

**STATE OF TEXAS**

**COUNTIES OF POTTER  
AND RANDALL**

**CITY OF AMARILLO**

On the 25<sup>th</sup> Day of April 2018, The Greenways Public Improvement District (PID) Advisory Board met at 3:30 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	Resigned	15	14
Page Butler	Yes	11	10
Stephen Carter	No	13	8
Don Carthel	Yes	12	10
Kim Dryden	Yes	8	6

**CITY OF AMARILLO STAFF:**

Kelley Shaw, City of Amarillo  
Leslie Schmidt, Asst. City Attny

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Eddie Scott, Developer  
Muff London, Developer

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes from December 13, 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 December 13, 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 stated this item was to continue the discussion held at the last meeting regarding how, if at all, the PID Board wanted to participate in using PID funds to maintain landscaping on private commercial properties. Mr. Shaw stated that the Board indicated at the last meeting they would consider, on a case by case basis, using PID funds for maintenance of landscaping located between the back-of-curb and property line but would not be inclined to participate in the installation/construction or repairs of any improvements and would not assist with any water bills.

Ms. London stated that she would discuss with Mr. Ramirez how any additional maintenance might impact his current work load.

Mr. Shaw then introduced Mr. Josh Langham, who is involved in the construction of a retail center at the corner of Greenways Dr. and Hillside, to discuss his project and potential request for assistance through PID funding. Mr. Langham stated how important it was to them to have their improvements enhance the character of the Greenways neighborhood. He stated he believed by installing appropriate landscaping and other improvements, he is also investing in the PID and the neighborhood.

He is asking that the PID board consider participating in the project by funding the landscaping and flat work outside the masonry wall as well as the maintenance costs of same.

Mr. Shaw asked for clarification on what would be improved and deeded to the City after Mr. Langham stated they felt it would be more cost effective to construct the project then deed the improvements to the City without going through the bidding process like the Colonies PID did. Mr. Langham said there were some landscaping that was inside the property but still outside the wall that would be deeded as common area. Mr. Shaw stated that if there was any reimbursement being considered, the current policy dictated the project would have to be publically bid to which Mr. Langham stated they could do that if necessary but timing wise would prefer them to construct and then deed the improvements over. Ms. Dryden stated she would prefer, if possible, to have improvements done without the bidding process as many times the lowest bidder is not the best one to do the job.

Mr. Shaw then discussed how projects that are going to be involved in any kind of reimbursement request has to be done according to current PID policy and the approved petition that established the PID. Ms. Dryden questioned if the PID's landscape contractor couldn't do the job and be paid? Mr. Shaw stated that he thought if the PID had current funds to do the job, that could be done. But if any reimbursement at a later time came, the developer would have to request it and the project would have to be bid. Ms. London asked how could someone other than the developer be reimbursed for work done. Mr. Shaw stated that, in his opinion, only the developer could request to be reimbursed at a later date. Discussion followed regarding bids and if Mr. Ramirez would bid.

Mr. Langham expressed his concern that the timing could be problematic if having to go through the City's bidding process. Mr. Langham estimated the project would be somewhere around \$90K to \$100K. Mr. Shaw asked Ms. Schmidt to clarify what he mentioned earlier about the potential of a property owner making new improvements in which the PID had enough current funds to pay for it. Ms. Schmidt stated that she was of the opinion that if improvements were constructed and PID funds were requested to pay the owner back (or anyone), the project would be required to go through the public bidding process.

Ms. London asked when the improvements needed to be in by to which Mr. Langham said September 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Langham asked if a CO could be issued before the sidewalks were finished? Mr. Shaw stated he thought it would not be but to call Building Safety to get a definitive answer. Ms. London stated she thought it might be possible to get a design and bid the project to where the project might be finished by then. Mr. Shaw thought it would be difficult but if everything was done correctly and submitted very soon, it might be able to be done. Mr. Scott stated he has gone to great lengths to get the neighborhood looking like it does and hopes that steps could be taken to make sure the commercial properties will enhance and not detract from the character of the neighborhood because up to now he has paid for many things but he will not be around forever to continue to do that.

Ms. London suggested that if the Board wanted to go beyond paying for maintenance of the landscaping associated with the new development and pay for the installation, that maybe the installation could be incorporated into the design and installation of the park improvements. Mr. Carthel restated that the Board had agreed that they would consider paying for maintenance only. Mr. Shaw stated that he still needed to consult with Legal on if the PID could, even going through the public bidding process, reimburse someone other than the Developer.

Ms. London asked if PID Board needed to make a motion to get the project incorporated with the park improvements. Mr. Shaw said no motion was needed but the project would just need to be put together and put forth to the board for approval and then follow the bidding process. Ms. London then showed a brief video presentation of the Greenways play lake area.

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

Ms. London made a video presentation of the proposed park improvements behind the retail spaces. As the video played, Board members asked general questions related to materials, lighting, etc. Ms. London explained how these improvements would tie into the parkway to the south. She also stated how the improvements would be a great buffer between the retail businesses and the residents. She then asked the Board if they wanted her to move forward by continuing to work with Mr. Cleve Turner on putting the design together for the improvements. Ms. London stated that she was being very conscious regarding the type of plantings and maintenance needed. She estimated the improvements would be \$650K and wanted the Board to let her know if she was on the right track so she could continue to move forward. The Board indicated that they thought she should move forward. Ms. London stated she would move forward on putting the project design and packet together.

ITEM 4:        Discuss future agenda items

Mr. Butler asked when the next meeting would occur. Mr. Shaw said he would let everyone know as soon as possible. There was no other discussion.

ITEM 5:        Adjourn meeting

No further comments were made and the meeting was adjourned.