

# COUNCIL MINUTES

October 4, 2001

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 October 4, 2001 at 7:30 a.m.

## COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Hawker  
Jim Davidson  
Bill Jaffa  
Dennis Kavanaugh  
Pat Pomeroy  
Claudia Walters  
Mike Whalen

## COUNCIL ABSENT

None

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson

### 1. Review items on the agenda for the October 8, 2001 Regular Council Meeting.

All of the items on the agenda were reviewed among Council and staff with no formal action taken. There was specific discussion relative to the following items:

Mayor Hawker stated that agenda item 5b will be removed from the consent agenda.

Mayor Hawker, Councilmember Jaffa and Councilmember Pomeroy declared potential conflicts of interest on agenda item 7b (Amending various sections of the Mesa City Code relating to the downtown sign ordinance as recommended by the Downtown Development Committee, the General Development Committee, and revised based on Council direction received on September 10, 2001) and said they would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

### 2. Discuss and consider proposed Action Plan from the September 6, 2001 City Council Planning Session.

Mayor Hawker provided a brief overview regarding this item and stated the opinion that the proposed Action Plan appears to be a comprehensive plan for moving forward with the objectives identified by the Council during the September 6, 2001 City Council Planning Session. Mayor Hawker requested that the discussion regarding regional governance issues scheduled for the November 1, 2001 Study Session be rescheduled to a meeting prior to October 22, 2001 if possible, to provide him with Council input prior to his scheduled attendance at a Maricopa Association of Governments meeting on October 22.

Vice Mayor Davidson requested that a condensed version of the Action Plan be added to the City's website. Vice Mayor Davidson stated that he would declare a potential conflict of interest regarding the discussion of power line corridors on October 8, 2001.

Discussion ensued regarding the Workplan deliverable *Develop a Proposed Affordable Housing Strategy for Mesa* on page 32 of the Workplan and the proposed use of the phrase *Housing Plan* in place of *Housing Strategy*; the status of the Arts and Cultural Division's budget adjustment request (BAR) totaling \$140,596 in conjunction with the Workplan deliverable *Provide Access to Exhibits and Educational Programming* on page 31 of the Workplan; and the notification of interested parties relative to scheduled meeting dates for Council discussion of Workplan topics that will involve significant citizen input.

3. Discuss and consider the establishment of a Golf Enterprise Fund.

Robin White, Chairman of the Mesa Parks and Recreation Board, addressed the Council and provided a brief overview of this agenda item. She reported that the five-member sub-committee that was appointed to analyze this issue met several times and that the recommendations of the sub-committee were unanimously approved by the entire Parks and Recreation Board. She stated that the Board feels strongly that a municipal golf course is needed in the East Mesa area and recommends that a Golf Enterprise Fund be established to ensure that the additional course and the two existing courses, Dobson Ranch and Riverview, are funded directly by the revenue generated from the golf courses.

Parks and Recreation Administrator Mark Woodward addressed the Council and reported that the recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Board is comprised of three elements: 1) establish a restricted golf enterprise fund, 2) adjust fees at Dobson Ranch and Riverview golf courses, and 3) initiate the design/development/acquisition of a third golf course in East Mesa. Mr. Woodward commented on the three elements and stated that the proposed fee increases would range from \$1 to \$6, depending on the season; that fees have not been increased since 1998; that staff proposes that the sale of discount green fees tickets be temporarily suspended until the new fee structure is in place; and that there may be an opportunity to purchase the existing Long Bow Golf Course, which has several advantages over development of a new course at the Red Mountain Park site.

Senior Internal Auditor Chuck Odom commented on the *Twenty Year Summarization of the Financial Performance Projection of a Three Golf Course System* (financial model) that was provided to the Councilmembers. Mr. Odom stated that the financial model shows that the proposal is viable over a 20-year period and will fund all direct and indirect costs, capital replacement and debt service.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding the amount of funds historically transferred from the Riverview and Dobson Ranch golf courses into the General Fund, Mr. Woodward advised that the average annual amount transferred over a 5-year period prior to the recent year is \$185,000.

City Manger Mike Hutchinson commented on the major irrigation project that was conducted and funded last year from the General Fund and voiced concerns regarding the funding of future

improvements necessary for the facilities. Mr. Hutchinson clarified that the issues of fee adjustments and developing/acquiring a golf course in East Mesa would be considered during subsequent meetings.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed fee increases, the importance of maintaining competitive rates and proposed changes to the discount card system.

Councilmember Pomeroy spoke in support of establishing the Golf Enterprise Fund and for acquiring a course in East Mesa. He also voiced a preference for acquiring the Long Bow course vs. developing a new course.

It was moved by Councilmember Pomeroy, seconded by Councilmember Whalen, that the recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Board to establish a Golf Enterprise Fund, be approved.

Councilmembers Kavanaugh, Walters, Jaffa and Whalen stated support for the motion. Councilmember Kavanaugh and Jaffa also voiced a preference for acquiring the Long Bow course vs. developing a course in Red Mountain Park.

Councilmember Walters stated support for maintaining fees for junior golfers at their current level.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced concerns regarding the potential effects of eliminating one of the City's revenue streams including negative impacts to other Parks and Recreation programs. He stated that although he agrees with the concept of the golfers paying for the facilities, he supports the current method of depositing golf revenues into the General Fund.

Mayor Hawker stated that although his general philosophy dictates that it is not a function of government to compete with private industry, he supports the concept of the Golf Enterprise Fund and supports the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the inadequacy of available land to develop an additional nine holes at the Riverview facility and the possibility of developing a junior golf learning center.

Councilmember Whalen voiced the opinion that a municipal golf facility in East Mesa would significantly benefit youths in that area.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Jaffa-Kavanaugh-Pomeroy-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS - Davidson

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote.

4. Discuss and consider items relating to the proposed updated General Plan.

Economic Development Director Dick Mulligan addressed the Council and introduced Dave Wilcox of Economic Research Associates (ERA), the economic development consultant retained by the City to evaluate the recommended General Plan and alternatives.

Mr. Wilcox addressed the Council and referred to ERA's recent report entitled *Fiscal Analysis of the General Plan Alternatives and the Proposed Selected Plan for the City of Mesa* that was provided to the Councilmembers. Mr. Wilcox stated that ERA was asked to assess the fiscal prospects of the City toward build-out status under the General Plan alternatives and the final General Plan recommended by the JMPC. He stated that based upon assessment of the City's financial status, ERA determined that the City is constrained by three circumstances, 1) state shared revenues, 2) sales tax revenues, 55% of which are from retail sales, and 3) revenue generated by the City's utilities. Mr. Wilcox stated that ERA's analysis of the City's financial status at the time of build-out under all of the alternatives and the proposed plan, without considering oncoming costs of financing further infrastructure beyond what is presently envisioned, "came out in a positive manner."

Mr. Wilcox commented on the numerous financial challenges the City will face in the future and said that the most critical challenge will be to upgrade the manner in which the City finances its infrastructure. He also stated that the City must capture jobs at a very enhanced pace in order to meet the stated employment vs. housing ratio objective.

Discussion ensued regarding the manner in which ERA calculated the cost of future infrastructure projects, the fact that residential development is considered economically negative for all cities, the concept of pairing with respect to residential vs. non-residential development; and the important future role of infill development and redevelopment within the City.

Mr. Wilcox stated that providing quality employment areas in connection with future development of the Williams Gateway Airport area, the future US 60 / 202 freeway interchange area and other future interchange areas along the 202 freeway, is critical to Mesa's financial future.

Discussion ensued regarding the value associated with the growth of higher educational institutions in Mesa; the concept of industry clustering; the City's utility enterprises; and Mesa's aging housing stock and infrastructure.

a. Consider proposed schedule.

Planning Director Frank Mizner addressed the Council and referred to the revised General Plan schedule entitled *MESA 2025 – A SHARED VISION Combined Schedule Revision (10-01-01) (DRAFT - Rev. 2)*, (See Attachment 1), that was provided to the Councilmembers. He reported that the revised schedule reflects the concerns previously voiced by the Council. Mr. Mizner commented on numerous, upcoming activities relative to updating the General Plan in accordance with voter approval/rejection of a final plan at the May 21, 2002 General Election. He noted that the revised schedule includes five public meetings and final action by the Council on January 28, 2002. He also noted that the Public Open House scheduled for November 15,

2001 would be changed to November 14, 2001 due to a conflicting Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Whalen, that the recommended schedule relative to the proposed updated General Plan, be approved.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced concerns regarding the lack of periodic updates to the Council throughout the process, the possibility that the accelerated pace of the process will lead to an inferior product and the fact that BRW Consultants, the firm retained by the City to assist with this process, has resigned from the project. He stated that although he supports the motion, his approval of the schedule does not infer that he is at this time approving placement of the General Plan on the May 21, 2002 General Election ballot.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated concerns regarding the lack of opportunity for public comment concerning the General Plan subsequent to the 60-day review period. He stated opposition to the proposed schedule due to his opinion that the May 21, 2002 target election date is not realistic and not conducive to providing a quality plan to the public.

Discussion ensued regarding the public comment opportunities afforded by the schedule and the process to date.

Councilmembers Kavanaugh, Pomeroy and Whalen stated support for the proposed schedule and commented on the subsequent opportunities the Council will have to review the progress of the Plan and, if necessary, to postpone placement of the General Plan on the ballot.

Mayor Hawker concurred with the comments of Councilmembers Kavanaugh, Pomeroy and Whalen and said that in the event the Council elects to postpone placement of the General Plan on the ballot, he would support placement of the Plan on the March 2004 Primary Election ballot. He explained that continuance until this time would allow consideration of the Southeast Regional Transportation Study, including the progress of light rail and freeway improvements, and also allow Council candidates to be questioned regarding issues relative to the General Plan. He also stated the opinion that voter turnout will be higher for this election since voters will also be voting for Councilmembers and a Mayor.

Councilmember Walters also stated support for the schedule and requested that staff provide the Council with a summary of public comments made regarding the Plan. She stressed the importance of communicating to the public that all of their comments will be considered.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES -       Hawker-Jaffa-Kavanaugh-Pomeroy-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS -       Davidson

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote.

(Mayor Hawker stated that the Special and Executive Sessions scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m. would be continued to a subsequent date.)

- b. Discuss and consider acceptance of the proposed land use map.

Planning Director Frank Mizner referred to a map provided to the Councilmembers entitled JMPC Plan (Attachment 2). He said that staff is seeking direction regarding land use designations for seven areas highlighted on the JMPC Plan map.

AREA 1:

Councilmember Whalen declared a potential conflict of interest regarding Area 1 and refrained from discussion/participation in this item.

Mr. Mizner stated that Area 1 is near the planned confluence of the US 60 and San Tan/202 freeways; that the Joint Master Planning Committee (JMPC) designated the area for Office use; that there is existing and currently approved mobile home/RV development in the area; and that staff recommends that the area remain Office or be designated Mixed Use/Employment (MU/E), as previously recommended by Mr. Wilcox. Mr. Mizner explained that staff retracts its previous recommendation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) in consideration of Mr. Wilcox's comments and the fact that the existing mobile home parks in the area are rental parks and do not contain individually owned lots.

Discussion ensued regarding the expected life cycle of mobile homes and mobile home parks; and the fact that the City can legally create non-conforming uses by designating an alternative land use for developed areas, pursuant to a recent opinion from Interim City Attorney Joe Padilla.

It was moved by Councilmember Walters, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that Area 1 be designated Mixed Use/Employment.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those voting.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced the opinion that other areas on the JMPC Plan map, in addition to the areas discussed herein and during the previous Study Session, require Council consideration of the land use designations.

(Councilmember Pomeroy was excused from the remainder of the meeting at 9:40 a.m.)

AREA 2:

Mr. Mizner reported that Area 2 is a 160 acre parcel located at the northwest corner of Signal Butte and Elliot; that the City previously desired to purchase the property for development of a park; that the property was designated Park by the JMPC; and that staff currently recommends designating the area MDR due to Growing Smarter mandates. Mr. Mizner explained that Growing Smarter prohibits designating an area Park without owner approval and a purchase plan to acquire the property. He added that Mesa has neither at this point.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Whalen, that Area 2 be designated as Medium Density Residential.

Councilmember Jaffa stated opposition to designating a land use at this time and requested that staff evaluate the possibility of alternative funding sources for purchase of the property.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that voters rejected the parks bonds issue on the ballot in 2000, the current area land values, and the possibility of designating the area Low Density Residential (LDR).

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Davidson-Kavanaugh-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS - Jaffa  
ABSENT - Pomeroy

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote of those present.

(Mayor Hawker declared a recess at 9:50 a.m. The Council reconvened at 10:00 am.)

AREA 3:

Mr. Mizner stated that Area 3 is a 160 acre parcel located on the northeast corner of Higley and Thomas bordered on the north by Tally, on the west by a large rock mining operation, on the south by the Red Mountain/202 freeway and on the east by the planned City park adjacent to Red Mountain Ranch; that there are currently several homes scattered on the parcel; that there have been a number of recently approved zoning cases for light manufacturing type of businesses; that the area was designated General Industrial (GI) under the 1996 General Plan; that the JMPC designated the area Business Park (BP); and that staff recommends the designation of Light Industrial (LI). He noted that LI more accurately reflects the current zoning pattern and is more compatible with neighboring development.

It was moved by Councilmember Whalen, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that Area 3 be designated Light Industrial.

Discussion ensued regarding the types of outside storage allowed under the LI classification, the current definition of BP, the nearby Falcon Field Airport flight corridor and the fact that batch processing plants are precluded under LI.

Councilmember Jaffa stated tentative support for the motion and requested that the record reflect his concerns regarding the definition of LI and outside storage allowed under the definition.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced opposition to the designation of LI and stated support for the BP designation. He also voiced support for retaining the 25% residential component in the BP definition and spoke in favor of the concept of providing residential near employment centers.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Jaffa-Kavanaugh-Whalen-Pomeroy  
NAYS - Davidson  
ABSENT - Pomeroy

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote of those present.

AREA 4:

Councilmember Walters declared a potential conflict of interest regarding Area 4 and refrained from discussion/participation in this item.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding the necessity of declaring a conflict of interest in conjunction with a spouse's employer's interests, Interim City Attorney Joe Padilla explained that pursuant to an opinion issued by the previous City Attorney, a Councilmember could have a conflict of interest in conjunction with addressing an item that pertains to property or other direct interests of the employer of the Councilmember's spouse.

Mr. Mizner reported that Area 4 is located on both sides of McDowell Road west of Greenfield Road and includes the Commons and Dover Industrial Park; that the 1996 General Plan designation is Commerce Park (CP); that the JMPC designated the area BP; and that staff recommends designating the area LI.

Discussion ensued regarding the City-owned citrus area located south of Area 4 that is designated Mixed Use/Employment (MU/E) with height restrictions; the proximity of Area 4 to the Falcon Field Airport runway; the fact that LI precludes residential and does not address retail development; the zoning process necessary for retail development within an area designated for LI, and the location of the planned City library near McDowell Road and Val Vista Drive.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Whalen, that Area 4 be designated Light Industrial.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced opposition to the motion and spoke in support of retaining the JMPC's designation of BP.

Mayor Hawker stated opposition to the motion and stated support for designating the area BP, based on staff's proposed definition of BP.

Councilmembers Kavanaugh and Whalen withdrew the motion and second, respectively.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Whalen, that Area 4 remain Business Park as designated by the JMPC.

Discussion ensued regarding the exclusion of big box retail in the BP classification; the departure flight paths of helicopters at Falcon Field Airport; the absence of staff's collaboration with Boeing regarding the designation of this area; and the fact that the current development of Dover Industrial Park is consistent with the BP designation.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present and voting.

AREA 5:

Mr. Mizner reported that Area 5 is located at the northwest corner of Val Vista and Baseline; that the currently approved zoning plan for the area is a mixture of office, retail, hotel and residential; that a zoning plan which deletes the residential component from most of the parcel and allows retail and restaurant uses was recently approved by the Planning and Zoning Board; that the JMPC designated the area Mixed Use/Residential (MU/R); and that staff recommends the designation of MU/R for the northern 10 acres of the parcel and Community Commercial (CC) for the remainder of the parcel. Mr. Mizner noted that the designation of MU/R for the entire parcel would not preclude any current/pending plans to develop the property.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Vice Mayor Davidson, that Area 5 remain Mixed Use/Residential as designated by the JMPC.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

AREA 6:

Mr. Mizner stated that Area 6 is located in southeast Mesa and is bound by Signal Butte on the west, Elliot Road on the south, Mountain Road on the east and the power lines on the north; that Area 6 is located directly east of Area 7 and north of General Motors (GM); that an existing Salt River Project transmission facility is located in the northwestern corner of Area 6 and that the remaining area is vacant land; that Area 6 was designated MDR in the 1996 General Plan, that most of Area 6 was designated MU/R by the JMPC Plan (except for the Salt River Project facility, which is designated Public/Semi-Public [P/SP]); and that staff recommends that the entire area be designated as P/SP. Mr. Mizner explained that although the State Land Department owns most of Area 6, the City is pursuing purchase of the property for a variety of municipal uses.

Vice Mayor Davidson declared a potential conflict of interest regarding Area 6 and refrained from discussion/participation in this item.

Discussion ensued regarding the City's ability to legally designate Area 6 as P/SP.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Walters, that the recommendations of staff to designate Area 6 as Public/Semi-Public, be approved.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present and voting.

DEFINITION REGARDING BUSINESS PARK:

Mayor Hawker stated that it would be appropriate to discuss and consider the definition of BP prior to consideration of Area 7 on the land use map.

Mr. Mizner stated that staff is seeking direction from Council regarding the inclusion/exclusion of a residential component in the BP designation. He noted that the JMPC considered the BP designation to include 25% residential. Mr. Mizner stated that staff proposes excluding the residential component from the BP classification and referred to a proposed, revised definition of BP, which was provided to the Councilmembers.

It was moved by Councilmember Walters, seconded by Mayor Hawker that the definition of Business Park be revised as follows:

Identifies areas where professional and medical office parks, research and development opportunities, light manufacturing, data and information processing centers are integrated in a campus setting with ancillary restaurants, retail and other supportive establishments. Appropriate locations offer direct principal arterial and arterial road access, connections to potable water and sanitary sewer, and proximity to public safety services. Business park areas should extensively buffer Light Industrial uses from other less intense employment or high density residential uses. Business park areas are located on, and with direct access to principal arterial and arterial streets, rail facilities and airports.

Mr. Mizner commented on the numerous reasons behind staff's proposed exclusion of residential from BP, including: 1) most of the BP designations on the plan are in close proximity to airports or freeways resulting in significant noise impacts; 2) there is increased demand for apartment projects over general business types of activities resulting in apartment complexes being built first, which increases land values for business development; 3) apartment complexes are typically developed on the most desirable locations; 4) there are problems associated with enforcement of the 25% residential component; and 5) residential development occurring prior to business development results in objections by residents to subsequent industrial development.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated opposition to the Motion and said that he supports retaining a residential component within BP. He stated the opinion that removing the residential element from BP makes it indistinguishable from the MU/E designation.

Discussion ensued regarding appropriate buffers to LI within and adjacent to BP areas; the option of developers to propose a General Plan amendment for consideration of residential within BP; and the fact that large scale retail development including big box retail is not included in BP.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced concerns regarding the elimination of development areas designed to produce quality employment and problems associated with residential development near airports.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Jaffa-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS - Davidson-Kavanaugh  
ABSENT - Pomeroy

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote of those present.

AREA 7:

Mayor Hawker stated that Area 7 and the General Motors' (GM) property are closely related and requested an update from staff regarding recent developments concerning proposed land use designations for the GM area.

Williams Gateway AREA Project Manager Wayne Balmer addressed the Council and referred to and commented on the following maps provided to the Councilmembers: 1) a map/sketch prepared by staff depicting the JMPC's proposed land uses for the GM area and also providing gross acreages of the various proposed uses; 2) a recent map from GM depicting proposed land uses and net acreages for the area; 3) a sketch/map of the area which was developed by staff in response to concerns voiced by the JMPC and the Williams Gateway Airport (WGA) Authority, entitled Option 1; and 4) a map of the WGA area depicting aircraft noise contours and incorporating various aircraft elevations during northeastern departures.

Mr. Balmer referred to two maps on display in the Council Chambers that depicted current approach and departure routes at WGA and stated that although the FAA has not yet determined the official approach and departure paths for WGA, staff is fairly certain that the paths presently in use will be officially adopted in the future.

Lynn Kusy, Executive Director of Williams Gateway Airport, advised that the process used by the FAA regarding the official designation of flight paths is a cooperative process and that the FAA would consider the current flight patterns and the location of residential communities when determining official departure/arrival flight paths for WGA.

Discussion ensued regarding aircraft departure paths and various departure elevations; aircraft noise impacts to areas north and south of the power lines (between Guadalupe Road and Elliot Road); the appropriate minimum width of the departure path running parallel to and south of the power lines; the noise level and contours associated with the KC135 aircraft; and the proposed locations of various residential land uses and corresponding densities in the GM area.

Councilmember Jaffa commented on GM's proposed land use map and outlined his preferred land uses for the area. He stated that he would not support any residential uses within one and one-half miles of the WGA flight paths.

Councilmember Walters voiced concerns regarding the amount of HDR contained in all of the proposed maps for the GM property and stated opposition to movement of the MDR area farther north in the recent plan proposed by GM. She also voiced concerns regarding allowing residential development in Area 7 due to aircraft noise in the area.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of determining an appropriate housing vs. employment ratio for the GM area and allowing developers some flexibility to swap land uses, based on the approved ratio, in areas of the plan not impacted by flight paths.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated the opinion that the Option 1 map developed by staff provides for a reasonable mix of uses and protection for the airport.

Councilmember Whalen stated a preference for Option 1 and for incorporating a sense of community into the residential areas.

Mayor Hawker commented on the WGA flight paths and aircraft noise contours in conjunction with proposed residential development, and on the appropriate phasing of development of the GM area. He stated that he would be supportive of Option 1 for the GM area if residential is excluded from Area 7 and stated the opinion that MU/E is appropriate for the majority of Area 7 to accommodate the flight corridors.

It was moved by Councilmember Whalen, seconded by Vice Mayor Davidson, that Area 7 be designated Mixed Use/Employment.

Councilmember Jaffa stated opposition to MU/E in Area 7 east of Ellsworth Road due to the fact that commercial development would be unlimited.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Davidson-Whalen  
NAYS - Jaffa-Kavanaugh-Walters  
ABSENT - Pomeroy

Mayor Hawker declared the motion failed.

It was moved by Councilmember Walters, seconded by Councilmember Jaffa, that the portion of Area 7 west of Ellsworth Road be designated Mixed Use/Employment and the portion of Area 7 east of Ellsworth Road be designated Business Park.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Davidson-Jaffa-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS - Kavanaugh  
ABSENT - Pomeroy

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote of those present.

Mr. Balmer stated that staff will collaborate with GM to revise the proposed land use map with consideration given to the comments made by Councilmembers, and return to the Council for further direction.

5. Appointments to boards and committees.

Mayor Hawker recommended the following appointments to Boards and Committees:

SPOOK HILL AREA DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Robbie Robinson (Replacement for David Guanell)

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Jillian Hagen (For term ending June 30, 2003 to fill vacancy of Edward Corral)

HOUSING AND HUMAN SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Carlos J. Vallejo (For term ending June 30, 2004 to fill vacancy of Kimberly Brooks)

Teresa R. Cotton (For term ending June 30, 2004 to fill vacancy of Alcira Lynne Angulo)

It was moved by Councilmember Jaffa, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendations and the appointments be confirmed.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

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

This item was continued to a subsequent meeting due to time constraints.

7. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Monday, October 8, 2001, 3:00 p.m. – Utility Committee Meeting

Monday, October 8, 2001, TBA – Study Session

Monday, October 8, 2001, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Mr. Hutchinson stated that the Executive Session precluded by the length of this Study Session, would be rescheduled prior to the October 8, 2001 Study Session.

8. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

9. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

10. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 11:55 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 4<sup>th</sup> day of October 2001. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

\_\_\_\_\_  
BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

Attachments  
pjt