



CITY OF LAS CRUCES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, August 20, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT: David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
Sara Gonzales, Interim Deputy Director
Adam Ochoa, Senior Planner
Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
Michael Danner, CLC Fire
Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Plan & Construct Admin, Parks
William Bass, Senior Engineer
Susan Reeder, Associate Engineer

STAFF PRESENT: John Castillo, Planner, Community Development

OTHER PRESENT: Anton Magallanez, Moy Surveying
Kent Thurston, KT Homes
Adrian Renteria, AE Engineering
Zack Libbin, Libbin Underwood Engineering
Terry Boyce, President of Boyce Tracts
Caitlin Frugoli, Libbin Underwood Engineering

1. CALL TO ORDER (9:00 a.m.)

Weir: Okay, we're going to call the August 20, 2025 Development Review Committee meeting to order. We have representatives of all departments except Public Works. And my understanding is they're on their way. But we do have a quorum, so we'll go ahead and start.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 May 7, 2025

Weir: First order of business today is to approve the minutes of the DRC from May 7, 2025. Have all had an opportunity to look at those? Or is anyone comfortable with making a motion to adopt?

Gonzales: I make a motion to approve.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

Nasir: Second.

1
2 Weir: Okay, I'll just do a voice vote. All those in favor, say "aye."

3
4 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5
6 Weir: All those opposed.

7
8 Harrison-Rogers: I abstain since I wasn't here. I'm going to abstain.

9
10 Weir: Okay.

11
12 Harrison-Rogers: Okay, thanks.

13
14 Weir: Okay. Minutes have been approved, 3-0-2.

15
16 **3. NEW BUSINESS**

17
18 **3.1 Case No. 24CS0500036: Hacienda Acres Replat No. 9**

- 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
- A request for approval of a non-administrative replat, known as Hacienda Acres Replat No. 9.
 - The proposed subdivision is currently approximately 0.864 acres in size, is zoned NH-3S (Neighborhood 3 Suburban) and located on the south side of Bataan Memorial East, approximately 450 feet east of its intersection with Hacienda Avenue, a.k.a. 6975 Reynolds Drive.
 - The subdivision proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into two (2) new lots that are equally divided and approximately 0.423 acres in size.
 - Submitted by Moy Surveying, Representative.

29 Weir: Okay. We'll go on to new business. The first item on the agenda is Hacienda Acres, replat No 9. Community Development. Do you have an overview or presentation you'd like to make?

30
31
32
33 Gonzales: Sure. This is a replat for a non-administrative replat, which is going from
34 one lot to two lots. It is Hacienda Acres, replat no. 9. The property is
35 currently 0.864 acres in size and is being subdivided equally to
36 accommodate 0.0432 acres in size for each lot. They are zoned NH-3
37 Suburban under Realize Las Cruces. It is located on the south side of
38 Bataan Memorial East, in which they would not have access to. However,
39 they will be having entrance off of Reynolds Drive, which is about 450 feet
40 east of its intersection with Hacienda Avenue. Staff did sent it out for review.
41 There were no pending comments as far as any approve with conditions or
42 contingencies moving forward onto the plat.

43
44 Weir: Okay. Does Moy Surveying have anything they would like to present or add
45 to the report?
46

1 Steve: I think I just wanted some clarification on that park impact fee, just because
2 I'm not as familiar with it with now the changes to it. So if we can talk a little
3 bit about that.
4

5 Harrison-Rogers: The fee in lieu or the park impact fee?
6

7 Steve: Both.
8

9 Harrison-Rogers: Okay. All right. So if you'd like some clarification, I can try to do it for
10 you.
11

12 Steve: Sure.
13

14 Harrison-Rogers: So there are two different things. There's a park dedication and
15 improvement or fee in lieu.
16

17 Steve: Okay.
18

19 Harrison-Rogers: And in a case like this, of course, you can't dedicate park, right. And
20 then there's a park impact fee. The way the park impact fees were adopted
21 this year, it excludes neighborhood parks simply because of now that
22 dedication or that fee in lieu. So when the equation was done, it was
23 assuming facility types that were aquatics, specialty facilities, regional
24 parks, community parks, not neighborhood parks. So at the time of building
25 permit, a fee in lieu is still applicable to the homes. Now, those are sliding
26 scale now. So if it's a smaller home, the fee actually went down. If it's a
27 larger home, the fee probably went up. And so that'll be due at the time of
28 building permit for the house.
29

30 Now, because you can't build a neighborhood park or dedicate land towards
31 a neighborhood park in this particular case, there is a fee in lieu. That
32 particular, when we did the calculation, because we're looking at the new
33 lot being added, not the old lot, right. And it comes to a really, really small
34 acreage amount. It would be .00732 acres to be dedicated for this particular
35 type of lot split.
36

37 Steve: 0.00732 is a calculated park that we would have had to have dedicated.
38

39 Harrison-Rogers: Yes, which is ridiculous.
40

41 Steve: Which we don't want, so we would do fee in lieu anyway.
42

43 Harrison-Rogers: Yes, exactly. And so based on that calculation and looking at the
44 current cost of land and average cost to build a park per acre, that fee is
45 \$3,718.56. Now, Sara did indicate to me that this particular project was
46 submitted in advance of the adoption of Realize.

1
2 Gonzales: Correct.
3
4 Harrison-Rogers: So this particular case, it's kind of a moot point because of the timing of
5 when you submit it. So for at least replant number nine, as I understand it
6 from the submittal date that Sara indicated, you are not subject to that.
7
8 Steve: So we're not subject to fee in lieu, but of course we are subject to the park
9 fee for the permit when they build the home.
10
11 Harrison-Rogers: Exactly. Exactly. But anything else that was submitted at a later date
12 that falls under Realize, they're subject to that fee in lieu and the park impact
13 fee.
14
15 Steve: Even if Realize is in effect but are still using to, we know we have that
16 Realize date, but we have an eight month or whatever transition period. So
17 even if we're electing to use the prior code, if Realize was already in effect
18 we're still subject to fee in lieu.
19
20 Harrison-Rogers: If you're using the prior code, I think the determination was that you're
21 not subject to the fee in lieu.
22
23 Steve: Even if it's after the Realize date of the submittal?
24
25 Harrison-Rogers: I don't know. Sara.
26
27 Gonzales: What it would mean is if you're using the prior code, you have to have
28 everything approved and basically completed before December 31st.
29 Starting January 1, there would be nothing under the previous code.
30
31 Steve: Okay.
32
33 Gonzales: Everything has to be in effect. So in this case development on this property
34 would take place within probably Realize Las Cruces. We have no
35 development plans, and so we're moving it forward. However, the submittal
36 date will allow it to not have that park dedication being required.
37
38 Steve: But for instance, anything, again hypothetically I recognize, but anything
39 submitted today could still be using the old plan, but everything would have
40 to be completed by 2025 to then not have a park dedication...
41
42 Gonzales: Correct.
43
44 Steve: Fee or park dedication requirement.
45
46 Weir: My understanding is that your plat would need to be filed by January 1st.

1
2 Steve: Yes, and final plat. Therefore, we'd have to have everything completed.
3
4 Weir: So, yes any plat afterwards. Just a point of order, Katherine and Steve. So
5 this fee in lieu, would that need to be collected at the time we were having
6 the plat recorded?
7
8 Harrison-Rogers: Yes.
9
10 Weir: And so the impact fee would still be collected with the building?
11
12 Harrison-Rogers: Correct.
13
14 Weir: Because the fee in lieu with the plat.
15
16 Harrison-Rogers: Because the fee in lieu is tied specifically to the subdivision.
17
18 Weir: Okay. All right.
19
20 Steve: So that's just the fee that would be assessed. However, we're not going to
21 be assessed on this because of the plat submission date. And then if it was
22 after the date, we'd have to have everything done before. I got it. So yes,
23 kind of park dedication or fee in lieu doesn't have impact to this, but we will
24 be subject to a new park fee for each lot at the time of (*inaudible*).
25
26 Harrison-Rogers: Yes.
27
28 Steve: That helps.
29
30 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.
31
32 Weir: Okay. Anything else? Any questions? Departments, anything that you'd
33 like to comment on that or anything else? If that's the case, I'll go ahead
34 and entertain a motion to approve Hacienda Acres replat number nine
35 subdivision. Do I have a motion?
36
37 Nasir: So moved.
38
39 Weir: Do I have a second?
40
41 Danner: Second.
42
43 Weir: Okay. I'll go ahead and take a roll this time. Public works.
44
45 Bass: No comments.
46

1 Weir: This would be the vote to approve.
2
3 Bass: Yes.
4
5 Weir: Yes. Okay. Community development votes yes. Utilities.
6
7 UTILITIES UNKNOWN: Yes.
8
9 Weir: Fire.
10
11 Danner: Yes.
12
13 Weir: Parks and Rec.
14
15 Bingham: Yes.
16
17 Weir: Okay. DRC is recommending approval to the Planning and Zoning
18 Commission for this subdivision.
19
20 **3.2 Case No. 25CS500057: Hacienda Acres Replat No. 10**
21 • A request for approval of a non-administrative replat, known as
22 Hacienda Acres Replat No. 10.
23 • The proposed subdivision is currently approximately 0.914 acres in size,
24 is zoned NH-3S (Neighborhood 3 Suburban) and located on the south
25 side of Bataan Memorial East, approximately 300 feet east of its
26 intersection with Hacienda Avenue, a.k.a. 6955 Reynolds Drive.
27 • The subdivision proposes subdivide one (1) existing lot into two (2) new
28 lots that are approximately 0.460 and 0.454 acres in size.
29 • Submitted by Carter Surveying and Mapping LLC, Representative.
30
31
32 Weir: Next item of business is Hacienda Acres replat number 10 subdivision.
33 Community Development, do you have a review?
34
35 Magallanez: I'm sorry, is that Zach Libbin. I can let him know to come in.
36
37 Gonzales: Carter's not here.
38
39 Magallanez: Oh, okay. Carter.
40
41 Harrison-Rogers: Now Sara, this one was submitted after though, correct.
42
43 Gonzales: Submitted after it. The question would be though is they still have the right
44 to use old code up until December 31st.
45
46 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.

1
2 Gonzales: Yes. I would see that as being assembled. So this is going to be Hacienda
3 Acres replat number 10. This is adjoining, essentially adjacent to the lot
4 that we just discussed at 6955 Reynolds Drive. It is also a non-
5 administrative replat subdividing the lots from one to two. It is also zoned
6 NH-3 Suburban within Realize Las Cruces, located on the south side of
7 Bataan. This property is about 300 feet east of its intersection from
8 Hacienda Avenue. This went through the review process as well. There
9 were no pending comments or approved with conditions.
10
11 Weir: Sara, just a point of order. Does the applicant need to be present before
12 we can act?
13
14 Gonzales: The applicant was on their way, however, something came up and had to
15 turn back around. There were no comments extended from the applicant
16 as the application has gone through with full approval. So there was nothing
17 additional to add in.
18
19 Harrison-Rogers: Mr. Chair. Can I ask a point of clarification from Sara? So in this
20 particular case they would be subject to the fee in lieu if they don't get this
21 recorded by January 1?
22
23 Gonzales: Correct. I would say for the record, if the plat does come in, if they can file
24 it by December 31st, then they would not be subject to the fee. If we receive
25 the application after, then they are subject to that fee if it's filed after January
26 1.
27
28 Harrison-Rogers: So as part of the discussion related to this, I would recommend then a
29 condition that based on the timing of when the plat gets recorded, if they
30 passed the date, as you indicated, they would be subject to a \$3,718.56 fee
31 in lieu.
32
33 Weir: Katherine, can you repeat that?
34
35 Harrison-Rogers: \$3,718.56.
36
37 Weir: Thank you.
38
39 Harrison-Rogers: Thanks.
40
41 Gonzales: For staff, so noted. I will put the condition upon that as well as the staff
42 report going to P&Z.
43
44 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.
45

1 Gonzales: So that way there is an understanding that that fee would be required if it is
 2 filed after December 31, 2025.
 3
 4 Weir: Okay. Any other departments have any questions regarding this
 5 subdivision plat? Hearing none. I guess I'll first take a, let's see probably a
 6 motion for the condition. Does the DRC have a motion?
 7
 8 Harrison-Rogers: I move to approve this particular case with the condition as stated
 9 previously.
 10
 11 Gonzales: Second.
 12
 13 Weir: I'll go ahead and do a roll vote again. Public Works.
 14
 15 Bass: Yes.
 16
 17 Weir: Community Development. Yes. Utilities.
 18
 19 Nasir: Yes.
 20
 21 Weir: Fire
 22
 23 Danner: Yes.
 24
 25 Weir: And Parks and Recreation.
 26
 27 Bingham: Yes.
 28
 29 Weir: Okay, so again the DRC is then recommending approval of the Hacienda
 30 Acres Replat No. 9 subdivision with a condition relative to the fee in lieu and
 31 date of filing the plat. Okay, I will leave the message and turn chairing over
 32 to Sara.
 33

34 **3.3 Case No. 25CS0500021: Mesa Crossings Subdivision Preliminary Plat**

- 35 • A request for approval of a preliminary plat known as Mesa Crossings
 36 Subdivision.
- 37 • The proposed subdivision encompasses approximately 20.468 acres, is
 38 zoned NH-1S (Neighborhood 1 Suburban) and is located on the
 39 southeast corner of Mesa Grande Drive and Peachtree Hills Road.
- 40 • The subdivision proposes 89 single-family residential lots and 5 tracts
 41 that will be utilized for drainage and right-of-way dedication.
- 42 • The subdivision is proposing an alternate cross-section for Peachtree
 43 Hills Road and an alternative turn-around road design for two internal
 44 roads.
- 45 • Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering & Surveying,
 46 Representative.

1
2 Gonzales: Okay, so we'll move on to Case No. 3.3, which is Mesa Crossing
3 Subdivision Preliminary Plat. I will turn to Community Development staff.
4
5 Ochoa: Thank you, Chair. Next case is Case 25CS0500021. It is a request for
6 approval of a preliminary plat known as Mesa Crossing Subdivision. The
7 subdivision itself encompasses approximately 20.468 acres in size. It is
8 Zone NH-1S, Neighborhood 1 Suburban. And located in the southeast
9 corner of Mesa Grande Drive and Peachtree Hills. Subdivision proposes
10 89 single-family residential lots in five separate tracts. That will be utilized,
11 a couple for drainage and three for right-of-way dedication, and I believe for
12 trail development as well.
13
14 The subdivision will also proposed, along with this DRC will be reviewing
15 alternate cross sections for Peachtree Hills, as well as alternate turnaround
16 road designs for two internal roadways proposed by the subdivision. This
17 did go out for review. All reviewing parties had recommended approval,
18 some with conditions. I believe engineering had a couple conditions, as
19 well as potentially other departments. I'll let them speak on those
20 conditions, if they had any. This was submitted by Libbin Underwood
21 Engineering. That concludes my presentation, and the applicant is here for
22 any questions for clarification.
23
24 Gonzales: Okay, so I will go ahead and go to staff first, and then have the applicant
25 respond to any other comments or conditions that were in place. I will start
26 with Public Works/Engineering. We'll go with Public Works first.
27
28 Bass: So, just based on our comments, that could address the pavement profile.
29
30 Ochoa: Sure. I could clarify that for you, Will. Thank you for that. So Public Works
31 was comfortable with the alternate cross section on Peachtree Hills with the
32 change of the actual pavement cross section to provide a three-inch asphalt
33 on an eight-inch base core on that Peachtree Hills. They were fine with the
34 cross section. It was just that change that Public Works was requesting.
35 So is the applicant good with that?
36
37 Libbin: Yes.
38
39 Gonzales: Okay.
40
41 Ochoa: Perfect.
42
43 Gonzales: Then so that would meet the needs of Public Works. I would go to
44 Engineering for any of their contingencies that are left onto the
45 development.
46

1 Reeder: Okay, so for Engineering, we approved with contingency. Drainage is going
2 to be reviewed and addressed as the permitting process moves forward. If
3 there's any layout changes, we don't know what's going to change with
4 drainage. So we have that initial drainage report. We're going to move
5 forward with that for right now. And we'll address any comments as we
6 move forward. For Transportation, for the dead ends, they need to be
7 approved or denied here. We were going to defer to Fire. If Fire is okay
8 with it, Engineering is okay with it.
9

10 Thurston: We're just talking about the two dead ends and the bottom left, bottom right?
11

12 Reeder: Yes, sir.
13
14

15 Thurston: Okay. What is the, do you have the distance on those? I know they're less
16 than 150 feet so. We're good.
17

18 Reeder: And then our last comment for Transportation was that the TIA needs to be
19 completed and submitted prior to filing the final plat. Okay. We want to get
20 this done sooner rather than later because it is a 30 working day review
21 cycle, so that's six weeks. The sooner we get that in and get it approved,
22 then the sooner we know what mitigation needs to be completed, if any, for
23 the subdivision before we go in for design and final plat submittal and
24 construction submittal.
25

26 Thurston: Okay.
27

28 Reeder: Okay.
29

30 Gonzales: Okay.
31

32 Thurston: Susan, I have a question about that, just real quick.
33

34 Reeder: Yes.
35

36 Thurston: Is a draft acceptable? The engineer that did the TIA provided the draft for
37 submittal for review, but do you want it stamped or do you want the draft
38 reviewed?
39

40 Reeder: We have to go through a whole TIA process, so that's a separate permit
41 process, actually. It'll come through Accela, I will route it out to
42 Transportation or Traffic Administration upstairs. They will conduct their
43 review, give back comments, and then we'll have that back and forth trying
44 to make sure all those mitigations are addressed. So we need to go through
45 that process separately. So I know that the draft is in there right now. If

1 you want I can forward that to Sue for a courtesy review. But we want to
2 get a full stamp set like done as soon as possible.
3
4 Thurston: Great.
5
6 Reeder: All right. And it should be under Realize a Tier 1 TIA, so if you haven't
7 gotten with Sue already, I would recommend doing that so you can get your
8 scoping done.
9
10 Thurston: Yes, he did get Sue on it for the scoping.
11
12 Reeder: Okay. Thank you.
13
14 Gonzales: Parks and Recreation.
15
16 Harrison-Rogers: Sure. so the developer worked with us to come up with a solution for
17 park dedication related to this. It was a trail, a multi-use trail along
18 Peachtree in the sort of same design as we've seen sort of further towards
19 Metro Verde. It'll help ultimately connect that hopefully in the next couple
20 of years. It does exceed the required acreage as per my calculations. And
21 so, in so long as we receive any landscaping plans or irrigation plans to
22 coincide with this during construction, that's all we need.
23
24 Gonzales: Okay. And Utilities.
25
26 Nasir: Utilities, we have no issues with this. I did the review for the master plan,
27 for Utilities master plan, and the connections for water, sewer, and gas were
28 there.
29
30 Gonzales: Okay. Fire Department?
31
32 Danner: No comments.
33
34 Ochoa: And just for point of clarity for Fire, the one cross section which is Holden
35 Lane is about 110 feet deep. And the one for Mesa Crossing Street is about
36 83 feet deep.
37
38 Thurston: Yes, anything less than 150 will get.
39
40 Ochoa: Perfect.
41
42 Nasir: So they're not going to be on the streets, right. They're going to be dead
43 ends.
44
45 Ochoa: They're dead ends, yes ma'am.
46

1 Gonzales: Okay. Any other comments from the applicant or any other comments from
2 staff? Okay, so I would entertain a motion for approval of the Mesa Crossing
3 subdivision preliminary plat.
4

5 Ochoa: Point of order. I'm sorry, point of order. Can we do two separate votes, one
6 for Mesa Crossing itself, the subdivision, and one for the alternate cross
7 sections.
8

9 Gonzales: Okay. So we will start with the cross section because that will ultimately
10 lead into your preliminary plat. So I will take a motion for the alternate cross
11 section being proposed by the applicant.
12

13 Danner: So moved.
14

15 Gonzales: Do I have a second?
16

17 Reeder: Seconded.
18

19 Gonzales: Okay, I will just do around the room is all in favor say "aye."
20

21 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
22

23 Gonzales: Any opposed? Okay, so approval of the alternate cross section as it does
24 get approved through the DRC. So now we'll move on to the Mesa Crossing
25 subdivision preliminary plat. May I get a motion for the preliminary plat?
26

27 Danner: So moved.
28

29 Gonzales: And a second?
30

31 Ochoa: Second.
32

33 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor.
34

35 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
36

37 Gonzales: Any opposed? Okay, so the preliminary plat moves forward also with
38 approval recommended by DRC.
39

40 **3.4 Case No. 22CS0500007: M Boyce Tracts**

- 41 • A request for approval of a non-administrative replat known as M. Boyce
42 Tracts.
- 43 • The proposed subdivision encompasses approximately 7.00 + acres, is
44 zoned NH-3.S (Neighborhood-3 Suburban) and located at 3300 Del Rey
45 Avenue.

1 • The subdivision proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into two (2)
2 new lots that are 2.87 ± and 3.84 ± acres in size.
3 • Dedication of Del Rey Boulevard and Mars Avenue is provided, and the
4 applicant seeks to waive improvements.
5 • Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering and Surveying,
6 Representative.
7
8 Gonzales: Okay, so I will go ahead and hear 3.4 which is M. Boyce tracts. And go to
9 Community Development staff.
10
11 Castillo: Thank you. So today we have case number 23CS0500007 also known as
12 the M Boyce tracts. This is a request for a non-administrative replant. The
13 proposed subdivision encompasses approximately seven acres. It is zoned
14 NH-3 S which is our neighborhood three suburban and it's located at 3300
15 Del Rey Avenue. It's at the intersection of Del Rey and Mars. The
16 subdivision, the subdivision proposes to subdivide the existing lot into two
17 new lots which range from 2.87 acres to 3.84 acres in size. They will be
18 providing dedication of Del Rey Boulevard and Mars Avenue. But the
19 applicant does seek to waive the improvements that would be required
20 based on the subdivision's requirements.
21
22 Gonzales: Okay. Is there anything the applicant would like to add additionally?
23
24 Boyce: No, I don't think so. I think John covered it pretty well.
25
26 Gonzales: Okay, so then we'll just go around the room. I will look to Public Works.
27 Any additional comments?
28
29 Bass: Public Works has no comments.
30
31 Gonzales: Okay. Fire Department.
32
33 Danner: No comments.
34
35 Gonzales: Utilities.
36
37 Nasir: I've been working with the surveyor about finding out where the sewer
38 connection is at. Because there's no sewer along Del Rey Boulevard. It's
39 only sewer along Mars. So I am assuming that that's where it's connected.
40 And we would like to have a dedication from lot to lot about having that
41 sewer line there. Our jurisdiction will end at the property line, but we would
42 like to have from the daycare lot to the other lot to have that easement
43 between each lot. So in case it breaks or needs to be repaired, they'll be
44 able to do it.
45

1 Gonzales: Okay. Are there any concerns from the applicant? Is that feasible as far as
2 providing a utility easement to allow the sewer to be extended through Lots
3 1 and Lots 2?
4
5 Libbin: That's fine. No problem with an easement.
6
7 Gonzales: Okay. Any other comments from Utilities?
8
9 Nasir: We also have a gas line main along the back side of the property and a
10 hydrant, an 8-inch line where the daycare is at. Right at the property border,
11 so we would like to have easements for those too. And those will be
12 easements for CLC.
13
14 Gonzales: Okay. So I turn to the applicant once again to see if there's any concerns
15 with the existing lines or fire hydrants to provide those easements as well,
16 so that way they're designated and located.
17
18 Nasir: That is correct. If it's not already out there. I'm not sure if - I couldn't find
19 an easement for the fire hydrant or the two-inch gas line. But if it's not, then
20 we would like to have easements because those are our mains.
21
22 Gonzales: Okay.
23
24 Libbin: I'm sorry, I'm not quite clear. What do you need for the gas line?
25
26 Nasir: So there is a gas line on the back side of the property.
27
28 Libbin: Yes.
29
30 Nasir: And it, I don't know why it was ran, but it was there.
31
32 Libbin: Right.
33
34 Nasir: Either the, if you're not going to need it, we can vacate it.
35
36 Libbin: No, that gas line goes to the building.
37
38 Nasir: That's what needs to be, we need to have an easement for that.
39
40 Libbin: Okay.
41
42 Nasir: And then the same thing for the fire hydrant.
43
44 Libbin: Okay. Yes. No problem.
45
46 Nasir: Thank you.

1
2 Gonzales: Okay. Any other comments from Utilities?
3
4 Nasir: No.
5
6 Gonzales: Okay. Parks and Recreation.
7
8 Harrison-Rogers: So a question for you, Sara. I just need to understand whether or not
9 this was proposed under the old versus new code to determine whether or
10 not the fees in lieu are applicable.
11
12 Gonzales: Based on the application it was submitted in 2023. Because of the time
13 frame it's taken to go through and understand essentially the dedication and
14 the waiving of the improvements, it would be following our previous code.
15
16 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.
17
18 Gonzales: The reason we are writing our reports to move forward with Realize is
19 understanding that the development of these properties will probably take
20 place under Realize Las Cruces. So that would be the difference between
21 these properties.
22
23 Harrison-Rogers: Okay. All right. So with that then unless this particular development
24 gets delayed, similar to how we spoke of it before, they wouldn't be subject
25 to the fee in lieu. However, if the development does get delayed and they
26 stumble into being required to follow the new code, they would be subject
27 to a \$3,718.56 fee in lieu for the dedication and development of a park.
28
29 Gonzales: Okay. So in that case the applicant, what that means is if the application or
30 the subdivision, once it goes through the Planning and Zoning Commission,
31 this is scheduled for next month. If the application or the subdivision is not
32 filed by December 31st, then it would be subject to the park impact fees
33 based on the time frame in which we would now be under Realize Las
34 Cruces.
35
36 Harrison-Rogers: Fees in lieu. Point of clarification, fees in lieu, not park impact fees.
37 Park impact fees are a separate and distinct thing.
38
39 Gonzales: Yes.
40
41 Libbin: Okay.
42
43 Gonzales: Any other comments by staff? Okay, seeing none. I would accept a motion
44 to approve with conditions similar to our previous case where we condition
45 it as if the plat has not been filed by December 31st, then it is subject to the

1 park dedication fee in lieu of. Can I get a motion for approval with the
2 conditions?

3
4 Danner: So moved.

5
6 Gonzales: And a second.

7
8 Nasir: Second.

9
10 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

11
12 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

13
14 Gonzales: Any opposed? Okay, so motion passes and moves forward to P&Z with a
15 recommendation of approval.

16
17 **3.5 Case No. 23CS0500095: Lujan Tracts**

- 18 • A request for approval of a non-administrative replat known as Lujan
- 19 Tracts.
- 20 • The proposed subdivision encompasses 2.05 + acres, is zoned REM
- 21 (Residential Estate Mobile) and located at 6401 Jefferson Lane.
- 22 • The subdivision proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into three (3)
- 23 new lots that range in size from 0.420 ± to 1.050 ± acres in size.
- 24 • Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering and Surveying,
- 25 Representative.

26
27 Gonzales: Okay, so we are now moving on to case 3.5 and 3.6. I would like to suspend
28 the rules and hear those together as they do basically pertain to one
29 another. It is Lujan Tracts that is coming in with a road improvement waiver.
30 The waiver is subject to going through City Council's process. The reason
31 it's going through City Council's process is because the zoning designation
32 in which is proposed is following REM standards. There is an accessory
33 building that would be on a separate lot by itself, which is not allowed in
34 Realize Las Cruces as part of the permission. So we are going through the
35 waiver process through City Council for this one. And so I will turn to staff
36 to hear Lujan Tracts and the improvement waiver.

37
38 Castillo: So today we have two cases. Case number 23CS0500095, also known as
39 Lujan Tracts. And then we have case number 24CS400008, which is a
40 Lujan Tracts road improvement waiver. So the Lujan Tracts is a request for
41 approval of a non-administrative replat. The property is currently zoned
42 REM, which is a residential estate mobile, and encompasses 2.05 acres in
43 size. And it's located at 6401 Jefferson Lane.

44
45 The subdivision proposes to subdivide the existing lot into three new lots
46 that range in size from 0.420 acres to 1.050 acres in size. The property has

1 dedicated right-of-way along Poose Creek, and will dedicate right-of-way for
2 Pecan Lane, which is just north of the subdivision. At this time, the applicant
3 is requesting to waive improvement to Pecan Lane. Poose Creek has been
4 dedicated to the city, and the city has accepted it back in I believe 1996, or
5 no, I'm sorry, 2004.
6

7 Gonzales: Okay. Just to do a point of clarification. In discussing it with the applicant,
8 because Poose Creek was done in 2004, that was one of the conditions
9 that had prolonged the process, because Poose Creek would have required
10 improvements. However, with the city requesting that dedication back in
11 2004, the improvements would now be on to the city to actually implement.
12 Jefferson Lane has also improved. It has already been improved to the
13 dedication standards, and that's why the request is only for the
14 improvements to Pecan Lane. It is a 50-foot road easement currently.
15 Twenty-five feet would be dedicated to the city. So the understanding would
16 be is improvements are very difficult to implement on a 25-foot road that we
17 cannot maintain when it needs to be 50 feet wide. Just for clarification. And
18 so I would go through Public Works. Any comments or concerns?
19

20 Bass: No comments.

21
22 Gonzales: Fire Department.

23
24 Danner: No comments.

25
26 Gandara: Utilities.

27
28 Nasir: No issues with the road improvements.

29
30 Gonzales: Parks and Recreation.

31
32 Harrison-Rogers: No issues with the road improvements.

33
34 Gonzales: Anything from Engineering?

35
36 Reeder: No.

37
38 Gonzales: Okay, so moving with that one, I would entertain a motion for Lujan Tracts.
39 We will separate these ones out, as this does have to get separate votes
40 through City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission. So I will
41 start with the road improvement waiver for Lujan Tracts. May I get a motion
42 for approval?
43

44 Frugoli: I'm sorry, before we—I just have a question real quick. Just before we move
45 any further forward, I did discuss with the property owner. He's not here
46 today, but I discussed with him potentially just doing two lots. So I just want

1 to throw that out there in case that changes anybody's thoughts about
2 anything at all. So he would probably just remove that northmost division
3 line, the new one. He would probably just remove that one and split it into
4 two lots instead.

5
6 Gonzales: So I would say this is going to hold to the same standard as we have
7 previously indicated on the other plats, and that would have to be
8 determined as to what that park dedication fee would be. And so with
9 changing those, just because this right now is currently with an accessory
10 building as it is by itself, it is still a non-administrative replat. We would still
11 process it through P&Z. You're allowed to reduce the number of lots
12 administratively if they choose to or through that process. With us moving
13 forward though, it would be the understanding that the final plat would need
14 to be filed prior to December 31st in order to not be subject to the park
15 dedication fees.

16
17 Frugoli: Okay. Thank you.

18
19 Gonzales: And so I will still go back to the road improvements, as those are still a
20 requirement, regardless if it is a one-to-three or a one-to-two lot subdivision.
21 So I will entertain a motion for the improvement waiver.

22
23 Danner: So moved.

24
25 Gonzales: And a second.

26
27 Reeder: Second.

28
29 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

30
31 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

32
33 Gonzales: Any opposed? No. Okay. So seeing that, the waiver will move forward to
34 Planning and Zoning Commission as well for recommendation to City
35 Council.

36
37 **3.6 Case No. 24CS0500008: Lujan Tracts Road Improvement Waiver**

- 38 • A request to waive the required improvements to Pecan Lane for a non-
39 administrative replat known as Lujan Tracts.
- 40 • Dedication of Pecan Lane is being provided through the non-admirative
41 replat.
- 42 • The City of Las Cruces Desing Standards Section 32-36.B states: A
43 subdivider shall be responsible for 100% of the street improvements
44 within the boundaries of the subdivision.
- 45 • Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering and Surveying,
46 Representative

1
2 Gonzales: I would move to Lujan Tracts. This is where the condition will be placed on
3 the final plat essentially being approved and filed prior to December 31st in
4 order to not be subject to the parkland dedication fees. Those were not
5 discussed. Those have not been determined as to what that fee would be,
6 but we would work with the applicant and let them know those fees prior to
7 the Planning and Zoning meeting. With that, may I get a motion for the
8 approval with conditions for Lujan Tracts?
9
10 Nasir: I would like, I'm sorry, I forgot that it was going to be discussed together, so
11 I do have a comment for the plat itself, and I've been talking to the applicant,
12 to the surveyor, about the fact that the water is only along Pecan, and they
13 do have a water meter there. And we would like to have an easement from
14 property owner to property owner, again for maintenance of that waterline
15 in case of a break or anything else after the meter.
16
17 Gonzales: Thank you. As the applicant's representative, is that a concern, or is that
18 going to be a problem to receive the easement for the waterline?
19
20 Frugoli: I don't think so.
21
22 Gonzales: Okay.
23
24 Frugoli: I will, I tried to get a hold of the property owner for today, but I will definitely
25 mention that to him, and if anything comes up, I'll contact you immediately
26 and let you know.
27
28 Nasir: And also for future development, the northern parcel, the sewer and gas will
29 have to be extended, because right now it's one parcel and it could have
30 been done right now through service lines, but not anymore at the moment,
31 it breaks. Or the other way around, if it will do something else for the bottom
32 one, they will have to extend the waterline for future development on the
33 southern parcel.
34
35 Gonzales: Okay.
36
37 Nasir: Because the waterline is only along Pecan, and the gas and sewer is only
38 along Jefferson.
39
40 Gonzales: So there's no waterline along Poose Creek or Jefferson that actually
41 currently services the home that's located on Lot 1?
42
43 Nasir: That is correct. That's why I'm asking for an easement from lot to lot.
44
45 Gonzales: Okay.
46

1 Nasir: Because the water right now is connected on Pecan, and the meter is on
2 Pecan.

3
4 Gonzales: Okay.

5
6 Nasir: And the rest is, it will be an easement from Lot 1 to Lot 2, or whatever lot
7 will be.

8
9 Gonzales: Okay. So yes, that would be subject to the easement in order to actually
10 get the services basically extended.

11
12 Nasir: And we don't need that easement to be dedicated to Las Cruces Utilities, it
13 will have to be dedicated from lot owner to lot owner.

14
15 Gonzales: Okay. Any other comments related to the plat?

16
17 Nasir: No. I apologize. I skipped that.

18
19 Gonzales: Okay. So with that I would entertain a motion with the approval of the two
20 conditions that we've now outlined. I would say the conditions of plat being
21 filed by December 31, 2025, for the Parkland Dedication Requirement, or
22 fee in lieu. And the second condition being that the easement for the
23 waterline extension to be dedicated onto the plat as an easement for utility
24 services. I will take a motion.

25
26 Nasir: So moved.

27
28 Gonzales: And a second.

29
30 Danner: Second.

31
32 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

33
34 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

35
36 Gonzales: Any opposed? Okay, this moves forward to the Planning and Zoning
37 Commission for a recommendation for waiver, and then condition for P&Z
38 action for Lujan Tracts as an approval.

39
40 Frugoli: Great. Thank you.

41
42 **3.7 Case No. 24CS0500117: Coyote Run Master Plan**

- 43
44
45
46
- A request for approval of a Master Plan known as Coyote Run Subdivision.
 - The proposed subdivision encompasses approximately 25.095 acres, is a multi-zoned property with R-1a/R-1b and R-3/R-4/C-2 and located

1 approximately 642 feet west of the intersection of Thurmond Road and
2 Settlers Pass.

- 3 • The master plan proposes to have a mixed-use development with 3.07
4 ± acres of non-residential land uses and 18.81 ± acres of residential land
5 uses.
- 6 • The subdivision will dedicate a 0.406 ± acre tract of land for the
7 expansion of Thurmond Road.
- 8 • Submitted by Moy Surveying, Representative.

9

10 Gonzales: Okay. We're going to swap people. Last application. Once again,
11 everyone, we are going to hear, or I'd ask to suspend the rules as we do
12 have the Coyote Run. Well, we can go ahead and just keep them
13 separated. We'll go ahead and hear Coyote Run Master Plan first, which is
14 Case 24CS0500117. I will go to staff.

15

16 Castillo: Good morning. Today we have a request for approval of a master plan
17 known as Coyote Run Subdivision. The proposed subdivision
18 encompasses approximately 25.095 acres. It's a multi-zone property that
19 contains R-1a, R-1b, R-3, R-4, and C-2. The property is located
20 approximately 642 feet west of the intersection of Thurmond Road and
21 Settlers Pass. The master plan proposes to have a mixed-use development
22 with 3.07 acres of non-residential development and 18.81 acres of
23 residential land use or residential development. The subdivision will
24 dedicate approximately 0.406 acre tract of land for the expansion of
25 Thurmond Road. And this was submitted by Moy Surveying as the
26 representative.

27

28 Gonzales: Okay. Is there anything additional the applicant would like to add?

29

30 Magallanez: No.

31

32 Gonzales: Okay. Then we will go around the room to see if there's any comments or
33 conditions placed onto this. I will start with engineering.

34

35 Reeder: Like previous, we're going to move forward with the contingency that
36 drainage is reviewed and addressed as the permitting process moves
37 forward in case there's any layout changes or if there's any flood changes
38 so that we can address those before we have that permit out. And we're
39 not doing any backtracking work.

40

41 Gonzales: Okay. Parks and Recreation.

42

43 Harrison-Rogers: So this is going to be really similar to some of the other things that we've
44 talked about. We really don't have an issue with the master plan. I know
45 that we had a lot of discussions about this would be a great location for a
46 park. The ordinance related to a previous annexation in this area was

1 reviewed. We actually were told that we can ask for a park, but we can't
2 require a park per that annexation ordinance that required 10 acres. And
3 so with that they are still subject to park impact fees related to individual
4 construction permits. And depending upon when this particular project gets
5 recorded, they may or may not be subject to a fee in lieu for park dedication
6 per Realize Las Cruces, which is a separate and distinct issue from the
7 annexation ordinance that had required some park dedication. Totally
8 distinct and separate. And I've done a down and dirty calculation of that,
9 but I'll talk about that at the preliminary plot rather than the master plan,
10 unless you want to hear it now.

11
12 Gonzales: So I think in the case of the master plan, knowing that the master plan would
13 go to the Planning and Zoning Commission for final action, if this moves
14 forward to our September meeting, if this were to be approved that would
15 technically be the approval. Would it still be conditioned upon dedication?
16 Because technically that is their approval. There would be no file date
17 associated with it.

18
19 Harrison-Rogers: Okay. Yes, no. If it gets approved before the December 31st date,
20 then no fee in lieu for park dedication would be required. If something
21 happens and it gets delayed, then yes, they might be. In which case, we
22 can get you that number.

23
24 Gonzales: Okay. Does that clarify for the applicant? So essentially if we go to the
25 Planning and Zoning Commission in September, if the case is approved,
26 then that considers the master plan approved. And then we would move
27 forward with essentially the approved land uses you have in place. If it does
28 not get approved, and it is not approved until after December 31, 2025, then
29 it would be subject to Realize Las Cruces park dedication or fee in lieu
30 requirements.

31
32 Magallanez: And that's only specific to the master plan?

33
34 Gonzales: Correct.

35
36 Magallanez: So we had mentioned, so if my understanding is correct, the park dedication
37 fee in lieu is required at the recording of the master plan? Or what was the
38 recording of a preliminary plan or final plan at that point? Does this, I guess
39 I'm just confused with the master plan part of it versus this. Because is this
40 getting recorded via final plan?

41
42 Harrison-Rogers: The master plan vests it, I think is what Sara was indicating.

43
44 Magallanez: Okay.

1 Harrison-Rogers: So the master plan, like the approval of the master plan would then vest
2 what comes after.
3
4 Magallanez: Okay.
5
6 Harrison-Rogers: If there was no master plan, we'd be talking about the recording of a
7 plat.
8
9 Magallanez: And so therefore, as long as this got done by December 2025 and approved
10 by P&Z, then we would not be subject to a park dedication or fee in lieu of
11 for the preliminary plan, even if that is in fact recorded in December of 2026,
12 let's say, or completed whenever that might be in 2026?
13
14 Gonzales: That is correct. Because the master plan ...
15
16 Magallanez: I think it's just approved by P&Z, right, is that the for the master plan, yes.
17
18 Gonzales: And the master plan just, essentially the master plan will vest basically your
19 land uses and the layout that's basically being proposed.
20
21 Magallanez: Got you. Okay. So then we're just subject to the master plan's deadline of
22 December 2025, not the preliminary plan, or what would be the final plan
23 then at that point could be thereafter?
24
25 Gonzales: Correct. So point of clarification. So you would have a vested master plan
26 if your preliminary plan does come in and get approved, and development
27 takes place within that two-year timeframe, because preliminary plans also
28 do expire.
29
30 Magallanez: Sure. Yes.
31
32 Gonzales: So if any point in which the preliminary plan expires, then the master plan
33 will expire, and now you're subject to whatever the current code would be.
34
35 Magallanez: At that time.
36
37 Gonzales: Correct.
38
39 Magallanez: Got you. So we'd have a two-year window to complete a preliminary plan if
40 this was done by December 2025 to then be vested and not have to face a
41 park dedication or fee in lieu of. Got you.
42
43 Gonzales: Correct.
44
45 Harrison-Rogers: If you want that calculation, I can give it to you. Do you want that
46 calculation?

1
2 Magallanez: I think the developer might want to hear what that calculation is.
3
4 Harrison-Rogers: All right. So if things go sideways for whatever reason, the park
5 dedication for this particular would be 0.1464 of an acre, which comes out
6 to \$74,371.20 for a fee in lieu.
7
8 Magallanez: We'll wait here for September meeting.
9
10 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.
11
12 Gonzales: So nothing additional. So we've gone through Parks. Anything additional
13 from Parks and Recreation? Okay. Utilities.
14
15 Nasir: Yes, we do have a condition of approval, and it was the variance for the gas
16 layout on the street. We will be approving the layout as it is right now
17 because right now it's just going on the loop, and what happens is when
18 you're on one side of the street, you're on the north side, and when you're
19 on the other one, you're on the south side.
20
21 Magallanez: On the southside. Right.
22
23 Nasir: And we do have it that all of it needs to be there on one side because it's
24 the loop. We will be okay approving that variance. We just need to have it.
25
26 Magallanez: You had to process the variance.
27
28 Nasir: Yes.
29
30 Magallanez: Is that your preference, just to stay on one side versus...
31
32 Nasir: Yes, because we don't want to have it crossing, especially because we don't
33 have water. The water out there is not... it's Moongate yes. And we don't
34 have sewer there. So we would like, we don't have a problem having it on
35 the loop instead of crossing back and forth.
36
37 Magallanez: Right. Okay.
38
39 Nasir: Because you will be doing the same thing with water and sewer. You will
40 be crossing back and forth. I think it's more practical.
41
42 Magallanez: RIGHT.
43
44 Nasir: To have it on one side or to have it looped together without crossing back.
45
46 Magallanez: Without crossing back to keep it consistent on one side of the street.

1
2 Gonzales: Yes.
3
4 Nasir: We just need to have a variance to have it documented, and so everyone
5 else knows that.
6
7 Magallanez: Again design standards as well.
8
9 Nasir: That is correct.
10
11 Gonzales: Okay. Fire department.
12
13 Danner: No comments. But just kind of a heads up. I think the way it was laid out
14 was like 20 lots, I believe it was, something like that.
15
16 Magallanez: Yes.
17
18 Danner: So in the event that layout changes or stuff like that happened, just be aware
19 that if you go over 30 lots we're going to need an additional access to that
20 area. And it can't be, it has to be, the two access points has to be no less
21 than a third of the total diagonal left of the property. So they essentially just
22 have to be on opposite sides.
23
24 Magallanez: Got you.
25
26 Danner: Other than that, we're good.
27
28 Magallanez: Okay. We're constrained by not having septic, so we don't anticipate having
29 more lots.
30
31 Danner: Got you.
32
33 Magallanez: Like we won't have more lots. Yes. Thank you.
34
35 Gonzales: Anything from Public Works?
36
37 Bass: No comments from Public Works.
38
39 Gonzales: Anything additional from staff or the applicant? Okay. With that I'd entertain
40 a motion for Coyote Run master plan approval?
41
42 Danner: So moved.
43
44 Gonzales: And a second?
45
46 Reeder: Second.

1
2 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

3
4 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5
6 Gonzales: Any opposed?. Okay. So master plan is moving forward with a
7 recommendation of approval.

8
9 **3.8 Case No. 23CS0500099: Coyote Run Preliminary Plat**

- 10 • A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat known as Coyote Run
11 Subdivision.
12 • The proposed subdivision encompasses 25.095 ± acres, is a multi-
13 zoned property with R-1a/R-1b and R-3/R-4/C-2 and located
14 approximately 642 feet west of the intersection of Thurmond Road and
15 Settlers Pass.
16 • The preliminary plat proposes twenty (20) large residential lots and one
17 (1) non-residential lot.
18 • The subdivision will dedicate a 0.406 ± acre tract of land for the
19 expansion of Thurmond Road.
20 • Submitted by Moy Surveying, Representative.

21
22 Gonzales: We will now go to our final case on the agenda. This is case 23CS0500099,
23 Coyote Run preliminary plat. I will turn to John with staff.

24
25 Castillo: So we have a request for approval of a preliminary plat, also known as
26 Coyote Run. As we know, it encompasses 25.095 acres. It is a multi-zoned
27 property, which is located approximately 642 feet west of the intersection of
28 Thurmond Road and Settlers Pass. So the preliminary plat proposes 20
29 large residential lots and one non-residential lot. The subdivision will
30 dedicate roughly a 0.406 acre tract of land for the expansion of Thurmond
31 Road. And once again, this was submitted by a Moy Surveying as a
32 representative.

33
34 Gonzales: Okay. Anything additional from the applicant? Okay. Seeing that, we'll go
35 around the room once again. I will start with Engineering on any concerns
36 with the preliminary plat.

37
38 Reeder: Same thing for drainage. Since we'll handle that under the master plan,
39 they just coincide.

40
41 Gonzales: Okay. Parks and Recreation.

42
43 Harrison-Rogers: I have no information outside of what we already discussed related to
44 the timing of approval and fees in lieu.

45
46 Gonzales: Utilities.

1
2 Nasir: We do have the condition that we put on every plat that the final plat will be
3 approved upon approval of the final set of subdivision construction plats.
4
5 Gonzales: Okay. And Fire Department.
6
7 Danner: Nothing.
8
9 Gonzales: And Public Works.
10
11 Bass: No comments.
12
13 Gonzales: All right. Seeing no comments or any additional, I would entertain a motion
14 for the preliminary plat.
15
16 Nasir: So moved.
17
18 Gonzales: And a second?
19
20 Danner: Second.
21
22 Gonzales: Okay. All those in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
23
24 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
25
26 Gonzales: Any opposed? All right, seeing none. Then this will move forward again to
27 P&Z, This I believe it's September 23rd's meeting as far as the Planning
28 and Zoning Commission with recommendation of approval from DRC.
29
30 Magallanez: Sounds good.
31
32 Gonzales: All right. Thank you.
33
34 Magallanez: Thank you, guys.
35
36 **4. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
37
38 Gonzales: Okay. Do we have any additional discussion items from staff? I know we're
39 still in the transition phase, so I'm just, you know, I'm going to bring up that
40 it's very difficult. We're going back and forth. We are trying to get a lot of
41 people moving forward with Realize Las Cruces so we can start
42 implementing those goals and those plans and policies. And so it could be,
43 you know we're still tugging at going back and forth for the next four or five
44 months. The hope would be is that by January we're all under Realize and
45 we have a clear understanding of what would be required by applicants. As
46 they are coming in, we are working with them to let them know they can use

1 either code. It's just you know we're trying to move forward with writing our
2 reports and understanding what's going to be the expectations moving
3 forward in January.
4

5 Harrison-Rogers: Okay.
6

7 **5. ADJOURNMENT (09:10 a.m.)**
8

9 Gonzales: So if there's any other comments or nothing, I would entertain a motion to
10 adjourn.
11

12 Danner: So moved.
13

14 Gonzales: And a second.
15

16 Nasir: Second.
17

18 Gonzales: All in favor?
19

20 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 Chairperson