Capital Improvements Advisory Committee
Minutes for the Meeting on
May 19, 2022
1:30 p.m.
Utilities Center
Board Room 225

Committee Members Present:
Jason Lorenz, Chairman
Mark O'Neill, Vice-Chair
Steve Newby, Committee Member

Committee Members Absent:
Don Curnutt, Committee Member

City Staff Present:
Denise Alejandre, Utilities Administrative Assistant
Robert Cabello, Deputy City Attorney, Legal
Sonya Delgado, Parks and Recreation Director
Tibor Kocsis, Battalion Chief Fire
Delilah Leyva, Senior Office Assistant Utilities
Catherine Mathews, Landscape Architect Parks and Recreation
Jose Provenzio, Utilities Deputy Director Business Services
Christine Rivera, City Clerk, Legal
Jacqueline Rubalcava, Accountant Senior Finance
Alma Ruiz, Utilities Senior Officer Manager
Jason Smith, Fire Chief
Delilah A. Walsh, Utilities Director

Others:
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC
Cassie McClure, Public Outreach Consultant
Carlos Villarreal, Willdan Consultant (via telephone)

Chair Lorenz called the regular meeting to order at approximately 1:32 p.m.

1. Conflict of Interest:
Chair Lorenz: As always our first item on the Agenda is the Conflict of Interest. Is there any Member of the Committee or any member of City staff that has any known Conflict of Interest with any item on the Agenda today?

There were none.

2. Acceptance of the Agenda:
Chair Lorenz: I would like to hear a, well we have got a couple of small edits on the Agenda today. I would like to move the Public Participation and Action Items and reverse them, so item number seven will come before item number six. Alma had a small edit on the Agenda for next regular meeting on June 16th, item number B. 1. should be Parks Impact Fee Update by Sonya [Delgado], I assume or maybe somebody else from there. Other than those two edits, I would like to hear a Motion to Accept the Agenda.
Newby: So made.

O'Neill: Second.

Chair Lorenz: All in favor?

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

3. **Acceptance of the Minutes:**
   
   **A. Regular Meeting on April 21, 2022.**
   
   Chair Lorenz: How about a motion to Accept the Minutes from last month?
   
   Newby: So made.
   
   Chair Lorenz: Do you have some more edits for us?
   
   O'Neill: One thing that I believe was left out, I am sorry I did not see it until this week. We forgot to put on City staff present last meeting because he came in a little late, Fire Chief Smith is not listed at least on my agenda.
   
   Chair Lorenz: Good catch.
   
   O'Neill: That is all.
   
   Chair Lorenz: He is thorough is he not?
   
   Newby: I am glad we have our mother here.
   
   O'Neill: I do read it.
   
   Chair Lorenz: I do appreciate that. How about a motion to approve as amended?
   
   Newby: So made.
   
   O'Neill: I will second it.
   
   Chair Lorenz: All in favor?
   
   **The Minutes were Approved Unanimously 3-0.**

4. **Old Business:**

   **A. Public Safety Impact Fee Updates by Chief Jason Smith**
   
   Chair Lorenz: All right. Old Business, Public Safety Impact Fee Update by Chief Jason Smith.
   
   Smith: Good afternoon Members of the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee. Fire Chief Jason Smith for the record. I would like to introduce Carlos Villarreal who is going to give you the update of where we are at with the Land Use
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Assumptions and the Impact Fee Analysis. Carlos, I will turn it over to you and I will scroll through the slides for you.

Villarreal: Okay, thank you Chief Smith. Good afternoon to the Capital Improvement Planning Committee. Happy to be back here with you virtually. I am flying a little blind here, but I have the presentation up in front of me on the computer as well, so hopefully I will be talking about the right slide when it comes up on the screen. Chief, if you could flip to the second slide there. Just wanted to highlight the changes that we have made to the analysis since I was last with you all and received your feedback.

The first item that is very significant is that we revised the worker weighting factor, so that is the important allocation between residential and nonresidential uses. The main revision there is we were able to get police call data for the same period that we had fire department call data and added that to the sample. This had a significant effect on fess, you know when we added in the police call data it shifted more of that burden toward nonresidential land uses, so I will point that out when we get to a subsequent slide.

Another piece of feedback that we received was that the assumption for hotel workers per room was too high for the type of hotel development that you are likely to see in Las Cruces, so I went back and checked the assumptions and found another factor for motels which was at a much lower employment density. Based on discussions with the Chief and James Edison our managing principle, we decided to take the average of the hotel and the motel land uses just to drive that assumption of workers per room. It is a lower allocation than you had last seen.

The next item here is we revised the CIP to include some ineligible uses of funds that had snuck in there, mostly pertaining to police vehicles, so we pulled those out. To remind everyone the threshold it has to cost more than $10,000.00 and last more than 10 years. Then finally we have revised the existing inventory to meet those same criteria, so we excluded the police vehicles that have a service life of less than 10 years.

On this slide it shows the effects of the revised worker demand factor. To recap, the worker demand factor is a way to express the demand for facility in terms of calls placed by workers or calls responding to places, nonresidential locations relative to those by residents. One way to think about this is for every call that responds to a resident, 1.27 calls are responding to locations where there are workers. We multiply the residents by one and workers by 1.27, again that relative demand factor, and that gives us our service population. In the prior draft I believe the worker demand factor was 0.29 and that was only based on fire department call data. Again, we have added the police department call data and revised that worker demand factor to come out to 1.27. What this lets us know is that there are many more police calls responding to nonresidential locations than we had been previously assuming.
This again shifts that burden toward nonresidential development and away from residential development.

On Table 2 here we have the occupancy density assumptions, and just wanted to point out the hotel/motel land use assumption that I highlighted earlier, I think previously it was 0.53 employees per room and we had received some feedback that that was too high for the types of hotel development you are likely to see in Las Cruces. Again, revised that based on the average of the hotel and motel rates and we are now assuming 0.35 employees per room. Second to that the assumptions in this table (inaudible 0:14:01).

Here in Table 3 the main change is as summarize here at this table but in the appendix table and the graph table and in subsequent reports is where you will see the details. We have removed police vehicles from the inventory that had a service life less than 10 years, and that has brought the total facility value assumed down to $83.6 million. That is the main change that you see in the table here.

In the Table 4 here, the existing cost per capita standards, (inaudible 0:14:47) for detail here so that we could be a little bit more transparent and hopefully follow the service population calculation a little bit better. At the top of the table there we are showing the weighting for residents and workers in 2020. Again, that weighting is based on the calls going to residential versus nonresidential locations. Again, for every one call going to a place where there is a resident you have 1.27 calls going to places where there are workers. We multiply the residents by one, we multiply the workers by 1.27, and then we sum the results together and that gives us our total service population. You can think of that as a resident equivalent. If everyone was making the same amount of calls that a resident made, how many residents would there be, and that is the 168, 169. To calculate the standard, we take the existing value of public safety facilities, again we have modified that in the prior slide to remove the value of police vehicles that have a service life of less than 10 years. We divide that by the existing service population calculated at the top of the table, and we get a facilities standard per service population of $497.00. That is the same as the cost per resident, so we multiply that $497.00 by one and that gives us the cost per resident. Then to get the cost per worker, again, because worker generate more calls than residents do, we multiply that cost per service population by the 1.27 weighting, and that gives us the $631.00. If you can think about it on average more calls are going to places where there is workers and so the cost per worker reflects that higher demand for public safety services.

In this next table, Table 5, we can then project the Public Safety Facilities Fee Revenue based on the assumptions from the prior table. We take that facilities standard per capita and multiply it by the growth and service population. If you recall the service population is essentially resident equivalent. We multiply the facility standard per resident by the service population growth and resident equivalent, and that gives us the total projected fee revenue in the time that
we are looking at. This has come down slightly and that is due to the portion of growth that is going to be nonresidential development. Obviously, nonresidential development will have a slightly higher impact, but we are mostly projecting residential development in Las Cruces. This results in a lower fee revenue projection than the last time you saw these tables of about $9.1 million in the 10 year planning horizon.

Table 6 shows the revised Public Safety Facilities CIP. Again, we removed any vehicles that were replacing existing vehicles, so what you are seeing here is all expansion of capacity. There is no rehab, no maintenance, no vehicle replacement, and of course everything on the list costs at least $10,000.00 and has a service life of at least 10 years. One note seems to be, this presentation was prepared for you. I heard from the Chief that the cost estimate for Fire Station #9 has increased to $8,318,000.00 so the total is slightly higher than you see in the slide in front of you at $26.3 million roughly. I just wanted to give that update.

In slide seven here we have the Draft Fee Schedule. Again, I will be presenting two versions of the fee schedule. This first version has the land use category that exactly matched your current fee program, so you can see we multiply the costs per capita by the density, either of employment or residents per dwelling unit, that gives the base fee. We include 2% for fee program administration and that gives us the total fee. This is again the first fee schedule.

In the Alternative Fee Schedule here on Table 7A, this is what I think is likely to be recommended by staff but certainly would like your input on it, CIAC. We have condensed the residential category, again removing that very low category of 900 square feet or less. I think the building permit data from the recent years that we have examined also confirmed this, that no one is really building very small units. Then on the nonresidential side, the warehouse and mini warehouse categories have been combined and we are using the average densities. They had similar densities to begin with, but we are using the average density of workers per 1,000 square feet to calculate those feet.

In this final slide here, we are comparing the maximum justified fee schedule, the one that matches your existing Land Use categories and the alternative fee schedule that was presented in Table 7A. We are comparing those to the current fee schedules. I will let the results speak for themselves there. If you all recall the prior graph had a much higher allocation to residential development and certain nonresidential fees were going to be decreasing. Based on that revised worker weighting factor, you can see in this revision the burden has shifted away from residential and toward nonresidential. In this revision none of the nonresidential fees would be decreasing, they would all be increasing, and depending on which fee schedule alternative some of the fees for the smaller units would be decreasing, again depending on the fee schedule we are looking at, and a much more modest increase compared to
the overall per residential compared to the last version of this fee schedule that you were able to review.

Okay, that is the end of the presentation. Happy to answer any questions or get any feedback from the Committee. Thank you.

Chair Lorenz: Anything to add Chief Smith?

Smith: Thank you Mr. Chair. Fire Chief Jason Smith. Just one other thing before we get started to opening up for questions. You will notice on the page with the land use assumptions for hotel/motel the weighted worker density in the slide, again Carlos already kind of hit on this, when this was prepared, we had not gone through and discussed the hotel and motel weighting. You see 0.13 on the presentation and I believe Carlos mentioned it is 0.35 if I got that correct Carlos?

Villarreal: Yes 0.34 correct.

Smith: 0.34. That is just a matter of timing from the revisions and updates.

Chair Lorenz: Great. Thank you. Questions from the Committee? Go ahead Mark.

O’Neill: Comment. I just want to thank you for incorporating our thoughts and ideas and concerns into your new figures. Thank you.

Villarreal: Absolutely. You are welcome.

Chair Lorenz: Mr. Newby.

Newby: Carlos. Good afternoon. That was a quick presentation. Thank you. Chief just a couple quick questions if you could go to Table 4. There on the first line residents showing 111,000, workers at 44,000. Are the workers a subset of the residents or are they cumulative to the residents?

Villarreal: The workers are distinct. There could be a worker counted there that also live in the City so there could be some overlap there but they are distinct. Residents may or may not work in the City. Workers may or may not live in the City. We are taking demand for each one independently of the other.

Newby: Okay. The total residents are off of the census information?

Villarreal: Correct.

Newby: The workers are off of what document?

Villarreal: Workers are based on another census data product. It is called OnTheMap and it identifies primary, here where it is primary worker or primary jobs. Primary jobs are your first job and your main source of income. Secondary jobs are if
you have a side gig. We just want a count of the people that work in the City. If you have two jobs, we do not want to count you as a second person. The OnTheMap data had account of jobs as of 2019 and so we used that data and then adjusted it into 2020 based on the assumed growth rate. Again, the US Census product, but it is the OnTheMap application that has a variety of statistics about employment throughout the country.

Newby: What would you estimate is the duplication between the residents and the workers?

Villarreal: I do not have that answer for you. I could not say.

Newby: The reason for my question is if all workers did not live in the City but all residents did, then adding those two together makes sense to get 155,000, but if the majority of workers also are residents it seems like you might be double counting. It would be good to know at least an estimate on what the combination of those are if the data is available. It might not be. I do not know.

Villarreal: Yes, I can take a look. I think what we are trying to do is get a sense of where the calls are going to, and the workers are more of a proxy for identifying if a call is going to a residential versus a nonresidential location. It is not exactly double counting because we are using the call demand to estimate that worker demand factor. I understand where you are going with that, and I will certainly take a look and see what percentage of folks both live and work in the City and see if there are any items of consequence in the analysis.

Newby: I am not suggesting you change the numbers. It would just be interesting to know what the duplication might be. Lastly on Table 8, dumb question here, up at the top Maximum Justified (DRAFT) and Maximum Justified - Alternative (DRAFT), so these are still draft numbers?

Villarreal: Yes, well what we are presenting today is the draft. We feel we are close, but I did not want to represent that fee with the final numbers that were being recommended to the City Council. Of course, you know any feedback that we would receive from you today should we deem it relevant, we still have the opportunity to adjust the numbers before presenting to the City Council. That is why the draft is there.

Newby: Okay, thank you. That is all Mr. Chair.

Chair Lorenz: Thank you Mr. Newby. I had a bunch of questions before I spent some time going over the numbers.

O'Neill: I saw you working on it.

Chair Lorenz: Yes, I got here a little bit early because I did not have enough time to prep before I got here, and I did like to see that Table No. 4 was significantly revised
to separate workers and residents. They go into the calculation much differently than they did last time. It makes a lot more sense to me.

Newby: Yes it does.

Chair Lorenz: There was a couple of items on Table No. 6 that I think potentially cause a problem for spending money this way. The way I understand the purpose of an impact fee and the map that Chief Smith shared with us, was it last time or maybe the time before that showed the response times and how they improved when you built a new fire station. I think that is exactly what impact fees should do. They should supply services to these new areas where there was no home before and now there is a home there. There was no fire station before, now we need a fire station. That makes sense to me.

The few things on this table that do not make sense to me are fire-energy efficiency, and sustainability. I do understand how that is a long-term capital improvement, although I do not see how that is something that is a demand created by growth. I think that is a demand created by politicians that want to build energy efficient and sustainable facilities, so to go back and upgrade an existing facility with energy efficiency and sustainability features I do not think satisfies the reason for an impact fee. The same thing is down here for police, I think those could potentially cause problems for the way that the money is being spent, but I like to see that the police did get the regular police cars out of there because they really did not belong. I guess it is more about comments than I had questions really. Those are the only issues I really saw with this.

O'Neill: I have one more question Chairman.

Chair Lorenz: Go ahead Mark.

O'Neill: Carlos, or Mr. Villarreal. I guess I said that right.

Chair Lorenz: Villarreal.

O'Neill: In all these figures have they accounted for, and I think you have but I just wanted to confirm, for vacancies, for vacant apartments, vacant residents, when we are looking at all these figures?

Villarreal: Yes, absolutely. In Table 2 in the occupancy density assumptions, those figures are across all units, so a person per dwelling unit on average across all dwelling units so that accounts for vacancies. That is why if you look at some of the figures, they might look a little lower than you would expect if you were looking at just occupied units. Absolutely we took vacancy into account.

O'Neill: Thank you.

Villarreal: Sure.
Chair Lorenz: Good.

Newby: Mr. Chair and Chief.

Chair Lorenz: Yes Mr. Newby.

Newby: On the energy efficiency piece, was that specific to go back to older facilities and increase their energy efficiency, or was that also to enhance energy efficiency and sustainability on the new facilities?

Smith: Mr. Chair and Committee Member Newby. Fire Chief Jason Smith. The energy and sustainability that is listed for the fire department is all brand new energy and efficiency items, some could be retrofitted to existing stations. The cost for the same energy and efficiency sustainability is also included in Station #9 as part of that, so that is mainly for a future placeholder of other growth, like with MIH building but in also with retrofitting existing structures.

Newby: The reason I ask is the state has just adopted the most current building codes which vaults us over three previous versions. They usually just do the next one in line. We are always about four to six years behind. We let all the other states figure out all the things wrong with the code. This time we jumped to the front of the line. The energy efficiency which I think these new codes will come to Las Cruces in the fall, are exponentially harder and stronger and more expensive than what we are experiencing now.

Chair Lorenz: Especially for civic and commercial.

Newby: Yes. I mean I would have no issue whatsoever on the million dollars if it could be dedicated to the new projects. I share the Chair’s concern if it is for other, which I would love to see it used if possible. The new codes are going to make your eyes water when it comes to energy efficiency for a good reason. Especially for a fire station that has a lot of open space, some really big doors, etc. It is going to be a lot of fun, it really is.

Smith: Thank you for that comment. We could look at our number before we take this to Council and we could revise that and dedicate that to only new expansion of service, not retrofitting or adding that new sustainability service to the existing stations.

Newby: That kind of money could be the difference between say a lead silver and a lead platinum build.

Chair Lorenz: I am really not seeing those numbers go into the calculations of the fee, so I do not think it is a concern in the impact fee. I do think it could be a legal concern in the spending of the fees later and that is really my only intention of mentioning it. That table is not included in the calculations, so I am not concerned about it there. Anything else gentlemen?
O'Neill: Nothing.

Chair Lorenz: Chief Smith. Thank you very much.

Smith: Thank you.

Newby: Thank you Carlos.

O'Neill: Thank you both.

Chair Lorenz: Thank you.

Villarreal: Thank you.

Chair Lorenz: Are you going to hang up Carlos or am I going to mute you?

Villarreal: I will hang up. I will hear from you all again. Thanks again.

Chair Lorenz: Take care.

Smith: Mr. Chair. Fire Chief Jason Smith. I believe we still have an action item on this one later in the agenda.

O'Neill: Yes.

Smith: If I cannot answer any questions, I will get ahold of Carlos so that he can get back on.

Chair Lorenz: Great. Thank you very much.

Smith: Thank you.

5. New Business:

A. Discuss Possibility Changing the CIAC Meeting Date by Chair Lorenz

Chair Lorenz: That took us through 4A one, two. Now we are on item five New Business, Discuss the Possibility Changing the CIAC Meeting Date. This is all my fault it says here, which I will take the blame.

Newby: Motion to adjourn.

Chair Lorenz: Any thoughts or concerns about changing the meeting time? I think we need to extend that question also to the department directors that are here.

Newby: Be that time or?

O'Neill: Can we do that?

Ruiz: Yes, I have some information relative to setting.
Chair Lorenz: For me we could either change the week of the month or the day of the week or both, but the third Thursday and Friday of the month are the only exclusions I have got.

O'Neill: We probably have to have so much lead time before we change that I would imagine.

Chair Lorenz: In many of my other board's we have the meetings late in the month, so we have the chance to get monthly financial statements in, but we do not really have that here.

Ruiz: Chair, Committee. Alma Ruiz, Senior Office Manager for the record. I anticipated this being on the agenda so I polled the department heads in regards to their availability. I did receive some information from, but not all. I did get it from legal so I apologize as I was, this is the all without even Public Safety and Legal in here. These mean that they are not available, okay. Any little open areas like here maybe, and again I have not received the information from Public Safety. Let me make this a little bigger. I have polled them in regard to the Monday's first of the month, second, third, fourth, all the way through the fifth, and I also got input from the transcriber who is critical to my staff but it is a little incomplete. Is there a date that the Committee is looking to move it to and then we can cross reference it to the staff?

Chair Lorenz: Would you mind scrolling down to show Thursday and Friday?

Ruiz: Sure.

Chair Lorenz: Because those looked the most available for this limited information. Right now, we are doing it the third Thursday. That would be, and it is showing a few conflicts.

Ruiz: I think it is because they have it booked as CIAC. For Carl I am assuming that is what it is.

Chair Lorenz: Got you.

Ruiz: I left it off from Delilah's just because I knew it was possibly going to be changed. Otherwise she has this on her calendar.

Chair Lorenz: Nobody around here is on four/ten's right? Everybody is working five days a week.

Ruiz: Some of them are on Wednesdays, yes Thursday mornings yes. Maybe I missed that. Maybe I moved them to Wednesday's. Maybe I put Delilah out for a selection committee. Let me copy these real quick here.

Chair Lorenz: Seems like Friday. Are you guys opposed to Friday?
O'Neill: If I am in town.

Newby: Workday of seven.

Chair Lorenz: Delilah.

Walsh: Yes. There is no slow day around here.

O'Neill: You mentioned maybe the second or fourth Thursday.

Chair Lorenz: Second or fourth Thursday would be fine for me. Second or fourth Friday.

O'Neill: That would be fine. The time is good for me, 1:30 p.m.

Ruiz: The second Thursday does not work for a lot of staff.

O'Neill: Okay.

Ruiz: Nor the...

O'Neill: Or the fourth.

Ruiz: The fourth possibly. Looks like it is a possibility.

Chair Lorenz: CC: Carl Clark.

Ruiz: Yes, but he has engineers who can present his projects.

Chair Lorenz: We usually hear from Mr. Provencio.

Ruiz: Either the fourth Thursday it looks like, or Fridays from 10:00 to 12:00.

Chair Lorenz: You prefer to stay away from Fridays it sounds like. You like your vacation.

Newby: Three day weekends.

O'Neill: Yes sometimes but the fourth Thursday would be great for me.

Ruiz: Thursday's, every Thursday Chief can I get clarification? Every Thursday, just the mornings are stacked?

O'Neill: Just depends on, yes, the presenting staff when they are available.

Ruiz: Okay, so mornings are out, but the fourth Thursday afternoon could work potentially for staff as I scroll this way to everybody. Okay.

O'Neill: How about you guys?
Chair Lorenz: That works fine for me.

Newby: I am good.

Chair Lorenz: Let us move it to the fourth.

Ruiz: Okay, great. Same time, 1:30.

Chair Lorenz: Same time.

Ruiz: Okay.

O’Neill: Can we do that in effect for next month or do we have to wait a month?

Ruiz: I take it back because like I said I did not poll, I mean I have Robert’s, I just have not inputted it. Robert do you have conflict on Thursday afternoons?

Cabello: No. My big concern was just that we needed to put this on an action item for voting.

Ruiz: Sure, so we can discuss it and then what we will do is we will vote on it next month. However we could, let me ask this question to Robert and to Christine. Because we have voted on that day of the whole schedule you know back in December, we would just bring an action next month so it would have to be held at the same time next month, like third Thursday at 1:30?

Rivera: You could do a temporary like cancellation and change.

Ruiz: Okay, perfect.

Rivera: Then put it as an action item.

Ruiz: Perfect. Okay. Good. That is what we will do. My staff will process a cancelation for the standard third Thursday at 1:30 for next month.

Chair Lorenz: Well next month still works. I can do the same time, same place next month.

Ruiz: Okay. Perfect.

Chair Lorenz: Then we can revise it after that.

Ruiz: Okay we will put it on the agenda for action.

O’Neill: You can do the third Thursday of next month?

Chair Lorenz: I can.
O'Neill: Okay.
O'Neill: Then we do not have to cancel.
Chair Lorenz: Save some hassle.
Ruiz: I like it.
Chair Lorenz: I am all up for saving hassle.
Newby: The fourth Thursday in November is Thanksgiving.
Ruiz: Okay.
Newby: I will be here.
O'Neill: We will not be here.
Ruiz: The Chair still has the authority to cancel meetings based on agendas or availability and so forth or quorum.
Chair Lorenz: We often cancel meetings around.
Ruiz: Holidays.
O'Neill: We are actually only required for four or five meetings a year.
Ruiz: That is correct, yes. Okay good. I will add this to the action item for next month. Thank you.
Chair Lorenz: Thank you, but do not go anywhere.

B. CIAC Member Vacancy Discussion by Alma Ruiz

Chair Lorenz: Because our next item on the agenda is the CIAC Member Vacancy Discussion since we lost Adam Roberts.
Ruiz: Yes thank you. Alma Ruiz, Senior Office Manager. We do have a vacant seat for a non-real estate, non-developer, non-financial member. The first ad is going to be in this Friday's Bulletin. We will run it for four weeks. I am also working on getting the ads under the legal notices in the Sun News for a month, and those would run Sunday, Wednesday, Friday's.
Chair Lorenz: This would be at large, right it could be anybody.
Ruiz: At large, yes.
Chair Lorenz: Could be a builder but does not have to be.

Ruiz: He could not represent. No, he cannot be, right? Because that is very clearly marked in the ad. I should have pulled it up. I probably could on this.

O'Neill: He cannot be.

Newby: Good try.

Ruiz: It says it cannot be. It cannot.

Chair Lorenz: Call all my buddy to come help around here.

O'Neill: You cannot stack the deck. You cannot stack the deck on us.

Ruiz: Unless they just do not disclose it on the application, but that is fraudulent. Anyhow, no it is an at large that does not represent real estate, developer, or financial holdings that fund those type of actions. For now the first ad will run tomorrow in the Bulletin, and then four weeks concurrent after that, and then a month worth of ads three times a week in the Sun News.

Chair Lorenz: Great.

Ruiz: We can hopefully, and Christine actually has sent out an e-mail to the City Council Members to inquire if there is anyone within their district who is interested in not just this Committee but other board vacancies so we may get them to encourage to apply as well.

Chair Lorenz: Great. Thank you so much.

Ruiz: You are welcome.

7. **Public Participation:**
Chair Lorenz: Now we will handle that number seven that snuck up above number six which is Public Participation. Do we have anybody here from the public that would like to speak? Not today. All right.

6. **Action:**

   A. **Discuss and Vote on Recommendation on Public Safety Impact Capital Improvement Plan by CIAC Members**

Chair Lorenz: Time for the Action items number six: Discuss and Vote on the Recommendation for the Public Safety Impact Capital Improvement Plan. That is a long way of putting that. Any further discussion among the Committee?

Newby: Mr. Chair.

Chair Lorenz: Sir.
Newby: I have no further questions which I am sure is a great relief. Chief, we appreciate the depth of which you went to accommodate our seemingly endless questions. I think the document is better than it was and more understandable. I know the numbers can drive you crazy, especially the complexity of something like this, but we do appreciate yours' and your staffs and your consultants work on this. I think we have come up with a good number that we can support.

Smith: Thank you.

Chair Lorenz: Mark.

O'Neill: I do not have any more. I will make a motion that we accept the recommendation for the impact fee schedule.

Newby: Second.

Chair Lorenz: All in favor.

The motion was Unanimously Approved 3-0.

O'Neill: Does that cover it?

Newby: See how easy that was.

B. Discuss and Vote on Recommendation of Impact Fee Schedule by CIAC Members

Smith: Very simple Mr. Newby. Thank you. Just one other item on there. I believe we have, looking at this correctly, there is two items, one and then two. One is the draft tables and ...

Chair Lorenz: That is why it was worded so strange. One is the Capital Improvement Plan and the other one is the Impact Fee Schedule.

O'Neill: Should I revise my motion.

Chavez: I will need a second motion to recommend the Impact Fee Schedule.

Smith: Mr. Chair. If I could. Fire Chief Jason Smith. Do you want us to do any amendments or changes to the Capital Improvement Plan that was presented today in regards to the energy efficiency or sustainability, or add a footnote that is for expansion of service only on those two items?

Chair Lorenz: You know I am not; I think that is up to you. I do not think I can, well I guess my recommendation would be to take out the efficiency and sustainability if it is not for a new facility. I just think that could cause you some problems.
Newby: I would suggest a footnote, leave the money in. I am a firm believer ...

Chair Lorenz: Ask for the money.

Newby: In sustainability. Ask for the money but a footnote shall be used only on projects created by demand. That way you would still get that money to spend on energy efficiency and it would be spent in a noncontroversial way.

Smith: Very good. Thank you.

Chair Lorenz: I think that is fantastic. We did have a vote for the Public Safety Capital Improvement Plan. I would like to hear a motion for the Impact Fee Schedule.

O’Neill: My motion was I think for the schedule.

Chair Lorenz: Okay.

O’Neill: I will make a motion that we approve the amended Public Safety Impact Capital Improvement Plan as presented.

Newby: Second.

Chair Lorenz: All in favor.

**The motion was Unanimously Approved 3-0.**

Smith: Mr. Chair, Committee Members. Thank you. Really appreciate the tough questions and looking at this in depth because it helped myself and our staff also understand a lot more about the impact fee analysis. Then one request for you, I believe the Development Code asked for a written recommendation from the Board. I do not know if we can use just the notes and the approval if that works. Christine and Rob.

Chair Lorenz: I think we kind of wanted to give a short presentation to the City Council anytime we make a recommendation one way or the other, so we will prepare something and get it to you as soon as possible.

Newby: There does need to be a written recommendation to Council.

Chair Lorenz: Yes.

O’Neill: The CEO I know was at the last City Council meeting. I was there and made a similar presentation with our concerns I believe, with some of our concerns I believe. I mean they address some things that we addressed, but I am sure they would still like a written, you know they need a written recommendation from us would be a good idea anyway.
Chair Lorenz: Since we are on your team on this deal, I think it is going to be pretty easy to write up something pretty simple that will just get us behind you.

Smith: Thank you Mr. Chair. We present to Council on the 23rd of this month on Monday, and then we take the Land Use Assumptions to Council on the 6th of June, followed by the 21st for the Impact Fee Tables. I would think that both the Capital Improvement Plan and the Fee Schedule go to the same meeting on June 21st.

Chair Lorenz: June 16th will be our next meeting? That will be the third Thursday in June right, is that what it says on here too? Yes, Alma's agenda agrees with me.

O'Neill: Yes.

Chair Lorenz: I can have something written up and approved. We can vote on that at the next meeting. Alma if you can add that to the agenda for next meeting. I will not be in the state on June 21st.

Smith: June 21st. Mr. Chair if I could, two other items for that agenda item. One there is a matter of timing with Christine, the City Clerk, on getting written documentation in, and the development code requires five business days that the written recommendation be turned in. I would say if it was going to be action that I would recommend appointing somebody to write up the recommendation as approved and then sent in before that, will defer to Christine on the date.

Rivera: If you would like to attach it to the packet so that Council has it available. It needs to be attached by June 13th.

Chair Lorenz: June 13th. Okay. Then we can circulate it through Alma for everybody's acceptance before that meeting. Is that okay with you Alma?

O'Neill: Or you could just write it up. We have accepted it already as a Board.

Newby: Chief. We can do one recommendation to Council on both of these items.

Smith: Yes sir. I think the same, the Capital Improvement Plan and the Impact Fee is on the same resolution.

Ruiz: Mr. Chair, Committee Members. Alma Ruiz, Senior Office Manager. We can, someone can draft it, send it to me directly or to the CIAC admin support e-mail, and then I will independently get everybody's input so that it is not a rolling poll. Then if we have to have approval action before, we may have to call a special meeting to do that prior in order to meet. Christine, you do not think we need to.

Rivera: I do not think we need to because they have already approved it, so it is just a memo.
Ruiz: Okay, so you just want to have the circulation?

Chair Lorenz: Yes, that was my thought. Thank you.

Ruiz: Okay because you mentioned adding it to the next meeting for approval but that's fine. I like that. That will be less.

Chair Lorenz: Then we will have it handled, because we have already taken action.

O’Neill: We have already approved it.

Ruiz: Good.

Chair Lorenz: It is just a matter of language.

Ruiz: I would just add so that we do not have a rolling quorum that it just be sent, whoever is drafting it would send it to CIAC admin support e-mail and then from there I can distribute it to the Committee with their instructions to only reply back with their comments. Then we can get a final version.

Chair Lorenz: Great. Thank you so much.

Newby: Chief. You mentioned those three dates. Does the CIAC need to have representation at any of those?

Smith: Mr. Chair, Mr. Newby. No, you are not required to have representation there. As always you are definitely welcome to join us. We have a public hearing this Saturday, a City Council work session on Monday, followed by another public hearing on Wednesday the 25th, and then from there we are to Council for resolution on June 6th and June 21st.

Newby: Thank you.

Chair Lorenz: Thanks Chief Smith.

O’Neill: If Alma is going to reach out, she will have to get it there then before the 13th.

Chair Lorenz: Yes, I will have it to her next week.

O’Neill: Okay.

Chair Lorenz: Yes, no problem. It should be pretty simple.

8. Board Comments:

Chair Lorenz: Board Comments. Anybody?

Newby: I am good.
O’Neill: I would just like to thank the Parks & Rec Department for that great tour and you answered a lot of our questions on the tour of the different parks. Some I had not even seen; I did not even know were in the City. I appreciate that. I am sure the Board appreciates the little tour we had. I just wanted to give a shout out to you guys. Thanks.

Newby: Thank you for reminding me of that. I told my wife before I came that I was going to thank you Cathy because that was a great tour. Your depth of understanding of places I had never seen before, and I have only been here 50 years. It goes again to a request to start having more of these tours because sitting up here, you are presenting or any of the other groups are presenting and if we do not have a visual of kind of the neighborhood, it really helps to see where Capital Improvements need to be made. Again thank you, thank you for your staff. It was a great tour.

Chair Lorenz: I echo all those comments and add to it my regret that I could not be there for the whole thing. The one piece that I did get to be there for was the piece I really wanted to be there for and that was the visit to the administration offices and to see the team that is putting together new projects. I had a feeling that you guys needed more staff in that little piece of the department and it was very obvious that you do need some help getting these projects off the ground. I see why the PIF money can stack up sometimes. It is a lot of work to put these projects together, and with three people that have other things on their plate beyond that, that is tough. I will be your advocate if you need somebody to go stand in front of City Council and say that you need more money for people. Give me a call, I will be there.

O’Neill: I will second that.

Chair Lorenz: I just cannot be there as a CIAC Member. I can be there as a citizen. Yes, thank you very much. Also just thank you to the Committee for being willing to be flexible on the schedule and the City staff for my little conflict. I hope we can find a new Member soon.

9. **Next Meeting Date - June 16, 2022:**
   A. **Old Business:**
      i. Public Safety Impact Fees Update
   
   B. **New Business:**
      i. Park & Rec Impact Fees Update
   
   C. **Action:**
      i. **None**

Chair Lorenz: All right. So, our next regular meeting is on June 16th and that is the one of very few days in June I will be in town, so I am glad it lands on that day. We should be able to hold that meeting. It should be pretty light with an update from Chief Smith. I do not know if it will be Alma or Sonya, or Cathy but one
of them is going to come talk to us about the beginnings of the new Park Impact Fee process that I appreciate you getting started ahead of time. Chief Jason Smith gave us a little ahead of time so we can spend some time digging through it a little bit.

10. Adjournment:
Chair Lorenz: If there is nothing else that is the end of our agenda.

Newby: Move to adjourn.

Chair Lorenz: Second.