that a normal appropriate use of impact fees to pay for a developers' building parks in his own development?

Herland: I noticed here it says neighborhood park level and I think we indicated we weren't really intimately familiar with the specifics of the transaction, but if it were a true, a neighborhood park that we defined in our study that's a system level park, it's providing recreational amenities for folks outside of that immediate development, then yes then impact fees could be seen as a legitimate use for the funds. Again, it's this distinction of the system level versus project level impact.
Chair Beerman: Okay. All right, I guess I'll let the other ones go for another time then if you're going to be revising your study. Then we had numerous questions, three, four questions, four pages of questions from the previous Chairman and I think TischlerBise response to most of those was, these are things that should be answered by the City rather than by the consultant.

Herland: There's a combination of those, but it goes again to the level of service question which I think is going to be further investigated, which will be further investigated as part of the Parks and Rec Master Plan, but there is a lot of level of service type questions and plans. Some of the comments are about needing less versus more and that's, again we're coming at this from here's your current level of service today and then there's further discussions and efforts to identify the desired level of service or the desired level of service, maybe you have enough of a certain type of a facility already to service into the future. I think there was a mix. There were some others that were integrated into the revisions to the report in terms of the differences and the previous two studies.

Chair Beerman: Based on what we've discussed today and your discussions with Ms. Delgado, when do you think you would have a final report that we could look at and evaluate?

Herland: I think, can we get back to you given the discussions with the Parks and Rec Master Plan and just get a sense of where they're at on that.

Chair Beerman: Okay. I guess, unless anyone has any follow-up questions, we will take questions from the audience.

O'Neill: I have one Mr. Chair.

Chair Beerman: Okay.

O'Neill: I know you're going to look into this and adjust the figures when we were talking about per acre. Maybe Jason or someone on the Board or someone here knows what the estimated price of those acres, what they're worth, those open land acres; the Dam, the open land. What's the value of those? Maybe someone here knows just to give me a ballpark figure.

McGarvey: Appraised value.

O'Neill: Yes. Appraised value. Just in my head I'd like to.

Suttmiller: Would you give your name please?

McGarvey: My name is Jeremy McGarvey.

Suttmiller: Thank you.
McGarvey: The West Mesa Industrial Park. We purchased a piece up there and I believe it was around $25,000.00 an acre. That's got roads, sewer, water, gas, lights, major access on and off of the freeway.

O'Neill: Other would be less than that because it's not developed at all.

McGarvey: Significantly less.

O'Neill: Okay. I just wanted to get a ballpark figure.

Lorenz: It's in the flood plain. The fact that you can't build anything in it makes it useless for most.

O'Neill: Thank you.

McGarvey: Like the walking path behind the flood control dam, right behind Target. That walking path that sits back there as everyone knows, I mean I don't know you've been back there and looked at the land, but part of that walking path sits underwater like two or three months out of the year. It takes the South Fork Arroyo water that comes in and a couple of other facilities. If they keep, if they pass this Impact Fee for $7,000.00, and we're a developer too. We develop small infill lots. We don't go after big tracts. We try to take old mobile home parks and stuff that have fallen apart, and no one's touching, buy them, develop them, and put affordable homes in. At a $7,000.00 Impact Fee, this will kill what we do. We will have to shut shop down and leave town and go somewhere else where we can make a profit.

O'Neill: Okay. I think we're getting off. Thank you. I think that's good information for the Board to know as far as those values. This is just a ballpark figure but I'm sure staff will look into it and really come up with some figures for us when we start making decisions on this. Thank you very much. That's all I have.

Chair Beerman: Who else would like to make a comment? Would you be able to speak at the microphone and give your name?

Montanez: Can everybody hear me okay?

Ruiz: For the record please.

Montanez: Okay. My name is Steve Montanez. Actually, my question if for you. My question is in your neighborhood park land infrastructure, your cost per person is at $222.00. Is it factored in this fee that the overwhelming majority of neighborhood park land is donated by the developer when the development is established? That is also quite a bit of special facility land that is donated or paid for through bond or state grants. The majority of this land here is at no cost to the City and it's going to be donated. Is that factored in to this cost per person?
Herland: The current policy of the City should be, but there are different levels of, these neighborhood parks as I understand are more system level parks, is that my recollection. There's sort of the development serving type parks which would be more of a pocket park, sort of that site specific which is part of the development approval process. I understand it. That would be captured within that. If there are, again happy to take feedback on, and it does kind of filter back to the Park and Rec Master Plan of what is the policy of the City? Is the City's policy to start at this level, at the neighborhood park level, take them out of the system level parks and have them be developer donated and provide it and get out of that level of business which we do find a lot of our communities, clients doing that and just starting at the community park level and going up from there. Given the way that the fees have been in place up until now, this is going to include it as part of the fee.

Montanez: You also brought up, I'm glad you brought up pocket parks because the...

Suttmiller: Excuse me sir. This is for everybody. If you could please come up here.

Montanez: I'm sorry.

Suttmiller: The reason for it is, is you're then speaking and being recorded so that the people that have to type the report, the minutes, have a clear. Anybody that comes up, if you want, please do it from there, and state your name so they know who's speaking. It's just a matter of processing all this stuff the most efficient way. It's not a punishment, I promise you.

Montanez: You also brought up pocket parks. I'd like to know first I wasn't sure if the answer was yes or no that TischlerBise is aware that especially neighborhood park land is donated by prior developers. Secondly your definition of a pocket park could be significantly different than our definition of a pocket park. The parks that you have listed here, the neighborhood park lands, I personally do not describe those as a pocket park. I actually describe those as smaller community parks. Pocket park would be something that Mr. Moscato with Sierra Norte Development would have in his development which is a smaller, maybe a half-acre park with no facilities on it or with limited facilities. What exactly would be a definition of a pocket park according to TischlerBise?

Herland: Yes, and I was using that term not knowing that that's the definition and terminology that's used here specifically and that those terms do often change. I'm talking about that type of a site-specific development serving a limited area of service for that park as part of a housing development, as part of a multifamily development, that kind of thing. Neighborhood parks qualify more as like I said small community parks where they're going to have a draw from outside of the immediate development.

Montanez: Thank you. My overall comment here is when TischlerBise does submit a final draft with these figures, you know just please factor in because it is a
significant factor, neighborhood park land is donated and that would bring
down the infrastructure cost per person.

Herland: Sure. Definitely would. Thank you.

Montanez: Thank you.

O'Neill: Thank you.

Chair Beerman: Sir.

Campbell: My name is Neil Campbell. I'm with Hakes Brothers. We're a homebuilder here
in Las Cruces as well as other parts of New Mexico and Texas. My question to
you is, in the report, in the recommendation that you give, do you also take a
look at the implications that that Impact Fee has on the rest of the economy
as a whole? For example, tripling or I think it's 272% that's what we're talking
about here when we're talking about single-family development. At 272%
increase in an Impact Fee I think a lot of times we forget that the developers
not going to eat it, is that correct John? You're not going to eat it. He's going
to pass it down to me. The builders not going to eat it, we're going to pass it
on to the buyer. The buyer is going to have to either come up with that money
or if they can't come up with that money they're not going to buy. For every
single-family unit that is produced, it positively impacts over 200 goods and
services in the community. My question is, have you guys taken into account
the overall economic impact that that's going to have in raising that Impact
Fee?

Herland: Thank you for the question. It's a good question. It is definitely something to
be considered. As part of this study, no because we're coming up with what is
the cost to serve new development at the current level of service, a capital
cost specifically. We did not do an economic impact study as part of this or
impact on affordability, which we do in a lot of other jurisdictions as well.
Happy to expand our scope and do that as well, but the reality is that it's not
likely that the Council's going to increase from $2,600.00 to $7,300.00 on that
hit. I mean from a political perspective and from an economic perspective it's
likely not going to happen.

Campbell: Then my follow-up question to that is, are you guys shooting for the stars
hoping to land on the moon with this or are you drawing an outlandish amount.
Just for example a $130,000.00 an acre. Has anyone ever purchased a piece
of land in Las Cruces for $130,000.00 an acre? I will gladly sell for that kind of
price.

Herland: I understand. It's a point well taken and that is a number that we need to
scrub. That is a number that needs to be scrubbed.

Campbell: When I think the concern that I have as a member of the community is that
when I see a number like that that's been overlooked by the group that's
supposed to be advising on this, it makes me think that they're disconnected from the community. That they don't understand exactly what our community goes through, what the economic impact for our community would be. I believe somebody said that you're out here from Virginia, is that right? I lived in Virginia. Great place. Extremely expensive to live. $130,000.00 would be a steal of a deal on an acre of land there. Here, you'd be crazy.

Herland:

A couple of things. I live in Virginia. Our office is based in Maryland. We do work nationally; jobs in Idaho, northern neck of Idaho, jobs in Arizona, all across Colorado, rural Virginia where, so it's across the board. It's not just where we make our home, it's just mostly so we have airports that we can fly out of and a choice of airports. I understand that concern and the intent is to be an update and to sort of fast forward to get to an updated amount from the previous go around. Some of those numbers were holdovers to be honest. It came from somewhere along the way that that was identified as the dollar value on the land. I understand. This was meant to be an update. Now we've identified where those points are to scrub, that one and in getting back to the shooting for the stars, landing on the moon, shooting for the sun, that's not my strong suite. That again, our intent is to identify what is the cost? What levels of service are you providing today?

Now again on the special facility stuff, those acres, yes you have that level of service today, but that's providing a level of service that's probably slightly into the future. That's not just today, 12 acres per 1,000 that you're going to continue to provide that same level of service for next 1,000 that comes in you're going to buy another 12. We're going to like either take that out or adjust it or take the 10% etc. It is a level of service that you have today. I mean it is what the acres are in the ground today that the City's providing to its citizens. The Impact Fee approach is what does it cost to continue to provide that? Again, given the land costs, yes so that's going to change that cost equation, but at the end of the day it's still a level of service an acre unit, widget, this is what you're providing and then there's a cost to go along with it.

Campbell:

John, I apologize for putting you on the spot but I think last meeting you had mentioned that if you take that cost out you're looking at a calculation, if you had taken that cost out it would basically remain the same, is that, did I understand that correctly?

Moscato:

Thank you. John Moscato. I think when you consider all of the ways that have been discussed that the Impact Fee breakdown presented here are misguided. Let's go through them real quickly. Number one, special facility land, most of it's not really used by Parks. In any event most of it is undevelopable so it really has not just a lower value than the $130,000.00, but probably in most cases zero value in terms of true appraised value. When you look at the $130,000.00 an acre, which is unsupportable by local numbers, add to that the fact that the neighborhood park land is donated. The community park land in many cases would be donated. You add all that up and I think we're going
to wind up with a decrease in the Park Impact Fee rather than an increase, because you're looking at nearly $5,000.00 that would be stricken from this Impact Fee breakdown. I just hope even though these issues were brought up in many other meetings that I've attended here, that maybe this would be the meeting that would trigger a reanalysis of these figures to a true breakdown of what the cost should be.

Suttmiller: Thank you sir. Did you give your name?

Moscato: John Moscato.

Suttmiller: Okay. Thank you. I know who you are.

O'Neill: Thank you.

Herland: Not to belabor the point, I just want to respond to that and knowing again that special facility item, we'll have an adjustment to the whole program. Regardless of how you got the land before, if you from this point forward as a City say "We're going to continue to provide that level of service in the future and purchase land," again there's a discrepancy on the cost to purchase, but continue to purchase land through Impact Fee dollars, then that from this point forward there is a cost potential, regardless of whether there was a cost that was had when you acquired the land in the first place. The same on neighborhood parks. If the policy is that developers are going to dedicate and you're going to dedicate it at a certain level of service, then yes, then that should not be an item.

Moscato: If 90% of the special facility land isn't being used for parks at all then that wouldn't be a relevant figure.

Herland: Correct. It should be 10%, level of service would be 10% of what it is currently, which is what it was before. Because they were acquired and integrated into the system prior to the change from the last fee study to this fee study, that was the change without that kind of adjustment on dialing it down from the 100% of the acres down to the usage.

Suttmiller: Mr. Chairman.

Moscato: It just doesn't seem accurate that a shifting of ownership so to speak from one department to another would result in an increase in the figure.

Herland: Well it increases the level of service, which is driving the fee. Because then it becomes a park, an inventory that's available for park uses which it wasn't before.

Moscato: It's not actually being used.

Herland: Right, and so there's some adjustments.
Suttmiller: I have sort of a follow on the gentleman's question. It was a good point the other gentleman made. The land doesn't cost anything, and the larger amount of the land isn't used. Like in a firing range you've got a small amount around land use to shoot pistols and rifles on, and a large amount of land to make sure that projectiles don't reach beyond it. The land all came from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). If the City's using it, we have a right around here. All the land around here that you're seeing outside is BLM land and we ask them for it and go through a process and guarantee that it's going to be used forever and ever for the City. It's free. A lot of the land down along the river. You can't put houses on it, it's in a flood zone, a major flood zone. I think those things need to be taken into account. It's like the firing range, I go out and fire routinely.

There's an amazing amount of land out there to expand it. Right now, it's not expanding because there's not enough demand to go out and put another 20, 30, 40 firing lines in it. That kind of stuff I think should be taken into account. I agree with that. I have no problem with impact fees, but they should be reasonable and determined on true cost and when you say, "Okay we're going to build 20 parks, where do we get the land." Where's the land in the previous, you used 2016 as a baseline. Where did the land in those parks come, how much did that land actually cost in 2016 or before when those parks? Zero. What's it going to cost in the future if we need to put another firing range up on the Mesa. Probably nothing. Go to BLM and say, "Give us several hundred or thousand acres" and they do it. That kind of thing. That's part of the overall thing. In my mind.

Chair Beerman: Do we have any more from visitors? We're interested primarily in hearing what the stakeholders have to say, the developers, and builders and anyone else.

Alcala: Miriam Alcala. It has been established that the $130,680.00 per acre is an incorrect number. I'm a very analytical person. If you're giving me projection of something would it be a possibility that there are other numbers that are not real, that need to be revised? I don't have a copy of the report. All of those numbers are, like what's the percentage?

Herland: Again, that was a holdover from the previous study.

Alcala: What other holdovers are in there?

Herland: The rest were updated as I understand it.

Delgado: The rest of the numbers in there are total acres that we have, the number of parks, the names of the parks, etc., where they're located, all that is.

Alcala: You feel confident that the other numbers are accurate.

Delgado: Yes.
Alcala: Okay. Thank you.

Montanez: Steve Montanez here again. Just more of a suggestion to this Committee. The last time a few of us met we did establish even at our last meeting it was established that Park Impact Fees, right now the City does carry over, the City currently has $3 million in unused Park Impact Fees. Definitely there's somewhat of a surplus to work with. What we calculated was as the policy stands now with a 400-lot development at Park Impact Fees being collected the way they are now, we're sitting at just over a million dollars that is being collected from a development. Over a million dollars are being collected by group Park Impact Fees.

Also, the City is acquiring land that's being developed. Our lots are developed, homes are built, a park is built. Ninety percent of the time it's built by the developer who has developed the lots, and a refund is given from the City for the facilities that are built on the lots. Some of these developers, I know for many it seems that a park is something that's very easy to build but you'd be surprised how many developers are very unfamiliar with how to do it. They still do it. They are refunded. In terms of the overall cost, you're starting to see that the Impact Fees, that we're doing very well with Impact Fees with the total costs that are collected versus the expenditures.

You look at developments such as Sierra Norte or Metro Verde, Park Impact Fees have, we've been able to enjoy things like our splash pad, some of the smaller community parks. Park improvements, Park Impact Fees have, there are special needs facilities at Young Park. Park Impact Fees are paying for some of the improvements in our old parks, Young Park, Apodaca Park, the trails, the shooting range, the airplane facility, the archer range. What I'm really trying to say to sum this all up, is that as the policy stands and what is being collected now, our developers, our building community, we can actually do a lot of what's being asked for in this report. We can actually do that now with what's being collected.

What would really need to be, and these discussions just have to be had with our current developers knowing that if they do develop in a certain part of town, that it is in their best interest to make sure and allot park space and build on that space for two reasons, they contributed a park to that development, they've contributed the facilities to that development and the money that they have spent in Impact Fees is staying in the development that they built. It's not going anywhere else. Just to consider that everything that is being proposed can actually be done with the Impact Fee system the way it is now. Thank you.

Chair Beerman: Director Delgado. Did you have something to say about that?

Delgado: Yes. Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I just wanted to make a comment about our $3.4 million that's sitting there. We have approximately a little over $2 million that's already set aside for building parks right now. We have a large
park we're building, it's going to cost us a little over a million. We do have some parks that are coming up in subdivisions that we're working on agreements right now. We already have that allotted, so I have probably just over a million dollars right now that's left. We do have a lot of other individuals that are coming forward and that million dollars is starting to go by really quickly.

As it comes in, we're trying to spend that. It takes us a little bit longer. We do have to have an agreement, but we are getting that spent. I do know that we had someone who made a comment about that the last time and I went back through to go double check all our numbers and we're sitting on just over $2 million. All that start is going to happen towards the end of this fiscal year and into next fiscal year. We're hoping to have some of these larger parks done by the end of this calendar year. We are moving on that. Right now, our level of service is for neighborhood park. We talked about Metro Verde, they have a lot of neighborhood parks and our neighborhood park is defined as one to two acres.

We work a lot with Mr. Moscato. We do have a lot of those parks up there. We do, do a reimbursement. We have discussed that here before. We are now, we do have those, but it's harder to go after a recreation center because I have to sit on money for a while until I can get enough money to go purchase land or to build a recreation center. We have a huge need for that. We have one indoor basketball gym for example. I have people knocking on our door every single day, they want another. I do have a couple developers that are interested in possibly helping me create one and build one somewhere and using some of these Park Impact Fees and try to come up with some kind of scenario that we can help each other.

I'm very, very excited about that. It is difficult because we deal with smaller bits of money at a time and to go after a larger piece, I have to hang on to that or go after other funding sources. Like I had said before, thank you very much for voting for the GO Bond. I meant that sincerely because we do need another avenue and I think that's a great one for us. It helps us keep these Park Impact Fees down and it helps us if we want to stay on the level of service for neighborhood parks, that's a great avenue. Just like many individuals already mentioned, that's okay because we need those too, but we're starting to grow and there's a lot of demand for a lot of different things. Everyone wants them right now. I've got people every single day, right now, when are you going to build that for me, I need this, I need that. It's difficult. We're working through that. I just wanted to let you know that I'm aware there's $3.4 million in there, but I assure you there's already over $2 million that's already been allocated to projects that are going to start coming.

Chair Beerman: Do you consider that you have any surplus?

Delgado: Any surplus on the Park Impact Fees?
Chair Beerman: Is all of the money that you have now, is that all earmarked generally for needs in the future? You also have to spend it within seven years.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Yes, we have to spend it within that time but that's not an issue. We spend that. Do we have a surplus? Yes and no. We have money that's coming in if they're building, so yes, we do get some of that in, we just have to kind of let it build up a little bit and then go after something. We do have things that are slated and ready to roll, and as we get that amount of money, we start working on it.

Chair Beerman: While you're still at the podium, I've been hearing about this $130,000.00 per acre number for years. It seems to me that that was called the total cost of a finished park and recreation land, $130,000.00. I believe that's how it's being used in the formula. Do you have any insight on where that $130,000.00 figure came from?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I don't want to sit up here and try and guess, but I'm going to have to go back and look at that, because that one was before me and I didn't know all the details then. Let me see if I can find that out and I will be working with the consultants and we'll get that straightened out and then we'll come back with a revision.

Chair Beerman: Either it's absurdly inflated or it's the cost that the City put on the average developed acre of Parks and Recreation land, the actual developed value. I guess we're going to have to find that out before we redo all the calculations. It seems like it makes a lot more sense as the cost of the finished acre, since it's so much out of line with what everyone says an acre is really worth.

Delgado: Right.

Suttmiller: Even then it can depend on the project.

Delgado: I'll go back and look and see if we can figure that out. We'll definitely, as Julie mentioned, we'll scrub that out.

Suttmiller: I have a quick question. Don't you have a prioritized list of projects slated to get, for future projects that you would use Impact Fees on?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Yes, we do, it's called the CIP list.

Suttmiller: CIP list. I thought so.

Delgado: Those are prioritized different ways, if we have state legislative funding, we have a certain time limit that we have to expend all those dollars. Sometimes we have a grant also has a time limit. Our Park Impact Fees other than the seven years we have a little more play on that. Just depends on what projects are coming forward. If we received any grants. The GO Bond, that's a major
priority for us right now. We do have a time limit, so we need to make sure that we work closely with our project managers to make them happen.

Suttmiller: There might be, I'd like to see the list personally, because I think it answers a lot of the questions that were brought up about the future. Basically, my understanding of Impact Fees is that's to put things in place for people who are coming in and buying those houses. What is planned for that that's not in right now because you're right, if you're going to put in a $3 or $4 million facility you've got to gather the Impact Fees up or they become part. I know with the utilities to a large degree they mix the funds so much is Impact Fees, so much is taxes, so much is user fees, that kind of thing. They have their CIP and it's really informative to people to see that. You're building a plat out there, you've got an area to develop in addition to what you're seeing from putting in neighborhood parks and that. There's also going to be a basketball and a swimming thing and they're going to cost $4 million and we need to get the funds for that before we go out and do it. Or we're going to mix funds and here's how we're going to mix them.

Delgado: Right. Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. You do see the CIP list every year. Public Works is someone who's tasked with keeping track of it and they bring it to you. I believe they should give you a quarterly...

Suttmiller: I haven't seen one in a while.

Delgado: ...Yes, a quarterly report I believe, but I can definitely touch base with them.

Suttmiller: We used to be briefed quarterly on them and that stopped.

Chair Beerman: Mark, you have a question.

O'Neill: While you're still there, I sure do have a couple questions. First of all, I think the Parks and Rec Department does a great job. I saw firsthand. I think you guys do a great job. We want the best of facilities here in our community and the best opportunities here. I know you're in the middle of a Master Plan though. I also know you guys did a survey. It might be helpful for the Board, for us to get the results of that survey if that's out yet, just to see what the community feels the needs are in the future, like how many gyms or what are their main concerns as far as trails and gyms and that. Maybe our Board can get the results of that survey when it's out, kind of helps us.

I think also when we look at, there was some talk about how we have to plan for the future too, but I think what we're doing is planning for six years in the future, just six years, we're looking ahead six years so that's what we need to focus on more than way down. I mean we can look at it but as far as making our decisions or recommendations we should be looking at six years what fees are going to be needed and not what we missed out on. I noticed a number of things where people say well by waiting this and delaying this you know we missed out on this much money. Well I don't think we need to look it that way.
We need to look at it, how much do we need and how should we calculate it. We're going to reevaluate everything I see now as far as these acreage fees and so forth. I think we can come up with a figure, the right figure and find out exactly what we need with your input, exactly the amount of money we're going to need throughout this, because we should come up again in six years to do this again.

Looking at it on the face, from what everything I've heard and all the discussion, I think the fee that's been presented is too high, just personally, it's just too high. We won't know for sure until we get all the more information. I don't think we're in a big, big rush to do this and we have to consider the impact on the community as well. Is there anything else you'd like to address from what I said?

Delgado: No. Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Thank you for bringing up the survey. If you haven't already taken it, we do have a Parks and Rec Master Plan Survey out there, it's still open. Tell you neighbors etc. We love that we're having some really good feedback on there. We're really, I'm excited to see what the end results going to be. We're still working on it. Thank you for bringing that up.

O'Neill: May I make just one last comment Mr. Chairman? I think we need to add that third element; we have community parks which are involved here and we have neighborhood parks where the developers pay for that land, and then get reimbursed for the development of that park, but I think a gentlemen, I forgot who it was, brought up about pocket parks. Well that has to be paid for too through these Impact Fees. Pocket parks I'm considering are less than an acre, like little small half acre park and there's no development fees and there's no land donated, maybe sometimes the whole land is donated but I think those have to be considered. I mean that's another element, the pocket parks. Do you have any idea how many of those we have?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I don't know the exact number, but we have quite a few and they're very small.

O'Neill: We have to keep them up.

Delgado: Right. We have to do the maintenance on them. We prefer them to be one and a half to two and a half acres and that's our neighborhood park. That's a little bit more manageable. Not only that but more people can utilize it at the same time. That makes a huge difference. We really do need community parks. Las Cruces has been growing fast and we've had areas that didn't have parks and so now I've got to go back and figure out how to go put one back in there somewhere. That has been a challenge. In the last several years doing the neighborhood parks and working with developers and doing the reimbursement has done some good things for us, definitely. They can build it faster, a lot faster than we can. Working with them and trying to work those
things out has been really good. We've had some really good things happen. I'm very pleased with that. We still have lots more to do, and that's okay too.

Chair Beerman: Jason you have any more?

O'Neill: Thank you.

Chair Beerman: Anything else Jason?

Lorenz: No, other than I guess a comment. It's great to hear that you see that it's working well, because I hear the same thing from the developing community. The fees that we're charging, the reimbursement methodology that you're using now is working well. You know Metro Verde is just kind of the most prominent example right now because there have been so many parks that have happened over there. We've seen it in other parts of town historically as well that collecting that fee and reimbursing the developer. He brings the land for nothing, you reimburse him for the improvements, everybody wins. The community gets the parks, they can walk to them. They don't have to drive to them. I'm glad to hear that it's working good on your end because on our end it seems like it's working great too.

Chair Beerman: I'd encourage anyone else out there who has something to say, speak up because we're doing okay on time.

5.B. **2018 Construction Activity by Larry Nichols.**

Chair Beerman: If not, we'll move on to what should be an interesting item on our agenda. It's presentation by our Community Development Director, Larry Nichols on 2018 construction activity. This is something that is good for the Committee to get maybe even on a monthly basis to see how healthy the development situation is in the City.

Nichols: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I'm Larry Nichols, the Director of Community Development. I'm here today to speak to you about the 2018 development and construction activity that we experienced this previous year. I have with me also the Deputy Director of Community Planning, David Weir. Between the two of us we hope we can give you some information and kind of give you an idea about what happened and a little bit about where we're headed. Earlier this afternoon I heard the Chairman mention that he's been hearing in the newspapers and from us as well and from myself in particular that there's a boom going on here in Las Cruces. When I first came back to Las Cruces a year and a half ago, I mentioned to folks that I thought we were on the threshold of experiencing more than average our linear growth. I'm going to show you here in a few minutes where some of that is occurring. It's not in every single area, but it's in a number of areas that are positioning ourselves for additional growth.

Why a person might ask? Well we've had this activity, we had this increase. What's behind that? Why are folks wanting to come to Las Cruces? I've lived
in Las Cruces off and on for about 40-plus years. Probably more than anybody in this room, but it's a great place to live. It's a great place to do business. I learned that early on. The spotlight on Las Cruces, why do people want to come? First of all, it's the number one safest City in New Mexico. We're the 32nd safest City in America. Number one best run City in New Mexico. Eleventh best run City in America. This resonates with folks. They like to see the City that is well run. There are a couple of studies that it's the happiest City in New Mexico. I believe that. I have a daughter that lives here, grandchildren and they're all happy. The 15th best City to retire. We do have a large retirement community here and many of those folks are buying homes or they're engaging in business.

That bottom line there shows a little bit about the cost of living index. The base metric or the benchmark there is 100, so it says that that's about 10%, the groceries are about 10% more expensive here, but look at housing. Housing is significantly less than the benchmark and that's one reason why people are coming here and we're experiencing this construction activity. You see the other metrics there on utilities and transportation, healthcare and several other items, education and so forth but basically the composite end is about 11% less to be here in Las Cruces, New Mexico, but Las Cruces in particular. That would encourage folks to want to come to Las Cruces.

Some of the demographics. We're saying we're about 101,000. Our household income is $40,000.00, it's based on 2017 metrics. We have a, look at the education enrollment, you know we have nearly 20,000 folks that are in our educational facilities. About 70,000 people here are employed.

With that idea, what happened in 2018? Well one thing that happened in development we had 72 new subdivisions. They were in different areas of the City, Legends West, Red Hawk Villas, Sonoma Ranch, Metro Verde. We have, that showed a 47% increase over the previous year. The reason subdivision activity is important is that is kind of precursor to let you know what's available for people to develop. I'm expecting in 2019 to see a similar growth activity that we had this past year.

Rezoning, we had 11, but that was an 80% increase from the previous year. Rezoning's are important because that allows people to either go into business or utilize the land in some other manner than which it is currently zoned. It gives them flexibility, capability.

Our infill district, we have vacant lots in our infill district which is the parcel of land that's in the center of the City, border on the east by I-25, the west by Valley Drive, on the south by University, and on the north by Three Crosses. That area there had a number of vacant parcels. I think now we have still about nearly 400 vacant areas in there in that infill district, but it's less than 4% from what it was. Tells me that that is being, activities occurring there.
Then we have had a number of communities, what we call blueprints which makes the land available through studies. We have a consultant on the Apodaca Blueprint. It was Halff and Associates, but that parcel has been approved by Council and as you see it's adjacent to the new hospital, the Three Crosses Regional Medical Center. That's going to be available for construction activity and development. They've also, City Council just approved the Sierra Tract Development Blueprint which is a four-acre parcel that's adjacent to the Sierra School that will be used for affordable housing. That's going to go out as a Request for Proposal (RFP) for folks to give us a proposal to develop those four acres for affordable housing and mixed use housing type of development. Then the Lohman Avenue Blueprint, that one's in process. That's going to be also a large development that's going to encourage, be available for folks to build and develop.

Chair Beerman: Excuse me, is that out along near the hospital?

Nichols: Yes, that is. It's where the previous landfill was. That has been studied engineering-wise. There've been samples taken and they're going to be able to remediate that and put into productive available land for development.

You see some of the symbols there, Sprouts, Rudy's, Mountain View, but we had $215 million of permit valuation as a 5% increase from the previous year. We had issued 7,300 building permits. Now this was building permits were permits of all types, all disciplines which would be new homes, new commercial, but mechanical, electrical, plumbing, all permitting. That was 11% increase from the previous year.

New homes, 511 new homes. The highest volume in nine years. This also goes to talking about the boom I guess you would say but from the previous year it was about 475 or 480. New commercial buildings we had 21, 12% increase. Some of them there that are shown on the slides. Probably the biggest area of activity we had were in the medical facilities. Mountain View Hospital is doing a renovation about $12 million. The Three Crosses Regional Medical Center, folks that have gone up Main Street recently, you're starting to see some of the, they're going vertical now, you're starting to see some of the steel frame being constructed. That's going to be a $44 million development due to be completed I think in about 18 months, what we're hearing recently. There have been six new medical clinics. The medical clinics were general office medical clinics, but they were also dermatology, dialysis center, and an oncology facility.

The business registrations for last year, there were 586 new business registrations. There were 2,200 existing renewals. I've shown a little bit of information on the bottom there. There's about a 4%, there was an increase of four new businesses, excuse me, four new businesses in 2017 which doesn't seem like much, but the renewals we're seeing there's a little slippage there. It's lagging behind last year. We've sent our Code Enforcement folks out to look at this. We're wondering why we might be roughly 400 less renewals, 450
less renewals. We're getting some feedback on that. Some folks have simply determined not to continue business operations. One of the more commonly mentioned reasons was that there has been the City approved a minimum wage increase and they're saying with the minimum wage increase for some of the small businesses that that's going to prevent them from continuing operations. That has two sides. You know folks are coming to Las Cruces because they hear the wages have been, we have a minimum wage here. You have on one side and then you have on the other side saying we're not able to accommodate that increase. We're looking into that and I'll have more information that I'll report to the Board later on, once we get that collected.

I wanted to mention a little bit about our PEAK Performance program that we've engaged in last year because it has enabled us to issue permits for development to support the builders and developers. We did have review time, plan review times of 16 days. We're now down to five to eight days depending on the size and complexity of the project. The plan, basically the plan review times have been reduced by 40%. Our field inspections are within 24 hours 95% of the time. We're doing community outreach. We make presentations to the Chamber of Commerce, to Las Cruces Home Builders, Association of General Contractors, Real Estate Association, and then the development community such as the architects and engineers associations. All of this is to promote development and business activity.

As I mentioned we adopted our new strategic business plan. We call it PEAK Performance. We have a survey mechanism in our lobby, and we ask people to, we call it the "Happy Button." If their business has been taken care of satisfactorily, they make a vote and right at this point in time we're at 98% satisfaction. The other thing we did to help promote construction activity, I determined that, I know a little bit about builders. I was one for 24 years. I know that they usually work from sunrise to sunset. When they're out there putting two by fours and walls together, you know they don't normally have time to come down between 8:00 and 5:00 to get a permit or turn in their plans for review, so we start at 7:00 now and we work till 6:00 Monday through Thursday, and then from 7:00 to 11:00 on Fridays. That's 50 hours of available services to the public.

We've also opened up an open counter permitting software that for minor type projects, you go through a series of questions on line at your home or at your business. You don't have to come to City Hall, and you answer the questions and at the end of it you can pay for your permit, you can have your permit printed. That can be as little as a 2-hour process on some of these minor residential projects.

The most active areas for development this past year in residential construction were the East Mesa, the Metro Park, the Red Hawk, Sonoma Ranch I mentioned and the valley, Legends West, central Las Cruces where the medical facility is, we spoke about, as well as a few apartment complexes, namely the specific Willow Creek and Horseshoe Villas. The subdivision it was
primarily Metro Verde, City planning initiatives I mentioned the Apodaca Blueprint, The Sierra Blueprint, the East Mesa, Sonoma Ranch, and again Metro; central Las Cruces were to do with Special Use Permitting as well as rezonings.

The permit valuations and fees, $215 million, I rounded up, but it was $214,378,000.00. The previous year it was $209 million. Our fees collected were $4 million on that valuation in 2018, and $4.1 and $4.3 in 2017. One might ask themselves, well wait a minute here we had a lesser permit value in 2017 and more fees collected than in 2018, but that all has to do with the type of projects. Some of the projects were smaller type projects and some of them were larger and so it's kind of changed the fee structure a little bit.

I guess I could mention while we're at this juncture of talking about fees, we talked about Impact Fees today, but we need to talk about Building Fees. We recently met with the Las Cruces Home Builders Governmental Affairs Committee and I mentioned to them in that time that I'm going to be going to City Council the 18th of March with a resolution to increase the Building Fee, not the Impact, but the Building Fee for permitting. The last time the Building Fees were increased were 2003. That's been a pretty long-time folks. We are probably in our study, we are the, Las Cruces has the lowest building permitting fees of any jurisdiction in the state, probably the region. We are currently at $0.14 a square foot. The proposal is going to, for a 2,000 square foot home that fee would be something like $280.00 for the Building Fee part, not the Impact, but the Building Fee. Our increase would be to match what the County has, $0.20 a square foot that would be a $0.06 increase, so for 2,000 square foot home you would be at $400.00 in lieu of the $288.00, so it's going to be about $160.00. What would I do if that were approved? What would I do with that increase? I want to hire some more inspectors so that we can keep the projects moving in short order and people can get their inspections more quickly.

Here we show the permits, 9,000 in 2017 and 7,300 in 2018. Here again someone might say "Wait a minute, why you show more valuation, but that showed about 145% increase in roofing permits. We had those weather events and we had a lot of roofing permits there for a couple of years previous to 2017, but especially in 2017. Here is a comparison of 2016, 2017, 2018 for new residential homes. You can see that it's going up. I'm hoping to hit the number of 600, maybe even 625 the coming year.

You see, this is a map. Look at down at the bottom you'll see the year 1829 and in the center there you'll see some little dots. The dots represent structures that were built. We were back in the 1800s and now we're 1850, 1853, 1854, a few more dots. The reason I'm showing this slide is, we talked about a boom or exponential growth and this is kind of what's happened since that date we started back in 1800s. We're at 1890 right now, we're starting to see some more structures there. The dots represent both residential and commercial properties. Well we're getting into 1900 now. Seeing what's happening there.
Now we're coming up to 1920, oh a little jump I guess World War I was finished. 1930s, we've gone through the depression a little bit maybe. Coming up to 1945, the war is going on in, but in 1945 both the wars over so we're starting to see pretty good jump in growth. Come up to the 1960s, seen expanding to the south. Still kind of central. Starting to go out to towards the east a little bit. Oh, we jumped over I-25 in the 1980s. Now we're up to about the 1990s. Wow, look what happened, boom. 2000, more boom. 2010, more boom. 2014, 2015, and now we're 2018. You can kind of see how Las Cruces has attracted attention, it's just going to repeat itself now. That's the end of my presentation. I'd welcome any discussion that you would like to have.

Chair Beerman: Thank you sir. I'll just mention that you said you have four new business permits in 2017 and I was one of the people that got a new one in 2018 and I didn't know what it was called but I remember the "Happy Button."

Nichols: I hope you struck it.

Chair Beerman: Oh yes, I thought everything went very well.

Nichols: Good.

Chair Beerman: Well managed. I was just wondering if we could have like a monthly report on how many homes were either permitted or started and how much came in from Impact Fees. Would that be hard to do?

Nichols: The Community Development Department, the permit techs, we do collect the permit fees in this end, but they kind of go there at the other end. I can do that. I can tell you just one day that happened last year on kind of monthly average. You know we were seeing about somewhere in the area of you know 35 to 40, 45 new homes, single-family dwellings, plus some apartment complexes and then the valuations run about, total valuations about $12 million, roughly $12 million. Then we'll spike like I think what was it, Mr. Chairman, I think last October/November we had a $56 million month because of the new hospital. It varies but that's kind of the activity that we seen in terms of single-family dwellings, then a few extra for apartment or mixed housing development. I can get that for you. I'd be glad to do that.

Chair Beerman: It kind of gives us a feel for things are going well. This is going to be over, this Impact Fee for Parks and Recreation, but if we're recommending whether fees should go up, down, stay the same, it's good to have a feel for how the economy, the development community is doing. Whether we should be stingy or generous in our recommendations.

Nichols: Mr. Chairman. As it was mentioned a little bit earlier today, not only are we in the Park and Recreation Master Plan, but we're also in the Comprehensive Plan study and I don't want to steal any thunder from our consultant but there have been some collected information, there have been some thinking and there have been some projections made on terms of population on what we might
expect to see in the next 25 years. Currently I think that number is at something like 34,000, in that area. There will be more specific to that but that's what we're, that's what the projections are now. That's at about a 1.2% growth. That's healthy folks. You know you see these really high growth numbers and it's very difficult for infrastructure to keep up with it and services to keep up with it. If we see another 34,000 or 35,000 folks here in the next 20 years, you're going to see this map even more populated.

O'Neill: I have a question Mr. Chairman.

Chair Beerman: Sure.

O'Neill: In your “why they come to Las Cruces”, you forgot one thing. The weather.

Nichols: The weather.

O'Neill: You didn't include that.

Nichols: That's an important one.

O'Neill: That's a big one.

Chair Beerman: I don't think your slides were in our package and I thought they were interesting if maybe we can get a hold of them.

Nichols: I had to tell them, she said "Larry I need your package." I said, "Well I'm going to have some amendments to it." I said but I'd like to put those amendments and then discuss them and not only just the numbers of percentage of increase or permits or new homes, but some of the factors behind that because I think that is what is sustainable for this growth to continue rather just say "Well we're going to stop and drop off." I do need to mention one thing though about that. I attend a number of City Council public meetings. They have them in the evenings. Each Councilor has their district and have. When I get a lot of feedback from those meetings. Whoever got here, just came to Las Cruces they want to be the last person to move to Las Cruces. They complain about congestion. They complain about traffic.

O'Neill: They haven't been to California.

Nichols: One of them even went so far as, and I even hate to mention this word here but one of them went so far as to say, "Mr. Building Official you need to declare a building moratorium." I said "No, you don't want that."

Lorenz: I disagree.

Nichols: They say why. I said well because you'll be going to El Paso to get your groceries and everything else. I find that interesting that we all want growth,
we all anticipate and plan for it. There are those that say, "I'm here, I like it, let's leave it just like it is."

O'Neill: Thank you for a great PowerPoint presentation. Very, very well. Very good. It helps. You said that you're projecting 625 new residential homes this year? Usually it's been like 40 or 50 so you're saying over 100 now and that's based on just December, January, and February the way you see it moving.

Nichols: Mr. Chairman and Committee Member O'Neill. Basically, the reason I stated that was not so much on what happened there, but I saw these high number of new subdivisions. That means there are lots available for people to build on. We didn't have that in the previous years. We had one subdivision I think had over 180 building sites. Kind of seeing that as the precursor to what could. I had builders tell me at the last part of the year that they were having some difficulty in finding building sites. With the approvals on these subdivisions that inventory's there now.

O'Neill: Thank you. That should raise all those other elements as well, the fees that are taken in and so forth. Thank you. That's all I have.

Nichols: I think I put everyone to sleep.

Chair Beerman: Not at all.

Lorenz: I've got one question for you Larry, if you don't mind. I think I keep a pretty good eye on the land in Las Cruces and what becomes available for sale, because I buy an awful lot of lots, not as much as some others but, you must be qualifying a subdivision quite differently than I do. I mean you did list three there that I'm very familiar with, but you said there were 72 subdivisions last year.

Nichols: Right.

Lorenz: You must be talking about something different than what I think of as a subdivision. Because I'm thinking maybe six.

Nichols: Well, and that is true Mr. Chairman, Jason. Every time a parcel come in that is divided in some fashion it is titled as a subdivision. Not all subdivisions are mega, they're not 100 or even 20 or 40, some of them are smaller.

Lorenz: Even just one parcel split into two, so that I could give...

Nichols: Yes.

Lorenz: ...Take my dad's land and split it between me and my sister or something.

Nichols: Yes sir.
Lorenz: Okay.

Nichols: And that would count in this. The preponderance of those were larger with the larger sizes. I would be curious if I may ask a question. Did you hear that same type of information at the end of year where there were a number of builders that were finding difficulty in finding lots?

Lorenz: My impression of the residential lot inventory is that it's becoming tighter, but developers are starting to develop again. From 2007 to 2017 we saw almost nothing. There was very little development that happened all for a decade. That pent up some demand and it needed to have some, we needed some time to absorb the inventory that was on the market and we finally started to work though that by probably 2014, 2015, and by 2017 there was significant demand, even what I might call scarcity for residential lots, but it took 10 years to correct the mistakes made of 2006 and 2007 where they just built way too much. To add to that, and maybe you can fill in the gaps in my recollection, but some members of this committee have talked about building booms and in my industry, we call "The Boom" 2004 through 2006, maybe a bit over into 2007. Do you recall what those building permit numbers are? My memory says something around 1,200.

Nichols: I think you're pretty close to that. As you said, that was the glory years and there was a lot of construction. There were a number of reasons for that, probably the main reason that I recall is, well I probably shouldn't use this term, but that's what was used, there were a lot of "Sweetheart" homes. There were people, money was available for folks and probably folks that shouldn't have been in homes.

Lorenz: Shouldn't have been building at all.

Nichols: I believe there was money there. That's supposed to, I can recall when I was a builder there was a period of time that the construction interest rate for construction loans was like 18% for a while. That stopped things. I think you're right.

Lorenz: I think it was around 1,200 in the biggest year and we're at 500 now and sure doesn't feel like a boom, but it does feel like we can finally go back to work.

Nichols: If our lending money and mortgage rates and all stay, I think we'll see. I don't know that we'll come back to the 1,200.

Lorenz: I hope not.

Nichols: You hope not?

Lorenz: I hope not.

Nichols: Too many houses to build here.
Lorenz: Well I think what happens is people that don't have the expertise in building start building and the homeowner suffers because they don't have the expertise in knowing which homes were built by quality builders and which ones weren't. If the jewelry's nice and the granite and the stainless is there, then it gave them the presentation. I think we need people building that know what they're doing, and I think we need the inspectors that have the time to do a proper inspection and I don't think that was happening back then either. The building permits were too plentiful, and the inspectors were driving by throwing a green sticker out the window.

Nichols: Mr. Chairman that hurts me.

Lorenz: Well you and I weren't here doing that then.

Nichols: That's true.

Lorenz: Now that we are, we can show them.

Nichols: I was in El Paso. Same thing.

Chair Beerman: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Well thank you sir. I appreciate it.

Nichols: Thank you. I'll follow-up with Mr. Chairman and the Committee I'll follow-up. You want a monthly, or a quarterly, or what would you like for that report?

Chair Beerman: I guess it depends on how difficult it is and whether a monthly will really be useful, if it really shows what we need to see.

Nichols: I do produce a month report for the City Manager and for the Council and I can just provide that to you as well.

Chair Beerman: That would be great.

Nichols: I should warn you it's also going to list every single permit. It'll be quarterly.

Chair Beerman: Not just houses.

Nichols: It gives location, name, district and all that.

Weir: You're just going to have to look at the first two pages and it's summarized.

Nichols: It's a total summary. I'll be glad to do that.

Chair Beerman: Maybe just two pages.

Nichols: Well the top two. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Committee, for allowing me to bring this information to you.
Suttmiller: Appreciate it.

Nichols: We felt pretty good about 2018.

O'Neill: Thank you. Well presented.

5.C. **Questions from CIAC Member Mark O'Neil regarding Open Space/ Neighborhood Parks.**

Chair Beerman: Okay, next is old business of which we have none.

Ruiz: Did we do C, did your questions get covered?

Chair Beerman: They were covered during the presentation by...oh I'm sorry. I forgot Mark's questions.

O'Neill: Mine were submitted and answered.

Chair Beerman: Okay.

Ruiz: Okay.

Chair Beerman: I did overlook that. Sorry.

6. **Old Business - None**

7. **Next Meeting Date:**

Chair Beerman: New item is our next meeting date. Then looking ahead to April, we have the vote on the Parks and Recreation Impact Fee scheduled which I guess is a little premature now since we're going to be having some rework on the consultant's report.

O'Neill: We weren't going to vote till the April meeting.

Chair Beerman: We were just saying that April 18th agenda shows a vote on the Park and Recreation Impact Fee which probably too soon now?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. That's what I was just discussing. If you give me another day or two, I'm going to see if I can flesh it out because I'm going to be doing both of them after today.

Chair Beerman: Okay. Anybody have any comments about the agenda for the next few meetings?

Lorenz: I think until we receive a revised report, I'm not really sure what the plan is.

O'Neill: Have time to review it, discuss it.
Chair Beerman: Okay, so we'll leave, next meeting will be reviewing the Utilities, Parks, and Public Safety projects.

Lorenz: Which I think would be great. Yes. Let's do that and hopefully by then we'll have, if not a report at least an anticipated arrival date of that report.

Chair Beerman: If there should be any developments on the Impact Fee, we can always discuss those too so that we're not up against. I believe there is more or less, we're over our allotted five years to do the review and we had a one-year extension and we're coming up against that I think in June, aren't we?

Delgado: End of June.

Chair Beerman: We really need to do something like May. We only push it back one month.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We were just talking briefly and maybe we can be back by April. I will make that definite and then I will give that over to Alma and we'll send that out to you.

Chair Beerman: Okay. Great. All right, so then we can discuss it in April and vote in May, I guess.

Delgado: If you discuss and we answer all your questions and you're good with that, then you can discuss and vote, or we can vote in May, either way.

Chair Beerman: All right. Well we'll see what happens. I'm kind of expecting significant changes unless that $130,000.00 per acre figure turns out to be valid.

O'Neill: Mr. Chairman, we're talking about future meetings. Can we also get that survey from the Parks and Rec survey? Will that be ready for the next meeting or the following meeting maybe when they get all the results in?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. That survey is part of the Parks and Rec Master Plan, so as we get a little closer to that I'll make sure to bring it to you so you can look at it.

O'Neill: Decide what month we can put that in our packet. Thank you.

Delgado: I'll work with Alma to make adjustments on the agenda.

O'Neill: Okay. How many more hearings do we need to take before we vote on the measure? We're talking about April or May? Do we have to have so many hearings before we do that? Open meeting?

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We had one today. I have one tonight, so that'll be two. Then we're obviously with the CIAC Committee and then where we have the Parks and Rec Advisory Board tonight.
O'Neill: You are having a hearing at the Park and Rec Board tonight? That was my question. It's okay for us to attend that?

Delgado: Sure.

O'Neill: I know we can't speak, we can just listen in.

Delgado: Sure. It'll be the same presentations you saw today.

O'Neill: Oh, the same thing.

Suttmiller: I think we need to get some expert advice. If there's more than three.

Ruiz: I apologize. I completely overlooked putting together a potential meeting quorum. At the most three would be able to attend. Three constitutes a quorum, so two.

Suttmiller: I do not intend to attend.

Chair Beerman: I'm not going to go. It's my understanding that we're going to get a copy of the minutes from that meeting.

O'Neill: If that's the case then I don't really need to attend because it's going to be the same presentation. I would like to get the input from the Board Members there on their questions that they have from TischlerBise and what their thoughts are. If we could get the minutes that would be fine.

Delgado: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We can get the minutes to you, that's not a problem.

O'Neill: Thank you.

Suttmiller: There would not problem with attending since it's just two.

O'Neill: Right. I'm just saying. I don't think I need to hear it all again. I want to hear what the Board Members have to say, their questions.

Chair Beerman: If I understand correctly this Committee does not have to hold hearings. We just solicited input to help us make our decision and City Council has to act within so many days after our recommendation. They also have to hold hearings I believe, but we don't have to hold any hearings.

Suttmiller: They need two months because it needs to go on, has a discussion item and then a voting item, so it takes two months to get through them and we should keep that in mind.

8. **Public Participation:**

Chair Beerman: We have our normal agenda item for Public Participation if anyone has anything
that they want to bring up that didn’t come up during the discussion of the Impact Fee and the study.

9. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair.
Chair Beerman: That takes us to the Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair. Does anyone have a nomination for the Chairman?

Chair Suttmiller: I nominate you to be Chairman.

O'Neill: I second that.

Chair Beerman: All right. Does this have to be a roll call or just all in favor?

Ruiz: You can do acclamation.

Chair Beerman: All in favor.

Mr. Beerman was Voted as Chairman Unanimously 4-0.

O'Neill: I'd like to nominate Mr. Jason Lorenz as the Vice-Chairman.

Chair Beerman: Is there a second on that?

O'Neill: Because we need to have a, according to our charter we need to have a developer as one of the positions, either Chairman or Vice-Chairman.

Chair Beerman: I'm not sure that's true.

O'Neill: It says in our or recommended.

Chair Beerman: Does it really say that?

O'Neill: Yes, it says that.

Chair Beerman: I know that...

O'Neill: It may not be a law for whatever, but it says it recommendation.

Chair Beerman: The City Attorney came over from City Hall and suggested that we alternate the Chairman position between the development community and the people at large. I know Jason's a great guy and that would be fine with me. It would be fine with me even though he's got a big job with the Builders Association.

Lorenz: At least I'm mostly out of that these days.

Chair Beerman: I'm glad you're willing to do it. You seem very sharp and well informed.

Lorenz: Thank you.
Chair Beerman: Is there a second to that one?

Suttmiller: Second.

Chair Beerman: All in favor.

Mr. Lorenz was Voted as Vice-Chairman Unanimously 4-0.

10. **Board Comments:**
Chair Beerman: Any comments from the Board? Anything?

11. **Adjournment:**
Chair Beerman: That brings us to adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:43 p.m.

[Signature]

Chairperson