



## COUNCIL MINUTES

September 9, 2004

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in a Study Session in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on September 9, 2004 at 7:31 a.m.

### COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker  
Rex Griswold  
Kyle Jones  
Tom Rawles  
Janie Thom  
Claudia Walters  
Mike Whalen

### COUNCIL ABSENT

None

### OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson  
Barbara Jones  
Debbie Spinner

Councilmember Rawles was present until 7:54 a.m., but he continued his participation in the meeting via telephonic equipment until 8:17 a.m. (during the discussion of agenda item #2), at which time Mayor Hawker excused him from the remainder of the meeting.

Councilmember Whalen was present for the discussion and consideration of agenda item #2. Mayor Hawker excused him from the remainder of the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

(Items on the agenda were discussed out of order, but for purposes of clarity will remain as listed on the agenda.)

### 1. Hear an update on the Mesa Arts Center.

Deputy City Manager Debra Dollar advised that the grand opening of the Arts Center is scheduled to occur in approximately one year. She stated that staff was present to provide an update on future programming and events, and to outline some of the issues that will be brought forward for Council action during the next year.

Arts and Cultural Director Gerry Fathauer provided an update on the types of facilities that will be available at the Arts Center.

City Engineer Keith Nath displayed a PowerPoint presentation (a copy is available for review in the City Clerk's Office), and he noted that the project is on

schedule for completion in February 2005. Mr. Nath also provided information on the status of the studios, galleries and theaters.

Financial Services Manager Bryan Raines continued the presentation by providing information on the ten-year Quality of Life program, which includes funding for the Mesa Arts Center. He reported that the Arts Center operational expenses are less than anticipated to date, and he also noted that Quality of Life revenues are lower than anticipated.

Materials Management Director Sharon Seekins advised that beginning in September a series of contracts would be presented to the Council for action regarding the purchase of furniture, fixtures and equipment (FF&E). She added that contracts would also be brought forward for Council consideration regarding catering and concessionaire services, a retail store operation and custodial services.

Ms. Fathauer stated that the Arts Center offers more than 700 adult and youth classes, and she advised that many opportunities exist for collaborative programming with Mesa Public Schools, Mesa Community College and other organizations that benefit students and at-risk youth. She added that a proposal would be forthcoming regarding affiliate organizations, policies and procedures, and parking plans.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Mesa Arts Center affiliate organizations are likely to continue to request City funding, that some funds would be returned to the City in the form of facility rental payments; and that the projected Arts Center operating costs are net of income.

In response to a request from Mayor Hawker, Mr. Nath clarified that the total budget for the Arts Center remains at \$94.5 million, and that Layton has a contract for a substantial part of that amount. He explained that the additional contracts that were awarded to Layton were not "cost over runs," but rather services that the City originally planned to award as separate contracts. He further stated that staff realized that it would be more cost-effective and efficient to have the contractor already on site perform these jobs.

Mayor Hawker thanked staff for the presentation.

2. Hear a report, discuss and consider the Design Review Board recommended changes to the site plan for the Light Rail Transit Center at Main & Sycamore which will result in an additional \$300,000 cost to the City.

Assistant Development Services Manager Jeff Martin reported that the Design Review Board (DRB) has recommended changes to the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) Center at Main and Sycamore. He noted that the Traction Power Substation (TPS) Building is the facility that provides power to the LRT system. Mr. Martin advised that the DRB prefers to locate the building further away from Main Street at the rear of the property, which would cause the City to incur additional costs of approximately \$300,000.

Principal Planner Laura Hyneman noted that a comparison of the issues discussed at the DRB's July 20<sup>th</sup> meeting (see Attachment 1) was distributed to each member of the Council along with copies of Site Plan A, which was approved by the DRB, and Site Plan B, the alternative plan supported by Valley Metro Rail (Copies of the site plans are available for review in the City Clerk's Office). Ms. Hyneman summarized the background and issues related to the Transit Center as outlined in the Council Report.

Mr. Martin advised that representatives of Valley Metro Rail were present to address the issue.

Betsy Moll, Manager of Architecture/Urban Design for Valley Metro Rail, introduced Ken Caswell, Managing Architect for the Valley Metro Rail consulting group.

Mr. Caswell stated that Valley Metro Rail is striving to develop a cost-effective, useful transit system, and he advised that Valley Metro Rail recommends Site B as the best alternative to serve the system. He added that the building and the landscaping would buffer the noise between the bus operations and the adjacent transit-oriented development.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, Alan Friend, Systems Project Engineer for Valley Metro Rail, explained that locating the building further away from the transit line would result in higher energy costs and increase the potential for maintenance problems.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Site A's increased operational costs would be more significant than the \$300,000 expense to relocate the building; that Site A would negatively impact the system operator's visual site access; that 15 similar buildings are planned to serve the LRT system; that Site B does not pose a safety issue for pedestrians; and that Site B's plans include architectural treatments and extensive landscaping that will serve as noise buffers.

Pete Berzins, Chairman of the Design Review Board (DRB), reported that the Board devoted a considerable amount of time to this issue. He advised that the Board's recommendation for Site A reflected their concern regarding the aesthetics of a building that would be in place for 20 to 30 years. Mr. Berzins stated that the operator's facility is in the same location on both site plans, and he expressed the opinions that the proposal for Site A provides the operator a better view of the tracks, improved access to parking facilities, and a more effective noise buffer for transit-oriented development.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that access to the LRT parking lot attempts to minimize the impact of traffic on the Sycamore neighborhood; that the site lease agreement requires access to the lot from Main Street; and that City of Mesa and Valley Metro Rail traffic engineers have approved the plan.

Councilmember Jones advised that his primary concern is the mechanical aspect of the Light Rail Transit System rather than the cost.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that the "operator's facility" referred to by Mr. Berzins is actually a restroom and break room for LRT personnel; that the operator of the system would be located in the Traction Power Substation Building; and that selecting Site A could negatively impact the location of a future substation if the LRT system was extended further east.

Councilmember Rawles advised that his major concern was the functionality of the system rather than the aesthetic features.

It was moved by Councilmember Rawles, seconded by Councilmember Griswold, that the Council approve Site B as the location for the Traction Power Substation Building.

Vice Mayor Walters thanked the Design Review Board for their efforts, and she noted that the City's boards and committees provide a valuable service. She advised that her support for Site B is based on her concerns regarding the potential operational risk posed by Site A.

Mayor Hawker indicated support for the motion, and he stated that his goal is to provide Mesa citizens access to the LRT system at the lowest possible cost.

Mayor Hawker called for the vote.

Carried unanimously.

3. Appointments to boards and committees.

Mayor Hawker recommended the following appointments to Boards and Committees:

MUSEUM AND CULTURAL ADVISORY BOARD

Lannee Eller                      Expiration of Term:    June 30, 2006

It was moved by Vice Mayor Walters, seconded by Councilmember Jones, that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendation and the appointment be confirmed.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES -        Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Thom-Walters  
NAYS -        None

ABSENT - Rawles-Whalen

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

4. Hear reports on meetings and/or conferences attended.

Councilmember Thom: Groundbreaking for Banner Baywood Hospital addition.

Vice Mayor Walters: Meeting with the freeholders.

Councilmember Griswold: Financing the Future Committee Meeting. Development Advisory Board Forum.

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson stated that the meeting schedule is as follows:

Thursday, September 16, 2004, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Monday, September 20, 2004, 3:00 p.m. – Fire Committee

Monday, September 20, 2004, TBA – Study Session

Monday, September 20, 2004, 5:45 p.m. – Council Meeting

Thursday, September 23, 2004, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

6. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

7. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

8. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 8:55 a.m.

---

KENO HAWKER,  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Study Session of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of September 2004. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

baa

Attachment

ATTACHMENT #5

**DRAFT -- NOT YET APPROVED BY THE DESIGN  
REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF MESA**

**MINUTES OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**SPECIAL MEETING  
July 20, 2004**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Planning Division Conference Room, 55 North Center, at 8:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Berzins  
Vince DiBella  
Tim Nielsen  
Dave Richins  
Rob Burgheimer  
Jillian Hagen

Laura Hyneman  
Debbie Archuleta  
John Wesley  
Jeff Martin  
Kari Kent  
Alan Sanderson  
Ken Caswell  
Betsy Moll  
Mike James  
Alan Friend

MEMBERS ABSENT

Randy Carter

1. Call to Order:

Chair Pete Berzins called the meeting to order at 8:11 a.m.

2. Design Review Case:

**CASE #: DR04-26**

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:  
REQUEST:**

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**

**OWNER:**

**APPLICANT:**

**Light Rail Transit Center**

NWC Sycamore and Main Street

Approval of the preliminary bus transfer facility and Park-and-Ride Lot designs.

District 3

City of Mesa

Jeff Martin, Assistant Development Services Manager, City of Mesa

**ARCHITECT:**

Ken Caswell, Architectural Manager, Valley Metro

**REQUEST:** Approval of a bus transfer facility, traction power substation, and operator facility

**SUMMARY:** Staffmember Laura Hyneman introduced Jeff Martin the City Project Manager for the Light Rail project and Alan Sanderson, City Traffic Engineer. Mr. Sanderson was sitting in for Kevin Wallace who has been involved with the project from the beginning.

Ken Caswell, Betsy Moll, and Mike James represented the case.

Ken Caswell stated that as they understood it the Board had two major concerns regarding this project. The TPSS building was too close to Main Street, and that there was a potential traffic conflict between the buses and cars entering the kiss and ride entrance. The other concern was with the design of the operator facility building. Regarding the operator facility the Board observed that the building was uninviting in terms of fenestration and the Board thought there might be opportunities such as additional glass to make it more inviting. Mr. Caswell stated this was not a public building so they wanted to be cautious. They moved the TPSS building to the north edge of the transit center. The building sits in a landscape area in the path of pedestrians from the park and ride.

Mr. Caswell stated they had reconfigured the kiss and ride so that parallel parking would not be encouraged but rather the kiss and ride would be like the airport where you pull in and exit the other side. Betsy Moll stated they had talked with Kevin Wallace and called other cities to find out it was common to have 5 or 6 spaces in the kiss and ride. Because the peak doesn't happen all at once. During the peak hours there would be a train every 10 minutes.

Mr. Caswell stated that the operator's facility had been opened up at the corners with glass or insulated panels for a more open effect so that the operator would have the ability to see almost 360°. He stated they had added horizontal louvers to provide shade on the western side of the building and an eyebrow of louvered canopies over the windows. He stated they wanted to maintain compatibility between the two buildings. He also stated the bus shelters would use the same shade system as the transit station with seats on both sides, louvers and overhead shade made of fabric.

Mr. Caswell stated that moving the TPSS building and the changes to the operator facility would cost an additional \$300,000 to the City of Mesa. He introduced Alan Friend of Valley Metro.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that the changes proposed would not change the amount of land being leased by the City for the transit facility. He confirmed that the sub lease of land had been appraised and approved by the FTA so they don't want to change the footprint of the project. This makes it difficult to move the kiss and ride. If the TPSS building is moved to the north it would allow the kiss and ride to have parking along both the west and the east sides of the drive lane.

Jeff Martin stated they have taken the project to the Council for enhancements in the past and the Council has been very reluctant to provide any more than base costs. He did not feel the Council would be supportive of the \$300,000 cost unless the changes were for purely safety reasons or operational reasons. He understands the Board's sentiments for the changes but he did not think they could get support of the Council.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed the reasons the TPSS cannot be underground are that water and electricity don't work together, the NFPA requires explosion proof cabinets, the building would have to be waterproof, the building would have to be above flood plain, and would require a smoke ventilation system.

Chair Pete Berzins then confirmed that if the Design Review Board approved the revised proposal the applicants would then have to go back to the City Council for approval of the additional funding.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen stated that if the TPSS building stays where it was originally proposed, the applicants had mentioned at the previous meeting the possibility of moving the kiss and ride to another location. She thought that the current location was difficult because you cannot turn into the kiss and ride if you are traveling east on Main. Betsy Moll stated that Kevin Wallace felt that passengers would not use the park and ride area as a kiss and ride lot because it was so far away from the station. They would only use the kiss and ride if it was close to the light rail station and the buses. She stated they did not have a definite preference for the kiss and ride location, because transit passengers will do what they want. It may be a concern, however for the adjacent developer.

Mike James stated that the parking area just north of the buses would be for handicap parking primarily.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed there was a concern that the original location TPSS building would block the proposed 'future retail' to the west of the transit site.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that Kevin Wallace thought the relationship between transit oriented development (TOD) and the bus stops were more uncommon than TOD and the light rail because buses are noisy and produce fumes. Betsy Moll stated there are maybe two examples nationwide. Ms. Hyneman then stated there would be 62' between the TPSS building and the face of curb of Main Street. Mr. Caswell stated they could create a plaza in that area. He stated there would be two entrances to the light rail; one at Main and Sycamore and the other west of that, at the main entry to the shopping center. Passengers using the western entry to the light rail would walk past the retail proposed west of the transit facility.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that one of his concerns at the previous meeting was that this was a poorly planned site plan. He thought that the problems were all related to the fact that there is too much being compressed onto a site that is too small. He questioned the \$300,000 price they quoted. He thought the revised proposal was a much better design than the original plan. He thought moving the TPSS building was a safety issue. He was concerned with the issue of people jay-walking across the street from the kiss and ride location. He thought moving the TPSS building location was a good compromise. He thought the changes to the operator building were better. His concerns with the project related to site design. He did not think putting a utility building along the street was a good idea.

Boardmember Dave Richins preferred moving the TPSS building to the revised location. He was concerned with the \$300,000 cost, but confirmed the cost of the project was 59 million dollars and Mesa's share of that would be approximately 26 million dollars. He thought that \$300,000 was a drop in the bucket. He thought that when the public builds things they have an obligation to engage good architecture and good design.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the original location was a safety concern. He thought people being dropped off at the kiss and ride would be boxed in by the building. He thought it was a case of form follow function. He thought it did not function well in the original location. He thought the revised location was a much better solution. He agreed the \$300,000 seemed high. The building had not changed so that would mean more than a \$1,000 a lineal foot to simply move the building 270'.

Alan Friend stated there were "eighteen 750 casing cables" which cost \$8.00 a foot to run to the building. He stated there are additional simulations that have to be run to determine what affect moving the building would have on the voltage for the system.

Boardmember Nielsen thought it was a matter of how the site functions. He appreciated seeing how the kiss and ride could extrapolate to the north. The original plans did not show that.

Jeff Martin confirmed Valley Metro Rail had reservations about moving the substation because of voltage drops. If the voltage drops the train may be slowed mid-way between substations. The safety issue is the negative return voltage. There is positive and negative and the rail completes the circuit back to the substation. The farther the distance between substations the rail potential goes up. They alarm at 50 volts and clamp at 70 volts. When it clamps you start generating straight currents off the rail. He stated there are some places in downtown Phoenix where the substations are very far apart, however, the TPSS buildings are usually 50' away from the tracks.

Mr. Martin stated he did not want to have a situation where the Design Review Board recommended the revised plan and then have Valley Metro tell the Council it won't work.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed the next substation would be at the Tempe Canal, approximately 1-1/2 miles away. He questioned why moving the TPSS building would be such a problem if the next substation were 1-1/2 miles away. Alan Friend stated that during maintenance you take substations out of operation. They had designed the system to maintain 625 volts in contingency operations, so they have redundancy in case something happens.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed that the \$300,000 was building relocation and running the simulation. He agreed there were several reasons why the building needed to be relocated, not just aesthetics. Whether the amount was \$100,000 or \$300,000 over the life of the project, which will basically be there forever, he was in favor of running it up the flagpole.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen was in favor of the revised plan. She liked the revised kiss and ride design with the additional spaces along the west. She liked the revisions to the operator's facility. She did have one suggestion, which was to increase the size of the awning so it extends beyond the building. She thought the awning would provide more shading. Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought it was important that it be understood that the changes to the operator facility were changes the Board felt were needed to improve the function of the building, not simply for aesthetic reasons. He reiterated that this project will be here forever theoretically, so what is the additional cost to have good design and good planning? The Board wants this plan to be successful. He thought the case was going to have to go to Council.

Chair Pete Berzins agreed with Ms. Hagen regarding the awnings. He also thought the Board had wanted the operator facility to tie in more with the surrounding facility. He thought the awnings should be more like the bus stops and the transit center. He thought those awnings would do more to break up the building and tie it into the site better. He still had issues with the kiss and ride. He thought it should be moved to the back. In lieu of moving it to the back and having the TPSS building where it was originally planned, he thought the kiss and ride should be moved to the west. Third from a traffic standpoint, he was still concerned that only west bound traffic could enter the kiss and ride. He thought the kiss and ride should be located so that people exit onto Main rather than entering off of Main. He confirmed there would be trains every 10 to 15 minutes so if there are 700 - 800 parking spaces, most of the passengers would be using the facility between 6:00 to 8:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., there could be a back up of cars onto Main for the kiss and ride.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer was concerned that the buses exiting onto Main would pull up as far as possible in their driveway and wait to pull out onto Main. This would obscure the kiss and ride area.

Chair Pete Berzins also did not understand why the kiss and ride was located between the pedestrian crossings. He was concerned people would jaywalk from the kiss and ride lot to the light rail. He thought that if the kiss and ride were moved north people would be more likely to walk to the lights. Regarding the building, he confirmed there were no changes to the actual TPSS building. His issues were site and traffic. If we are going to be stuck with this site we need to maximize what is there and make it work. From a public standpoint he thought the Board and the City needed to do this right now.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought that the kiss and ride would probably only be used by passengers coming from the east because there is not a lot of residential to the west and those people could go to the station at the Tempe Canal. He liked the idea of having the TPSS building moved as far north as possible. He thought the Board needed to look at this project from an economic development standpoint. He said in San Diego there is a lot economic development around the station. He thought that having the TPSS building along Main was counter to economic development.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer stated that if the revised plan isn't approved by Council, maybe the TPSS building could be reoriented to face more of a north south direction rather than east west. Then if they moved the kiss and ride out it would open up that area.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the property owner is insistent that there be an entry drive on this site.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed there was 300' between the main entrance drive into the shopping center to the west and this driveway.

Boardmember Rob Burghiemer confirmed with Alan Sanderson that the City would allow driveways closer than 300' apart. Mr. Sanderson did not understand the Board's traffic concerns regarding this site. He stated people traveling east would enter the transit facility through the main shopping center entrance. He thought people would drop off passengers at the closest, most convenient location. He felt that if the kiss and ride were moved it would not be used.

Chair Pete Berzins wondered how people would know not to enter the kiss and ride area traveling southbound from the parking lot to get out onto Main. There was some discussion regarding this issue. There is existing parking that ends just north of the proposed kiss and ride area. Mr. Sanderson stated that parking would need to be removed. Mr. Sanderson thought that the kiss and ride was set up would be more convenient for some people than others.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen thought the Board should see a comprehensive sign package for the project.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought people would be dropped off on Sycamore because it is closer to the light and you won't have to drive past the buses.

It was determined there would probably be 6 to 8 buses an hour. Alan Sanderson did not think people would jay walk, because they would be discouraging people from crossing tracks. Mr. Caswell stated that when you disembark you would have to step down off the platform, 21 ", then cross two tracks, then step over a curb, which is 8" to 10". The track way is large gravel.

Jeff Martin stated that staff would like to take both plans to Council and encourage the Board to speak to Council about their concerns. He stated the issue would come down to dollars. He appreciated the Board's work on this project and felt the project had been improved through this process.

Dave Richins confirmed with John Wesley that the site plan still needs to be approved by City Council.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer thought the Board should vote for what they believe is best.

Board member Jillian Hagen was concerned that if the Board recommends the revised plan and the Council does not approve the money, the applicants will build the original plan without changes. She thought that if the TPSS building stayed where it was originally proposed then there needed to be other changes, such as moving the kiss and ride.

Boardmember Rob Burgheimer confirmed that staff needed for the Board to make a decision at this meeting. They could assign conditions to an approval but they really could not delay the project by continuing anything. Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated it was important for the Board to make a decision. She stated it was all about compromise and what serves the greatest number of people in the best way, in the safest, and most affordable way.

Boardmember Tim Nielsen asked if they could still look at alternatives for the kiss and ride location. He suggested having more than one kiss and ride location. He confirmed the applicants needed a final decision on the project.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed that if the Board approves the revised plan then the project has to go to Council.

Boardmember Dave Richins liked the new operator facility. He suggested removing the kiss and ride and making it a plaza. He would prefer moving the TPSS building but wondered if it was really a viable alternative.

Boardmember Jillian Hagen thought that if you make a plaza you would be taking away the landscaping that buffers the TPSS building and the air conditioners. She did not think that a plaza with benches was a good idea next to the TPSS building.

Boardmember Dave Richins thought that the project should be designed as an economic development project.

Chair Pete Berzins confirmed with Betsy Moll that they knew they would have to go to Council for additional funding. Betsy Moll stated they are a consulting firm and they are OK with presenting the project to Council. He was concerned because if they had to go to Council it would not be heard until August 16<sup>th</sup>. They would have to push back the bid date.

Ken Caswell then suggested as a third alternative they eliminate the kiss and ride, turn the TPSS building so it faces north/south instead of east/west, move the air conditioning units so they are away from the pedestrians, create a landscaped, paved plaza, and move the entry drive to the west of the TPSS building.

Staffmember Laura Hyneman stated that the idea is to make this facility as user friendly as possible and the kiss and ride is considered a real amenity.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Rob Burgheimer and seconded by Jillian Hagen that the revised scheme presented July 20, 2004 for DR04-26 be approved.

If the additional money is not allocated, approve the original plan with the following conditions:

1. Reconfigure or relocate the kiss and ride location.
2. Reorienting the TPSS building and service lot so that it maximizes the pedestrian presence at the street and the mechanical equipment to moved away from Main Street.

Discussion: Jillian Hagen was concerned with how the TPSS building would be reconfigured. She wanted the air conditioning units in front of the building instead of at the end of the building. She wanted the kiss and ride to be a pull in and out rather than parallel parking. Rob Burgheimer did not want the air conditioners to be along Main Street.

Boardmember Vince DiBella wanted to make it clear to Council that the Board prefers the revised plan. He had confidence in the Light Rail team and City staff to work out the revisions to the original plan if necessary.

**VOTE:** Passed 6 - 0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:** Although the Board felt the revised site plan was a much better design they understood that it would require City Council approval of the additional cost, therefore they also approved conditions for the original proposal should the Council not approve those costs.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant