1 2	JOINT WORK SESSION SUMMARY & DIRECTION SHEET	
3 4	The following is a brief summary of the Agenda items discussed at the Work Session, with	
5	appropriate direction given to the responsible staff person by the City Council. The required	
6	follow-up actions are to be taken by those responsible officials.	
7 8	The City Council of the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico, held a Joint Work Session on Tuesday,	
9	February 26, 2019, at 2:03 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, Conference Rooms 2007-B & C.	
10		
11 12	THOSE PRESENT:	Mayor Ken Miyagishima Councillor Kasandra Gandara, District 1
13		Councillor Greg Smith, District 2
14		Councillor Gabe Vasquez, District 3 (Absent)
15		Councillor Jack Eakman, District 4
16		Councillor Gill Sorg, District 5
17		Councillor Yvonne Flores, District 6
18		
19		Abraham Sanchez, CPAC
20		Russ Smith, CPAC
21		Roberta Gran, CPAC
22		Sharon Thomas, CPAC
23 24		Harvey Gordon, CPAC Heather Watenpaugh, CPAC
25		John Moscato, CPAC
26		Mary Ann Hendrickson, CPAC
27		Todd Stuve, CPAC
28		George Vescovo, CPAC
29		
30	OTHERS PRESENT:	Stuart Ed, City Manager
31		Jennifer Vega-Brown, City Attorney
32		Christine Rivera, Deputy City Clerk
33 34	Mayor Miyagishima called the meeting to order.	
35	wayor whyagisinina cancu the meeting to order.	
36	Sharon Thomas, CPAC Chair welcomed everyone.	
37		
38	Larry Nichols, Community Development Director gave an introduction.	
39	The Comilla Halff Associates are smallered as the Discount Decision of the Discount Decision Decision Decision of the Discount Decision	
40 41	Jim Carrillo, Halff Associates gave an overhead presentation. Please see PowerPoint presentation.	
42	Matt Noonkester City Explained continued with the overhead presentation.	
43	· 1	
44 45	Rachel Shindman, EPS continued with the overhead presentation.	
46	Matt Noonkester gave an introduction on Growth Scenario Exercises.	

Break out sessions for Growth Scenario Exercises were conducted. Please see attached notes from each table.

Councilor Smith presented for Group 1. He said they went with the third choice because it provided us opportunities to look at things in the reality context as well as the idealized. We were looking at taking some of the areas where we want to have nodes of new commercial and radiating out from those. We're looking at the new city property across from Mountainview, looking at some of the development Mr. Moscato has been involved with Metro Verde, and then looking at some of the existing things going on. We also wanted to make sure we were connecting with transit and bike trails so that we have destination points and connecting pieces. We want to preserve agriculture. We were very strong about wanting to make sure we protected the arroyos. We have green spaces, connected infrastructure, and neighborhood housing areas. Near the arroyos we looked at some of these areas to intensify development and concentrate but also leave several areas natural. In the downtown area and historic areas, we're looking at historic preservation, new use, connecting the Amador Proximo with hike and bike trails, and transit. We want to consider the market realities and the steps involved, continue to look at infill opportunities, preserve some of the character of our community, especially adobe structures, and looking at multimodal connectivity.

Councilor Eakman presented for Group 2. Looking at redistricting in 2020, we know mine and Councilor Gandara's districts are going to increase. We are excited about downtown, Amador Proximo, and East Lohman with 113 acres that the City brought from Albuquerque, which could be a second downtown area. We are looking at a lot of four-story development in downtown. We need a transit system out to the West Mesa and the Airport. We want to save trees and it should go into our planning. We are seeing growth towards the University. We have a natural grade going out towards US 70.

Councilor Gandara continued for Group 2. She said we want to change use of downtown, maximum development, compact location, maximize mixed use, walkable communities and complete corridor, emphasize open space, improve access to parks, increase the number of trees, disconnect to industry in the West Mesa, improve access to job centers, different use of alleys, infrastructure invested within existing built neighborhoods, investment in inner moving outward, city commitment to redevelop investment tools, TIDD in the Amador Proximo and historic districts, redesign corridor infrastructure, transit to West Mesa area, to downtown, health centers, the mall, and East Mesa complete streets, parks, open space, improve and expand Apodaca Park, and improve infrastructure in the El Paseo area. We chose option 3.

 Sharon Thomas presented for Group 3. We talked about all the projects going on and started thinking about infill and corridor centers because we recognize that there is going to be other growth. We talked about the area where the City was doing planning with the State Land Office. We saw this as remaining protected. We talked about bringing in the space around the high school because you can't walk to it or bike to it. This land belongs to BLM and we had some conversations to get the State Land Office to trade with BLM, so it would be owned by the State Land Office. We also looked at cluster development, open space, and trails to get to this school. Along University, there's the Aggie Uptown and that's not part of the City yet but that is something

we'll have to make decisions about. We looked at downtown as a big commercial center. Sonoma Ranch and 70 is developing into regional. We thought maybe there was some way we could have one on this side to spread out your main centers. We agree with more trees. We don't do parkways and developments anymore so there's no trees. The number of empty stores at the mall keeps increasing and lack of people so we talked about that being converted into a lifestyle mall and more places to do accessory dwellings. We talked about the major corridors being Amador and Lohman, Solano, El Paseo and eventually Sonoma Ranch. We would like some development around the Industrial Park because there is no place for people to live.

> Todd Stuve presented for Group 4. We thought the strategic development was just right. It was just enough rural and just enough compact and the most realistic. We wanted to protect things that were natural. We wanted to preserve some of the agriculture on the west side of town. We thought about protecting some of the area around the airport, one for possible airport growth and potentially to have some buffer to the residents. We wanted to focus on the area around Centennial High School and connect it with some of the roads to the eastern border of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. We thought that there is a huge opportunity to develop along University Avenue and revitalize parts of Telshor. We thought about expanding south into the downtown areas to provide a more enhanced downtown. We are seeing a lot of growth to the northeast side of town. We felt Mesa Grande would make sense to connect through the center of town at Lohman and Sonoma Ranch to reduce some of the congestion along Triviz, along Telshor, and support the neighborhoods that will be developed. Sometimes it is difficult to get to the northwest area, so we thought there might be some good east to west connections, connecting Mission on the other side of the dam. We thought it was important to look at how transit would improve the ability for folks to get to places in our City, so having loops that made sense around the NMSU area and take them through the downtown area, and also places around the Picacho area. We discussed how to revitalize along the University section, so we discussed urban high-density housing and some mixed-use commercial area. We looked at places on Solano, downtown, El Paseo, and Alameda that need to be revitalized and have some mixed commercial/residential.

Councilor Sorg presented for Group 5. We have a dividing line with Interstate 25 and we only have 3-4 corridors crossing that interstate. So, I tried to plan out the growth that is on the East Mesa in a way that people don't have to cross that dividing line. I'm trying to approach this in a people centric way. On either side of 70, we tried to show as much mixed use as possible. There is a lot of development to go on the East Mesa. We would also like to see work centers on the other side of I-25 so people can work. We chose scenario 3 and I have also been saying trees for years.

Jim Carrillo said every group used scenario 3 and we saw a lot of similarities. Don't forget the heart of the City and the reason why Las Cruces is here.

Matt Noonkester said we are going to take all the maps back and look at areas of consensus, conflict, and then let Ian run these through some of our analysis to give you individual feedback and how the group came together.

Jim Carrillo said we will use this to develop a future development plan.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:03 p.m.