

STATE OF TEXAS

**COUNTIES OF POTTER
AND RANDALL**

CITY OF AMARILLO

On the 13th Day of December 2017, The Greenways Public Improvement District (PID) Advisory Board met at 4:00 PM at the Greenways Development Office located at 6003 Tuscany Village, Amarillo, Texas, with the following people present:

VOTING MEMBERS	MEMBERS PRESENT	TOTAL NO. MEETINGS HELD SINCE APPOINTMENT	TOTAL NO. MEETINGS ATTENDED SINCE APPOINTMENT
Shane Brooks	No	15	14
Page Butler	Yes	10	9
Stephen Carter	Yes	12	8
Don Carthel	Yes	11	9
Kim Dryden	Yes	7	5

CITY OF AMARILLO STAFF:
Kelley Shaw, City of Amarillo
Leslie Schmidt, Asst. City Attny
Stephanie Coggins, City Budget Analyst

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:
Eddie Scott, Developer
Muff London, Developer

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes from August 18, 2017 meeting

Mr. Shaw opened the meeting and established a quorum. Mr. Shaw then asked if there were any questions or corrections to the meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes of the August 18, 2017 meeting was made by Mr. Carthel and seconded by Mr. Butler and carried unanimously.

ITEM 2: Discuss how PID maintenance/operation and associated assessments apply to commercial lots within Greenways PID boundaries.

Mr. Shaw asked Mrs. London to please lead this discussion. Mrs. London began by explaining that there are commercial lots now being sold and who are subject to PID assessments. Mrs. London said that questions are being asked as to what benefit commercial lot owners receive by paying assessments? Although commercial lots are subject to assessments, currently there is no plan or process that takes care of their landscaping that is put in like the parkways or perimeter landscaping elsewhere in the Greenways.

Mrs. London has asked Mr. Shaw what the Colonies do in this regard and was told the Colonies newest area along Hillside is landscaped and maintained with PID funding. There is a commercial development in the Greenways that is wanting to put in very nice landscaping but would like to have PID help with the maintenance since they are paying PID assessments. Mrs. London asked Board members for their comments on what they thought would be the best way to address this situation?

Mrs. Dryden stated she felt that something might need to be done because there may be a case where a particular property manager does not maintain their landscape to acceptable levels. Mr. Butler asked if the same restrictions that apply to homeowners would apply to commercial lot owners? Mrs. London stated that moving forward CCRs could be written to require something like that but it would not be retroactive.

Mr. Butler asked what does the City require? Mr. Shaw stated that business were held to typical landscaping standards and nothing more. Mr. Carthel suggested that the PID could maintain whatever landscaping is installed back to the property line whether it meets City standards or is more than City requires. Mr. Carter pointed out that the developments are different and no standard landscaping will exist. Mr. Scott stated being unfamiliar with PIDs in the beginning, he just assumed commercial lots would do something nice and maintain it and that the homeowner restrictions were what needed to be addressed.

Mrs. Dryden stated that she would be in favor of the property owner installing all improvements and paying for water, but PID assessments could be used for the maintenance of the landscaping (excluding water). Mr. Butler agreed that seemed like a reasonable way to handle the situation. Mrs. Dryden clarified that it would be only for those improvements within the right-of-way. Mrs. London then stated they also needed to consider all aspects and Mr. Carter brought up tree maintenance. Mrs. London then stated she would need to discuss a breakdown of responsibility with Ramirez Landscaping. Mr. Carter asked who replaces trees? The Board then clarified that PID assessments would be responsible for maintenance only and not installation, replacement, or watering. Mrs. London stated she would get with Mr. Ramirez regarding what he would charge.

ITEM 3 Discuss future park improvements and associated maintenance of any improvements

Mrs. London began by stating they were redesigning new parkway and wanted input from Board on design and maintenance. Drainage was redesigned with new dirt work. Mrs. London believes design will direct water the way it should go and that was her main focus and concern. But she would not be opposed to perhaps a gazebo or pocket benches but didn't want to get to elaborate and needed to focus more on drainage than "recreational" elements and wanted to know if Board thought the same. Mr. Carthel thought that southern area already addressed those type of recreational elements. The Board generally agreed with this direction of "design" and improvements. The Board still questioned the necessity of the City's drainage fee in this area.

ITEM 4: Discuss and consider impact of new parkway improvements on current Greenways PID maintenance contract

Mr. Shaw stated he added this to the agenda as this was an item within the maintenance contract that will need to be addressed at some point. Mrs. London stated that there is still a lot of discussion needed before this can be detailed and addressed. She will get with him and will bring back to board.

ITEM 5: Discuss future agenda items

There was no discussion.

ITEM 6: Adjourn meeting

No further comments were made and the meeting was adjourned.