



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

CITY OF LAS CRUCES
INFRASTRUCTURE/CIP POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the City of Las Cruces - Infrastructure/CIP Policy Review Committee February 20, 2019 at 3:30 p.m., at the City of Las Cruces, City Hall, Nienburg Room (Conference Room 2007-C), 700 North Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Greg Smith, City Councillor, District 2
Gill Sorg, City Councillor/Mayor Pro Tem, District 5
Jerry Cordova, Civil Engineer, Public Works
David Dollahon, Assistant City Manager, City Administration
Marcy Driggers, Utilities Attorney, City Attorney's Office
Sonya Delgado, Director, Parks and Recreation
Adrienne Widmer, Water Administrator, Utilities
Linda Dawson, Water Administrative Assistant, Utilities
Elizabeth Teeters, Policy Analyst, City Administration
John Moscato, Home Builders Association
David Maestas, Director, Public Works

OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott Marr, Information Technology Director, Information Technology
Tony Trevino, Project Development Administrator, Public Works
David Sedillo, Deputy Director, Public Works
Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Senior Planner, Community Development
Jimmy Moreno, Associate Engineer, Public Works
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Stuart Ed, City Manager, City Administration
Gabriel Vasquez, City Councillor, District 3 (via phone at 4:05 pm)
Jorge Garcia, Director, Utilities
Rocio Nasir, Chief Engineer, Community Development

I. Call to order: Meeting called to order by Chair Smith at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 16, 2018:

- a. All members present reviewed the December minutes provided. Mr. Cordova motioned to approve the minutes and Ms. Harrison-Rogers and Councillor Sorg seconded the motion. All members present were in favor and no one opposed.

III. Action Items

1 a. No actions items for discussion

2 **IV. Current Discussion Items**

3 a. **Permeable Pavement**

4 i. Mr. Cordova presented a short video and the attached power point covering
5 Permeable Pavement.

6 ii. Councillor Smith ask if there were any complaints for test area in La Llorona
7 Park. Mr. Cordova stated there have been none.

8 iii. Councillor Smith added, "I appreciate the depth that you went into that and
9 certainly, as I pointed out at the beginning, and certainly my interest as you
10 pointed out during the discussion about the Plaza, has been when we're
11 looking at how we pave large areas that we did end up having to have
12 collection or detention or retention ponding areas and those kinds of things.
13 And with the getting the water to areas that are landscaped and that sort of
14 thing. How we maybe do a better job if we can percolate water into the soil
15 as opposed to trying to collect it or as opposed to trying to bring it in. So, I
16 think you also very clearly pointed out some of the downsides. Which are
17 the cost, which are the fact that dust blows in and clogs and it up, and then
18 with the caliche soil which as you pointed out is mostly in the lower parts of
19 town, or at least seems to be, that that then adds a hugely complicating
20 factor. But I very much like your suggestion that we do a pilot project. I think
21 that would be the sort of thing where we could get them from our own
22 experience right here literally on the ground what's happening here locally
23 with that sort of thing. Do you have a suggestion as far as the scale or where
24 something like that, like would it be a parking lot? We certainly wouldn't want
25 it to be an outdoor basketball court."

26 iv. Mr. Cordova answered, "Yes, I think a parking lot would be a very good
27 candidate. Maybe a smaller one in an area that we know we have some
28 pretty good soils. Also, one other possibility of a pilot project would be to
29 address a problem that we have on Carlyle Street, something that I
30 discussed with David. Something maybe we might want to try. I don't know
31 if any of you are familiar with Carlyle Street where it intersects with McClure.
32 What happens there is the drainage is headed towards McClure and then
33 there's a rise in the pavement and it tends to want to pond there for about
34 100 feet. We typically have to send out our vactor trucks every time it rains
35 to get that water out of the roadway. There isn't a real easy solution to that.
36 One of the ways I was talking to David about solving that problem would be
37 to basically create a big French drain out of permeable pavement. What
38 we've tried to do is build some smaller French drains in that area and
39 although it kind of helps take that water down over time, it's not quick
40 enough when it gets clogged really quickly. So, I would say take a 100-foot
41 section of pavement, make it out of a permeable pavement, develop a really
42 deep reservoir and ensure that you're punching into that sugar sand in that
43 area to get that water to go down quickly. And perhaps maybe we can
44 lessen the frequency that we go out there with our vactor trucks."

45 v. Councillor Sorg added, "I like the idea of permeable pavement. However,
46 the reasons that was mentioned here, it's going to be difficult. And the

1 reason is because our water supply in this valley here is going down. It's
2 going to get less and less as time goes on. Estimated 50% less water in the
3 second half of this century. Is there anything we can do to recharge our
4 aquifer? Or if you can store it then used afterwards. This is all good.
5 However, there are other ways of recharging the aquifer besides permeable
6 pavement. But in selected locations and a pilot project. Good."

7 **b. East Mesa Unpaved Roadways**

- 8 i. Ms. H-Rogers handed out the attached draft policy document covering all
9 recommendations from the last year's meetings. Ms. H-Rogers added, ".
10 Essentially, I've packaged it all for you here and what I'm looking for, over
11 the course of the next several weeks, is feedback on are we on the right
12 track? Have we addressed all the items that were previously discussed? Are
13 there any glaring omissions or are there any huge corrections that need to
14 take place in this document?" and asked Councillor Smith, "if you want to
15 talk about maybe some of the finer points. Or bigger points rather than the
16 minute details." Councillor Smith answered, "Thank you, Ms. Harrison-
17 Rogers. I think that we don't have Councilor Flores here today. Councilor
18 Sorg has certainly been in the thick of some of this and what's been going
19 on in District 5. I think you're familiar with what some of the areas in District
20 6 have going on as well. So, do you have some points that you feel might
21 need to be made at this point or are you okay with what Ms. Harrison-Rogers
22 was suggesting about coming back later?". Councillor Sorg said, "Let's
23 continue." Ms. H-Rogers, using the attached handout, presented the entire
24 outline.
- 25 ii. Councillor Sorg asked for an example of an offsite improvements. Ms. H-
26 Rogers stated, "If there are significant drainage improvements that would
27 have to occur offsite to take care of let's say an arroyo crossing or something
28 to channel that water. That may be something that from a funding stand point
29 may be way too expensive to tackle at that moment and time and we may
30 choose to move on to something else."
- 31 iii. Mr. Trevino added, "At this time we currently have a consultant on board
32 that's doing a drainage study for both the North side and the South side of I-
33 25 and the Hacienda Acres development. I think what Katherine's kind of
34 going to, I think we should probably be called upon there is, what they're
35 going to be providing with us for the drainage study and an approach of how
36 we're going to handle this drainage of possible ponding areas we can do.
37 So of course, we're going to have to utilize that as one of our main driving
38 forces for what roads are going to get done, what major connections for
39 storm drains need to get done now. Probably start in the lower end for water
40 collection location and then move forward from there. So that's going to have
41 to be one of the top priorities of how these get prioritized as part of that. A
42 lot of that might just be offsite improvements probably before we can do any
43 build and construction"
- 44 iv. Mr. Dollahon stated, "So there might be secondary efforts that we, well
45 primary efforts that we may have to do before we can actually get to the
46 roadway. So that may push the roadway down and we may have to look at

1 doing offsite improvements and then maybe jump to a different roadway that
2 has less difficulties and come back to a future road, a previous identified
3 road because of the offsite improvement." Mr. Trevino agreed.

4 v. Ms. H-Rogers continued with the second policy in the handout. Councillor
5 Smith interjected and asked, "Just for a pause there. I just want to get a
6 private sector thought on that if I may from Mr. Moscato. In your operations
7 with the things that you've done under these kinds of circumstances and your
8 working in that not too far from this area, have you got some thoughts on
9 how that's been working, what's worked well and what hasn't with that
10 approach?" Mr. Moscato stated they really haven't had to deal with this very
11 much. Mr. Dollahon stated, "Mr. Chairman the reason is that Mr. Moscato is
12 the developer who actually provides all the public infrastructure
13 improvements that unlike others who don't realize what the development
14 process is about. These are people who are smaller scale who are creating
15 a subdivision to create a second lot to put mom on or something like that. By
16 including that in the policy that would make staff's ability to coordinate with
17 them and decision making both of a planning and zoning commission and
18 ultimately the City Council. Because we've never had a policy that said this.
19 Our policy would be 'if you're going to subdivide, we may give you a waiver
20 to the road improvements in limited situation, but without question you have
21 to give us the right-of-way' We've never granted a right-of-way." Ms. H-
22 Rogers added, "The only time that's ever occurred was when it was
23 constrained for some reason or somebody's house or structures or well or
24 something was affecting the ability to grant as much right-of-way as perhaps
25 was needed. But often in those situations, and it was more typical of the ETZ,
26 that's a whole other ball of wax, when we used to have the ETZ, a road
27 easement reserved for future ability to take that right-of-way was often
28 placed on plats. But it's not typical as David stated. But we've had people
29 request it before. The City's been adverse to condemning private land for
30 right-of-way acquisition. But ultimately if the City and the majority of
31 landowners are supportive of road improvements moving forward, what
32 we're recommending is that if we're left with 15% or fewer of the landowners
33 remaining, that we would actually try to actively condemn them, if they're
34 refusing to donate. We have done it in the past. It's not our typical approach,
35 this would be something that's relatively new. There is no policy right now
36 written regarding condemnation in cases like this. But it has almost ruined
37 several projects before. It's something that has been added. So that may be
38 something that you want to discuss further."

39 vi. Councillor Sorg asked for an explanation of what almost ruined the project.
40 Ms. H-Rogers explained "It is a technical term. It stalls a project and if we
41 have time constraints on grants or other funding sources, I guess in most
42 cases funding grants you'd be paying them anyway. But it can create
43 problems because it'll delay projects significantly." Councillor Sorg said, "Pay
44 for the right-of-way, you mean. The grants would. Ms. H-Rogers answered,
45 "For CDBG funds, you have to actually pay for the rights-of-way. But
46 typically, we don't." Councillor Sorg then asked, "Don't in any case if we

1 condemn that piece property we pay for that property?" Ms. H-Rogers said,
2 "Absolutely we do, but it can delay the project significantly."

- 3 vii. Councillor Sorg asked, "Well that condemnation process is long kind of?" Mr.
4 Dollahon answered, "Well yes and no. Two parts: it requires Council action
5 to formally condemn property. That's not the long part. Then there's a court
6 procedure. I don't think the court procedure for condemnation is that long
7 because once we file the condemnation for a public purpose and put money
8 with the courts, we essentially have the right of entry and we can start the
9 project. The issue with courts is bickering over the dollar amount that we're
10 going to have to pay them. That will not stall the process but historically the
11 Council has not been willing to condemn property. Here's the other issue that
12 we have to be careful on this policy or this direct action is if we get to that
13 point where we have to pay somebody for property, where we've gotten the
14 other 10 property owners to give it to us voluntarily, then they go "well, you
15 didn't tell me I could get paid?" But that's the reality of the situation. If you
16 want to be a hold out, I just think we need to reflect in here that acquisition,
17 we need to reinforce the fact, we need the right-of-way for free because once
18 we build the road, we maintain it forever. And that's not in here. So that needs
19 to be."
20 viii. Councillor Smith added, "Well and I think a lot of this grows out of the fact
21 that in those particular areas we have a lot of where the City annexed in
22 previously County and relatively unregulated kinds of things and we're trying
23 to come back and make up for past lack of structure."
24 ix. Ms. H-Rogers added, "In condemnation it's just an uncomfortable place to
25 be and ultimately when roads are being selected to be placed on the CIP,
26 that's part of the analysis. And hopefully we can gauge whether that's going
27 to be problematic. Because we're going to be going out to the public and
28 soliciting their feedback as part of that analysis."
29 x. Councillor Sorg asked, "Can you give me an estimate of what the percentage
30 of the cost of a roadway, the rights-of-way cost would be? It's not too high,
31 is it?" Ms. H-Rogers said, "No, it's not. The cost of land out there is, if I recall,
32 \$42,000 for an acre. The last time Bill Ham looked at it and so you would
33 just base it on whatever the square feet of that is. I don't have that with me.
34 It was something that we included in one of the prior meetings that we had
35 regarding this. I can get that for you. I can send that to you. I don't have that
36 with me, unfortunately."
37 xi. Ms. H-Rogers continued, "One of the other goals was pertaining to state or
38 federally funded projects and it basically just stating we would follow any
39 rules regarding that which is paying people for the right-of-way ultimately.
40 And then I have some statements here regarding if we make things non-
41 conforming. Which is I think, where David was going with regarding for sewer
42 connections. Which is a big question mark. When I spoke with NMED
43 originally about all of this, if we go through a right-of-way acquisition process
44 and we knock people down below the three-quarters of an acre and they're
45 no longer compliant with the septic regulations, in some cases they can't
46 hook up to sewer because we don't have it functioning. We put the lines in

1 the road, but until we evolve our connections, it doesn't function. What do
2 we do then? When I spoke with NMED, they said "well, they have to come
3 into compliance" which means a FAST system until such time as the sewer
4 is functioning. We don't want, I don't think the City wants to be put in a
5 position where we're trying to do good things, we're trying to work the
6 neighbors, they're giving us land, and it's "but now you have to pay \$10,000
7 to add a new septic system that's fully enclosed." I don't think we want to do
8 that. So the question is are we going to end up in a place where we force
9 people to connect to sewer, do we force people to comply with NMED and
10 install these FAST systems, or, what I've included in here is that we work
11 with NMED to come up with some sort of agreement to allow people, until
12 the systems fail, to not do anything. That's the proposal. But at the time when
13 I spoke to them, they were like "no, they have to come into compliance." Ms.
14 H-Rogers asked Ms. Widmer to explain.

15 xii. Ms. Widmer stated, "So that kind of conflicts with what this Policy Review
16 Committee requested from the Utility moving forward in changing the
17 ordinance for sewer. That once a sewer has been installed, which there's a
18 little nuance with that that we'll be clearing up before it ever goes to Council
19 on what is the definition of a project. So internally we're working with Marcy
20 to find that. To say when do they need to tie in. So, if part of your policy
21 allows waivers, then it has a high potential of being in direct conflict with a
22 new sewer ordinance that says 'if it's built and it's in front of your house, you
23 need to hook in.' In addition, it's my understanding we for not have any non-
24 functioning sewer anymore. One of the grants we got took care of that one
25 that was on, it's there in Hacienda Acres. That is now tied in"

26 xiii. Ms. H-Rogers added, "Okay, that was my concern. So ultimately that's why
27 we're here. So, if there is some sort of some conflict then this is the feedback
28 that we need so we can correct it. Another part of this is how we deal once
29 the land is acquired, we've gone through the process, how do we deal with
30 it to ensure there's a clear chain of title, the legal descriptions and the
31 boundaries of where that right-of-way is, is where we need it in terms of
32 moving forward. There have been some problems in terms of just acquiring
33 right-of-way via deed and then not platting it. And so, our recommendations
34 as part of this is to actually go through the process where individual deeds
35 are taken from individual landowners and then, once it's under our
36 ownership, going back and actually platting that right-of-way. And that just
37 makes it clear for everyone including Public Works and everybody else who
38 has to work within that right-of-way. Because we have had problems in the
39 past. Are there any other questions about the right-of-way acquisition now?
40 I know this is a lot, so people are just going to have to let it sink in and then
41 provide me commentary. And I can provide everybody the link on the
42 SharePoint so that everybody can access the document electronically as
43 well."

44 xiv. Councillor Sorg asked, "You said that you don't want to put these roadways
45 on the CIP because why? Ms. H-Rogers responded, "No, we do. And that's
46 part of some of the action items on here. My question is the frequency of

1 that. Should it be a different, so right now everything we're reviewing the
2 prioritization list annually. We are annually putting a project or a segment of
3 a project on the CIP and budgeting it annually. Is that too aggressive a
4 request?"

5 xv. Councillor Sorg asked if the CIP is actually the 5-year plan. Ms. H-Rogers
6 replied, "Well you've got the budgeting part of it and then you have the five-
7 year plan. So, there's an annual budgeting and then there's the overall sort
8 of long term five years." She then referred to Public Works.

9 xvi. Mr. Maestas stated, "If it's the Committee's initiative and their request to look
10 at putting that on the five-year CIP we can. One thing to keep in mind is that
11 we try to project out every year a total amount of revenue that we will have
12 which our funding sources are gross receipts tax and such. And if that
13 amount of projects exceeds the revenue we're having there, they're going to
14 have to be some others scheduled projects that get taken out of that five-
15 year list. And that would be Council's prerogative to make that
16 determination."

17 xvii. Councillor Sorg replied, "The reason I ask that is my understanding is that
18 we don't get capital outlay from state unless it's on the list. Even if it's five
19 years." Mr. Maestas said, "Yes sir, that's correct. That is a very good reason
20 to have it on the list while they look for funding sources from the state or
21 federal grants. It is better that we have that project identified on our CIP."

22 xviii. Councillor Smith added, "Well, let me, because I think what I hear Mr.
23 Maestas saying is that there's a certain amount of flexibility that needs to be
24 maintained with doing some of this annually. But perhaps when we kind of,
25 we can anticipate that some things are likely to be ongoing CIP kinds of
26 things, that perhaps some of those things should be given consideration for
27 a five-year plan. Does that make sense? From a standpoint of we don't want
28 to overly burden the five year plan and we don't want to over confine what
29 we can do with some of the shorter term planning from the standpoint of what
30 you're bringing up, Mayor Pro-Tem Sorg, that we do want to be sure that
31 when we're asking the legislature for capital outlay money, that it is on the
32 CIP and ready to go. So I think some of that might just be a teasing out of,
33 okay which of these projects are likely to end up in that kind of situation and
34 does it make sense for them to be on a five year plan, and which of these
35 might fall by the, might not as likely be there and we might need that greater
36 flexibility. Is that kind of hybrid system make sense to what we're trying to
37 do? Mr. Trevino"

38 xix. Mr. Trevino said, "Yes, currently on the CIP we do have an unpaved roads
39 project callout in the CIP. Which I believe is a quarter million dollars a year.
40 It's not specific to any roadway. But there is aside a quarter million dollars a
41 year for unpaved road projects."

42 xx. Councillor Smith stated, "So that allows us I think some of that flexibility and
43 then allows us to go ahead and ask on the CIP that we're trying to address
44 that particular issue." And Councillor Sorg asked, "What would be wrong with
45 just naming a road? Naming a road out in these two areas, one in each area,

1 and that way the legislator who looks at it and says "Oh yes. That's my
2 district. I'd like to give a little money to that." What's wrong with that?"

3 xxi. Mr. Trevino replied, "Councilor Sorg, I believe, when once you get this
4 drainage study completed by the consultant, we'll have direction and can see
5 how we can approach this in a more efficient manner. It'd be kind of hard
6 now to kind of call the road now when it's not even. I think the direction the
7 board went with drainage studies will give us a better route and direction to
8 probably attack this and have some backing for this. Since they're both going
9 under the same contract, both the Hacienda and the Mesa I believe
10 sometime in the fall."

11 xxii. Councillor Sorg asked, "So there's no chance we could get any road on the
12 CIP for next year." Mr. Dollahon replied, "My recommendation to staff is that
13 we redirect the unpaved road money to Pecan, Wilt, and Melody and let's
14 look at using the money for surveys, right-of-way acquisition, other
15 documentation because we have wasted 30-plus-years out there and we've
16 never had a written, close to a written policy. And I want to know what we're
17 using \$250,000 on unpaved roads for. So, nobody in the room can answer
18 that question?"

19 xxiii. Mr. Trevino answered, "As me being part of Public Works, I have not." Mr.
20 Dollahon stated, "We can take \$250,000. That's condemnation money. I can
21 force people on Melody and Wilt to give me right-of-way. That's \$250,000
22 down the road that I am right now, no pun intended. So, no we can put the
23 first two roads, one in each area, on next year's CIP. At least for right-of-way
24 acquisition. And we need to work it."

25 xxiv. Mr. Maestas said, "If I could continue on the original discussion. Yes, it's a
26 good point that to have it on there. Especially for the additional funding
27 sources. But as David points out, my recommendation would be and if the
28 Committee's okay with it, we would take that unfunded roads line item, not
29 get rid of that, we would use that line item and with the stash identify the two
30 roads that have been brought up that have been identified as priority and we
31 can use that funding to get started on those two projects."

32 xxv. Mr. Maestas said, "If I could continue on the original discussion. Yes, it's a
33 good point that to have it on there. Especially for the additional funding
34 sources. But as David points out, my recommendation would be and if the
35 Committee's okay with it, we would take that unfunded roads line item, not
36 get rid of that, we would use that line item and with the stash identify the two
37 roads that have been brought up that have been identified as priority and we
38 can use that funding to get started on those two projects." And then asked
39 how far along were we in the presentation. Councillor Smith stated they were
40 on 3.1.

41 xxvi. Mr. Dollahon stated, "I think one of the things, this is a good start and we
42 would adopt this by resolution with some modification. I think we know
43 generally the right-of-way lists and that's what's missing from this is the
44 prioritization by area of the right-of-way list. Because we know Melody and
45 then Rexview, then Wilt and then Pecan. And then we'll have the drainage
46 study in the fall. But I think the right-of-way list needs to be referenced and

1 as an appendix to this. And then we can adopt this via resolution and then
2 as we refine the list where the drainage study impacts things, then we can
3 come back and just amend the appendix list. But we should be, we've waited
4 30-plus-years to do this if not longer, we're at 40 years. Yes, we're at 40
5 years for getting this area and it's not going to hurt for us to revisit it once a
6 year."

7 xxvii. Ms. H-Rogers asked, "So one of the big questions that I have, this brings up
8 something really good, David. Right now, we have two lists. We're still
9 waiting for the drainage stuff to come in. The question is, we have Area 1,
10 we have Area 2, do those need to remain separate or are we combining
11 those lists into one list? Keep them separate?" Mr. Dollahon responded
12 progress needs to be simultaneous annually, adding "I think one of the things
13 that's not in this policy is an annual report out to the City Council. That will
14 remind us not only do we have to do this process once a year, but we need
15 to report out on our progress to City Council and the constituency. That's
16 only fair. If it's being transparent of what we do. It's still going to take us
17 another 30 years to complete this."

18 xxviii. Ms. H-Rogers continued the presentation. Mr. Dollahon asked, "On action
19 item 4.3.2, I don't know that we need that. Because it creates an extra layer
20 to an approval policy. Because that's not how we would approve a design
21 cross section. That's an administrative function and if you do it in 4.3.1 and
22 4.3.3, you're still being transparent and there's still communication. But you
23 don't want to add an extra step to that process because the engineers
24 already have enough work to do."

25 xxix. Ms. H-Rogers replied, "The reason that was in there was to ensure that the
26 City as a whole, staff as a whole, was working collectively to come up with
27 the design. So that all of these other provisions are met. I think if we have
28 clear internal policies regarding that, it's not an issue and that can go away."

29 xxx. Councillor Smith added, "And I think you're saying that this needs, that you
30 put it in there as a safe guard. You're saying you don't think it's needed. So,
31 from the standpoint of "okay we've expressed that here in this discussion"
32 that may help inform the going forward." Ms. H-Rogers stated it was an extra
33 layer and she would strike it and continued with number five of the
34 presentation.

35 xxxi. Mr. Dollahon stated, "I think we need to have an offline discussion with
36 budget and accounting on this issue. I think we're going to need to flesh out
37 more details on this portion and we're going to have to be very careful in our
38 message because I think we can take a little bit of money from a bunch of
39 people and say "oh, we're not dedicating it to the road in front of your house.
40 We're dedicating it to another road in your neighborhood." And then there's
41 the accounting monitoring if somebody were to subdivide and we have built
42 the road. Well they should pay too, that doesn't go to a road in front of their
43 house because suddenly we paved the road in front of her house and they're
44 willing to subdivide. And they do, but they don't pay for any of the
45 improvements when their neighbors did. I think we need to include that in
46 the policy because it needs to be in the neighborhood, and we need to define

1 what that neighborhood is. It's not a direct one for one connection. It's a
2 mutual benefit for everyone involved. But that's also an accounting and
3 budgeting thing. Because we're potentially going to have money that we're
4 going to hold on to for a little while and so that's a concern for me. But I'm
5 okay with that." Ms. H-Rogers agreed and continued with the last of the
6 goals. Mr. Dollahon felt 5.4.2 needed to be rewritten.

7 xxxii. Mr. Dollahon added, "I don't know if we answered the fifth bullet: CIAC over
8 PRC. We are not involving the CIAC. I think ultimately the decision on the
9 roadway priority needs to come from this Committee and it's an appendix to
10 this policy document that ultimately, it's presented to City Council. It's a
11 Council decision. So that is in there. I have some other comments, but I will
12 give them to you directly."

13 xxxiii. Ms. H-Rogers stated, "Yes. And I'm expecting that everyone will e-mail me
14 or come visit me and tell me what they want. What is my deadline David? I'd
15 like to have a more final document to everybody for maybe a decision. I can
16 do next month, if you all want that unless you all think that's too fast."

17 xxxiv. Mr. Dollahon said, "I think because we have more work coming, and this may
18 be a two-part process. I think I'd like for everyone to have their comments
19 back to you before the next meeting so that we can come back in April with
20 what I am going to call a semi-final document."

21 xxxv. Ms. H-Rogers asked, "Not for adoption then? It won't be an action item or
22 will be?" Mr. Dollahon replied, "No. We'll probably make a recommendation
23 in April and then we'll take something to Council. We may have to revisit it
24 in the fall after Tony's drainage study is done. But we've wasted enough
25 time that we don't need to be sitting around waiting for." Councillor Smith
26 added, "Well, we don't have any fiscal year kind of constraints on this. This
27 is simply us trying to get this most effectively in place as we try to move
28 forward." Mr. Dollahon responded, "Right. But we're also moving forward in
29 the budget process and so I would like to know in April that we can have this
30 to Council sometime in May or June. There is an indirect budget connection
31 that we need to be prepared to move on."

32 xxxvi. Councillor Sorg added, "And in fact, thank you Mr. Dollahon by the way for
33 making a lot of this clear. Especially the process/next step. But also, in the
34 budget, this is the CIP, that's part of the budget. If we're talking CIP. I came
35 up with three concepts that I think we talked around a little bit here and you're
36 going to find this strange maybe. First of all, in cost of construction, I'm
37 looking at projects we've done, the City has done paid for by the taxpayers
38 money in the past and most of you in the room here have been, were here
39 when we decided to go ahead and take some of our bonded money, but it
40 was tax money, to build Sonoma Ranch Boulevard south all the way to the
41 high school. That was not cheap. But also, I'll say the same thing about
42 Roadrunner north. I think we can probably find a couple other examples too
43 where the City's had to build the roads one way or another for whatever
44 reason. And I see these local roads that they're small potatoes compared to
45 projects like that. We're not talking about an arterial or a collector, and so I
46 just want to put it in perspective that the concept of what's going on here.

1 Second thing, it's hard to do infrastructure projects. They're hard to get going.
2 They're hard to keep going. I understand that. But I spoke to my brother up
3 in Montana when we were, I don't know if we were branding calves or
4 rounding up the cows in fall, but as we were standing there in the cold windy
5 situation trying to keep warm as we were doing this, I said 'you know wouldn't
6 it be nice to have a nice row of trees along this side here where the wind
7 usually comes from.' He says to me 'oh that takes forever to grow trees
8 here.' I said 'yes it's not easy to grow trees. But if you would've started 10
9 years ago, you'd have a nice tree right now.' Third thing is not losing sight of
10 this, having a paved street attracts new development, Attracts new housing,
11 better housing as a rule.' And so, this just makes the neighborhood better all
12 the way around when you have a good street out there that people don't
13 have to drive through mud to get to their house and so forth. End of my
14 concepts. "

15 **c. Public Works PEAK Performance**

- 16 i. Councillor Smith introduced Mr. Maestas who presented the attached Public
17 Works PEAK Performance.

18 **V. Future Discussion Items & Task Listing**

- 19 a. Facility Maintenance Plan Update - March
20 b. Infrastructure Development Procedures – Traffic Signals Agreements vs. Other
21 Infrastructure (Roadways, Parks, Medians) - March
22 c. East Mesa Unpaved Roadways - April

23 **VI. Next Meeting Scheduled:** March 20, 2019 at 3:30 p.m.

24 **VII. Adjourn** - Meeting adjourned by Chair Smith at 5:06 p.m. with no objections.
25
26
27

28
29
30
31
32

33 _____
34 Greg Smith - Chair

35
36
Approved: 3/20/19