

1                                   **REALIZE LAS CRUCES AD HOC COMMITTEE COMMISSION**

2  
3   Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Realize Las Cruces Ad Hoc  
4   Committee Meeting held Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

5  
6   **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- 7       Christopher Brown
- 8       Daniel G. Buck
- 9       Paul Dulin
- 10      Arturo Duran
- 11      David G. Lynch
- 12      John Moscato
- 13      George Pearson
- 14      Paul Pompeo
- 15      Luis Rios
- 16      Dawn Sanchez
- 17      Sharon Thomas

18  
19   **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

- 20      Dan Carter
- 21      Sara Gonzales
- 22      Scott Kaiser
- 23      Ken Odenheim

24  
25   **STAFF PRESENT:**

- 26      Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Senior Planner
- 27      David Sedillo, Director of Public Works
- 28      Tony Trevino, Deputy Directory Public Works
- 29      David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
- 30      Natashia Billy, Senior Engineer, Public Works
- 31      Michael Kinney, Development Engineer, Community Development
- 32      Steve Pacheco, Senior Engineer , Public Works
- 33      Kyle Arend, Engineering Administrator, Public Works

34  
35   **1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order. David Weir volunteered to  
36   sit in as Chair.

37  
38   **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES -**

- 39      • **January 4, 2023:** Moved and seconded to approve minutes of January 4,  
40      2023. Motion passed unanimously.

41  
42   **3. POSTPONEMENTS:** None.

43  
44   **4. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

45  
46   **4.1 Design Standards Section 5 - Drainage, Flood Control and Erosion**

1                   • **Section 3-4 Zoning Procedures**  
2

3 David Weir started the discussion of Section 5. Katherine Harrison-Rogers  
4 created a handout containing the comments from Board Members and the  
5 current Section 5 was passed out. Board Members discussed concerns  
6 about arroyos and natural drainage ways. FEMA does not recognize  
7 arroyos smaller than 150 CFS. The consultant is working on the regulations  
8 for local builders concerning arroyos. The suggestion was made to  
9 emphasize more strongly regulations and incentives to try to retain and use  
10 precipitation water. There was concern about having State Statute included  
11 in this Code and that there are currently references in this draft to flood zone  
12 types that do not exist in Las Cruces. Some Members have concerns about  
13 the organization and structure of the document. Katherine Harrison-Rogers  
14 went over the comments submitted by Board Members. There was a  
15 question about wind erosion. Comments were made about pages 318 and  
16 320 regarding unclear wording of erosion protection standards. There were  
17 concerns about page 321 regarding revegetation requirements and  
18 irrigation systems. Staff also has the same concerns and will be taking them  
19 to the consultant. There was a discussion about erosion and slopes and  
20 soil types. The current process for developers is to submit their SWPPP at  
21 the same time as the rest of their design documents. That is not expected  
22 to change. Page 319 Section 3a and page 326 Section 9a discuss SWPPP  
23 development and submittal. The document references NM DOT regulations  
24 and EPA requirements.  
25

26 The next item of discussion was stormwater management. A suggestion  
27 was made to include incentives for developers who submit plans for  
28 harvesting stormwater. The problem with this is that homeowners do not  
29 maintain the small ponds on their properties and the water still runs down  
30 the road, creating a safety hazard. Staff and consultant are trying to include  
31 green infrastructure as much as possible. Pages 322 through 325 have  
32 several references to violations of other regulations and laws and should be  
33 reorganized out of the sections on erosion control and stormwater  
34 management. There was concern about the water quality section being  
35 more like ordinance than design standard. There was discussion regarding  
36 the current wind erosion ordinance and that the City adheres to State and  
37 Federal regulations. City Staff have not had a chance to review this  
38 document, so they will be doing that after this meeting. This document is  
39 very different from the earlier version. Concern was raised regarding  
40 enforcement of Item 6.b.5. This section concerns allowances when the  
41 guidelines overlap with other departments such as the Utilities Department.  
42 Board Members are concerned that the new Code document is too specific  
43 and many things should be moved to a more easily modified manual while  
44 the standards remain more general. There was discussion about how  
45 different the storms are in this area compared to the rest of the country and  
46 how the design of roadways and drainage systems needs to be different

1 because of that. Board Members are interested in having discussion with  
2 the consultants when convenient. Members were interested in having the  
3 word "arroyo" more clearly defined. On page 327, item F there is an  
4 indication that "additional requirements may be requested from the  
5 operator" and that seems too vague. Board Members ask for further  
6 clarification here. There will be a glossary attached when the document is  
7 finished for all the terms. Page 331 section ix is too broad and needs to be  
8 tightened up for the Las Cruces area. No variances will be allowed in flood  
9 zones. Page 332, section vii is unclear about which studies and maps need  
10 to be done and to whom they should be submitted. Some of this section  
11 comes verbatim from NFIP and FEMA.

12  
13 Section E refers to incorporation of green infrastructure. It is not very in-  
14 depth. There was discussion regarding pervious concrete. Maintenance is  
15 an issue with this material.

16  
17 Section F refers to drainage and stormwater quality submittals. Staff is not  
18 satisfied with this section but they have not had a chance to work on it.

19  
20 Section G speaks of drainage system operation and maintenance. There  
21 was discussion about the difference between a master drainage study and  
22 a final drainage study. On page 338 section vii, it was suggested to add a  
23 recommendation that curb and gutter capture stormwater. There was  
24 discussion regarding situations when capturing stormwater may not be  
25 appropriate or safe.

26  
27 Staff requested Board Members to submit more comments for discussion  
28 at the next meeting.

- 29  
30 **5. UPCOMING MEETING DISCUSSION ITEMS:** To be determined.  
31  
32 **6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** None.  
33  
34 **7. ADJOURNMENT (4:50):** It was moved and seconded to adjourn. Motion passed  
35 unanimously.

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson