

COUNCIL MINUTES

March 14, 2002

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 March 14, 2002 at 7:30 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

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

COUNCIL ABSENT

Claudia Walters

OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson
Debbie Spinner
Barbara Jones

(Mayor Hawker excused Councilmember Walters from the meeting.)

1. Review items on the agenda for the March 18, 2002 Regular Council Meeting.

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

Mayor Hawker declared a potential conflict of interest regarding agenda items 5g (Higley Road Improvements McDowell Road to Red Mountain Freeway), 5h (Fire Station No. 217) and 5i (Transit Maintenance Facility) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation in these items.

Vice Mayor Davidson declared a potential conflict of interest regarding agenda item 7a (Granting an easement to Salt River Project at Southern Avenue west of Ellsworth Road) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

2. Hear an update and consider issues associated with the proposed site for the Multipurpose Facility.

a. Hear a presentation from the Mesa Visitors and Convention Bureau.

Robert Brinton, Executive Director of the Mesa Convention and Visitors Bureau addressed the Council and introduced Kevin Thorpe, Board President and General Manager of the Dobson Ranch Inn and Dave Muth, General Manager of the Mesa Hilton Hotel. Mr. Brinton reported

that in addition to the financial assistance provided to the City in connection with the soil tests, the Mesa Convention and Visitors Bureau's Board of Directors has elected to commit further support for this project in the sum of \$150,000 annually plus an inflation adjustment. Mr. Brinton referred to a letter provided to the Councilmembers and commented on the importance of future tourism growth in the City. He reported that Mesa's hospitality industry has declined in recent years due to the closing of the Rosarita, General Motors and Motorola facilities. He noted that research conducted by the Bureau in recent years indicates that new tourism related development in Mesa is critical to growth of the hospitality industry. He said that it is the opinion of the Board of Directors that development of the Multipurpose Facility in Mesa will benefit Mesa residents, businesses and the hospitality industry.

Mr. Muth commented on the fact that members of the Mesa Convention and Visitors Bureau are united in their support of this matter and voiced the opinion that the opportunity of being the host City for this facility is a "lifetime" opportunity. He commented on the fact that the hospitality industry in Mesa accounts for 12,000 jobs; that bed tax revenues in the City have decreased in recent years; and that business generators and the number of hotel rooms in Chandler have dramatically increased in recent years.

Mayor Hawker voiced appreciation for the support and financial commitment from the Bureau and commented on the importance of partnerships in this endeavor.

Councilmember Pomeroy stated the opinion that the Convention and Visitors Bureau's united support of this project is impressive, especially in light of the fact that opponents claim that the project will not provide economic benefits to the City.

b. Update on partnerships.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson voiced appreciation to the Mesa Convention and Visitors Bureau for their support. Mr. Hutchinson reported that recent discussions with the City of Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community have been successful and it is anticipated that written commitments from these communities will be secured within a few days. He also reported that Arizona State University has agreed to a property trade with the City, which would provide the City with the ASU parcel located south of 8th Street for the development of a combination parking/athletic facility.

Mr. Hutchinson commented on recent developments concerning the City of Tempe and reported that although Mesa attempted to partner with Tempe in this project and remains open to that possibility, Tempe has chosen to partner with the Gila River Indian Community.

c. Discuss upcoming meeting schedules.

Mr. Hutchinson reported that the City and the Gila River Indian Community are scheduled to make final proposals to the Tourism and Sports Authority (TSA) Board on Tuesday, March 19, 2002 and that the TSA is scheduled to announce their selection of a site and an alternate on Thursday, March 21, 2002.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that while at the recent National League of Cities Conference, several Tempe Councilmembers independently indicated support for ongoing

discussions with Mesa regarding this project; and the manner in which the City was notified that Tempe decided against partnering with Mesa.

Councilmember Whalen stated that this is a rapidly changing process and stressed the importance of maintaining open lines of communication with Tempe.

Councilmember Kavanaugh voiced appreciation to Tempe Councilmembers Carter, Copple, Cahill and Mitchell for their responsiveness concerning this issue.

Councilmember Pomeroy voiced concerns regarding local news reports indicating Mesa's unwillingness to work with Tempe concerning this project. He commented on the fact that Tempe has repeatedly rejected proposals from Mesa in recent years relative to a stadium project. Councilmember Pomeroy stated support for ongoing efforts to partner with Scottsdale, the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, the TSA and the Arizona Cardinals.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that this issue will be placed on the March 18, 2002 Regular Council Meeting agenda and citizens will have the opportunity to address the Council concerning the issue.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated appreciation to Councilmember Whalen for his ongoing efforts in this matter and to Councilmember Walters for her efforts to engage Tempe Councilmembers in partnership discussions.

Discussion ensued regarding ongoing negotiations with the Hurley family and the Arizona Cardinals, and the upcoming Joint Council Meeting with the Tempe City Council.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced appreciation to supporters of this project and commented on the difficult task of structuring a proposal that precludes financial risks for the City. He also commented on the possibility of developing convention space in conjunction with the Multipurpose Facility and voiced the opinion that a successful proposal would ultimately result in significant redevelopment in west Mesa.

Councilmember Whalen also voiced appreciation to the Mesa Convention and Visitors Bureau for their ongoing support of this project.

3. Hear a presentation, discuss and consider the Parks and Recreation, Economic Development and Transportation 2025 Plans.

Development Services Manager Jack Friedline provided a brief overview concerning the processes of updating the General Plan and developing the Parks and Recreation, Economic Development and Transportation sub-plans. He advised that the presentation concerning the Parks and Recreation Plan would be continued to a subsequent meeting due to a scheduling conflict on the part of the City's consultant. Mr. Friedline introduced Transportation Planning Administrator Kevin Wallace and Dan Hartig of Parsons Brinckerhoff, the City's general consultant regarding all four plans.

Transportation Plan

Mr. Wallace voiced appreciation to the citizen committee members who have participated in the Transportation Plan process, particularly Lela Steffey, Chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee and Vern Mathern, Chairman of the Transportation Advisory Board.

Mr. Hartig referred to the February 22, 2002 draft of the Transportation Plan and reported that there would be two more iterations of this Plan based on input from the public, the Council and the Joint Master Planning Committee (JMPC). He noted that the final draft is scheduled for Council review during July 2002.

Mr. Hartig reported that the Transportation Plan is a multi-modal plan consisting of several components including streets, public transportation, bicycle/pedestrians, and transportation demand management. He commented on the results of public surveys that were taken during this process regarding transportation priorities and reported that one of the surveys indicated that streets and public transportation are equally important. He added that another survey indicated that finishing local freeways and widening major intersections are primary transportation priorities. He commented on the importance of planning future transportation improvements because of the ongoing growth projected for Mesa, particularly in connection with the expansion of the Williams Gateway and Falcon Field areas and redevelopment of the General Motors and Town Center areas. He also commented on future growth that is anticipated in the Pinal County area adjacent to the City.

Mr. Hartig referred to a map on display in the Council Chambers that depicted existing and future bicycle facilities. He stated that the future plan provides for a bicycle route or lane on all arterial streets and a significant number of mid-section streets. Mr. Hartig also commented on the shared use paths along canals that are in various stages of development and added that a future shared use path along U.S. 60 is being explored with the Arizona Department of Transportation.

Mr. Hartig referred to and commented on a map on display illustrating a concept plan of future transportation corridors and facilities in the Town Center. He reported that specific modeling and evaluations indicate that Main Street is the preferred thoroughfare through the Town Center for the Light Rail Transit Project. He also referred to and briefly discussed a proposed Transit Center at Main Street and Hibbert.

Mr. Hartig stated that planning future street improvements for the City was a very detailed process involving the Transportation Subcommittee and the Transportation Advisory Board. He referred to maps on display that depicted various proposed street and intersection improvements. He noted that the Plan provides a parkway along Higley Road and a parkway from the 202 Freeway near Hawes Road southeast into the Pinal County area. He commented on the various improvements necessary along Higley Road to transform it into a parkway and noted that the parkway planned near the Williams Gateway area would be similar to a freeway in design.

Mr. Hartig commented on projected levels of service on various streets, and on proposed street improvements designed to facilitate public transportation.

Mr. Hartig stated that the total projected cost of the Transportation Plan is \$2.6 billion. He outlined the projected costs of each component of the plan, including: 1) \$1.7 billion for streets; 2) \$800 million for public transportation; and 3) \$41 million for the bicycle plan. He noted that the projected costs include capital expenditures and maintenance and operation expenses for a 25-year period. He further reported that projected transportation related revenue for the same period is \$1.1 billion, resulting in a shortfall of \$1.4 billion.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson relative to Federal funding, Mr. Hartig advised that he is not certain whether all funding has been captured in the revenue analysis. He noted that there are unresolved questions concerning matching Federal funds for bus transit and developer contributions for street improvements. He added that future iterations of the Transportation Plan will address additional possible sources of future transportation revenue including impact fees for street construction, a transportation/utility fee and additional sales tax revenue.

Mr. Hartig outlined several questions and comments from the JMPC that the public will be encouraged to comment on during the upcoming open house meetings, including questions relative to adding a 202 Freeway interchange at Mesa Drive and a US 60 interchange at Lindsay Road.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen concerning the possibility of developing Mesa Drive into a parkway, Mr. Hartig reported that this issue was discussed at length among staff, the Transportation Advisory Board and the Transportation Subcommittee and the consensus was that Higley Road is preferred over Mesa Drive because of reduced construction impacts on residents.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that a previous study conducted concerning the possible development of a parkway on Mesa Drive, Gilbert Road or Higley Road indicated that Higley Road is the preferred location; the various types of parkways; the fact that the only north/south parkway on the proposed plan is along Higley Road; the various improvements envisioned to transform Higley Road into a parkway; the lane configurations planned for Mesa Drive; the fact that the proposed Plan provides that future right-of-way acquisition for arterial streets accommodate six lanes; the percentage of Federal subsidies concerning light rail and bus transit accounted for in the projected revenues.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced concerns regarding the absence of major north/south arterials designed into the plan between Country Club Drive and Higley Road and the absence of 202 Freeway interchanges between Country Club and Gilbert Road. He commented on the importance of implementing a City-wide multi-modal system, including commuter rail, in conjunction with the Light Rail Project, and stressed the importance of ensuring that future development coincides with residential densities and employment centers designed into the General Plan in conjunction with public transit corridors.

In response to Councilmember Jaffa's stated concern regarding 202 Freeway interchanges, Mr. Hartig advised that the only additional 202 Freeway interchange that is being considered for future development is at Mesa Drive and noted that right-of-way has been acquired for a future interchange.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced concerns regarding the “readability” of the Transportation Plan and the manner in which the Plan transitions from technical to non-technical information. He also commented on development that is occurring in Pinal County and stated the opinion that the Plan does not adequately address future transportation corridors in the southeast areas of the City adjacent to Pinal County.

Discussion ensued regarding the Light Rail Transit project, impending Council decisions concerning Mesa’s participation in the project, the fact that voters approved Quality of Life sales tax funds for design of the project, and the amount of funds authorized by voters.

Councilmember Whalen indicated support for a full Council discussion relative to the Light Rail Project alignment. He voiced concerns regarding the inclusion of the Light Rail corridor through the Town Center in the Plan without Council direction to do so and the disruption this could cause to the Town Center.

Mayor Hawker reported that he would be participating in a regional meeting later that day concerning moving forward to the final design phase of the Light Rail Project and said that although he is in favor of moving ahead, he would not support proceeding to final design without formal Council direction to do so.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson advised that this issue would be placed on an April Council meeting agenda.

Economic Development (Strategy) Plan

Economic Development Director Dick Mulligan addressed the Council and introduced Dave Wilcox of Economics Research Associates, the City’s consultant concerning the Economic Development Plan.

Mr. Wilcox commented on the current size of the City (128 square miles) and the future size of the City at build-out (170 square miles) and noted that at build-out, Mesa will be the equivalent size of the entire San Fernando Valley in California.

Mr. Wilcox reported that although the Economic Development Plan as well as the Transportation Plan and the General Plan are based on a 25-year horizon, the projections associated with these plans realistically reflect a 25-40 year period.

Mr. Wilcox commented on the City’s growth potential during the next 25-40 years and noted that the City’s population is expected to increase 50% (211,014) and housing units are expected to increase 33% (58,625). He further reported that pursuant to the goals outlined by the JMPC and the Council, successful implementation of the City’s General Plan would result in employment growth of 131% (203,198+). He commented on the fact that this is an ambitious goal, which if successful, would increase the jobs per capita ratio from .36 to .56.

Mr. Wilcox discussed the numerous development advantages unique to the City, including: 1) municipal government as an enterprise; 2) a large resident work force and resident market to support local retail and services; 3) the ability to handle utilities expansions; 4) developing regional freeway access; 5) opportunities for jobs clustering at Falcon Field and Williams

Gateway Airports; 6) expanding education and health clusters; 7) recognizable employment centers; 8) oncoming regional improvements of cultural and recreational facilities (Mesa Arts Center and Indoor Aquatics Center); 9) relatively low cost of doing business; 10) location of nationally recognizable names in technology and information (AT&T, Boeing, TRW); 11) professional and entrepreneurial local government, and 12) significant land resources offering the opportunity to grow. He noted that the San Tan urban economic hub, as envisioned by the JMPC, encompasses 20,000 acres and offers the City significant development opportunities.

Mr. Wilcox stated that opportunities for “job clustering” are immediate and he commented on the recently approved Longbow development. He noted that at build-out, approximately 7,000 new jobs will be created within this development. He stressed the importance of striving for development that will produce high-quality jobs and noted that future iterations of the Economic Development Plan will further address this issue.

Mr. Wilcox referred to and commented on a map on display in the Council Chambers that depicted the City’s eight recognizable employment centers. He stressed the importance of focusing efforts on these centers and noted that in excess of 70% of current jobs are located within these centers and the same ratio is projected at build-out.

Mr. Wilcox discussed the major development challenges the City faces, including: 1) the fact that it is often recognized as a “low-cost low-wage” community; 2) dependence on sales taxes and state transfers; 3) lack of visibility in the region; 4) need to reposition and reinvent regional retail centers; and 5) the need to dramatically increase jobs per capita ratio. He stressed the importance of reinvesting in major retail centers, particularly the Fiesta Mall and Superstition Springs Mall areas, every 5-7 years and reiterated the importance of taking immediate steps to increase the number of quality jobs in the City.

Mr. Wilcox outlined and commented on numerous program initiatives and other recommendations, including: 1) sustain capability/land-use policies to ensure Williams Gateway Airport development; 2) establish clear business strategies for Falcon Field employment center development; 3) upgrade and evolve the super-regional malls and adjacent power centers; 4) create multiple economic development incentives programs including property clearance incentives, entitlements, speed of permits processing, public infrastructure assessment district funding, financial “gap” funding techniques and creation of unique Economic Development Ventures fund; 5) initiate off-campus East Valley of Institute classes/training in Mesa enterprises; 6) initiate and expand viable business clusters; and 7) select and form industry and business clusters (at least 4 to 6 in the next 4 years) in order to generate stronger competitive positions. He also identified and commented on several performance measures and management recommendations.

Mr. Wilcox discussed the concept of paired development (residential and employment centers) and reported that future iterations of the Economic Development Plan will further address this concept.

Mr. Mulligan commented on the importance of achieving the jobs per capita ratio outlined in the Plan and noted that taking appropriate steps within the next 5-10 year period is critical with respect to achieving this long-term goal.

Mayor Hawker stated approval concerning the aggressive jobs per capita ratio goal and spoke in support of providing regional job centers and shorter work commutes, promoting educational opportunities within the City, and retaining and attracting college graduates to live and work within the City.

Vice Mayor Davidson commented on the aggressive nature of the employment goals that have been outlined. He stated support for the Economic Development Strategy Plan and appreciation to staff and Mr. Wilcox for their work in this regard.

In response to a question from Councilmember Jaffa concerning the types of jobs envisioned in connection with the jobs ratio goal, Mr. Wilcox stated that ideal future job growth in Mesa will be higher education, technology and skills oriented. He noted that the next draft of the Plan will identify and define the types of quality jobs and compensation levels envisioned.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced concerns regarding protecting areas designated for industrial and commercial development in the Williams Gateway area and commented on the importance of "phasing-in" residential development in this area to avoid encroachment issues.

Discussion ensued concerning land use designations and future development in the General Motors area, the fact that the General Motors area is not currently within the corporate limits of Mesa, and the issue of guidance language for the General Plan to ensure that the land use plan is not compromised in the future.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, Mr. Wilcox commented on the Multipurpose Facility project and stated the opinion that the economic development value associated with this project lies in the adjacent land that is available for development of high visibility "City entry" space that will attract quality employers.

Discussion ensued concerning the economic initiatives and incentives historically offered by the City and the fact that nearby Indian communities are now able to offer significant cash incentives to developers.

Mayor Hawker thanked staff and Mr. Wilcox for the update.

4. Hear a presentation on the proposed FY 2002/2003 Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG), and Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME).

Assistant City Manager Paul Wenbert addressed the Council and introduced Community Revitalization Director Kit Kelly and Community Revitalization Specialist Lisa Hembree to update the Council regarding staff's funding recommendations concerning the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG) and Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME). He noted that staff's recommendations have been developed in association with the Housing and Human Services Advisory Board.

Ms. Kelly commented on the application process and reported that the public hearing regarding this matter will occur at the March 18, 2002 Regular Council Meeting and that funding approval

of staff's recommendations will be determined by the Council at the April 1, 2002 Regular Council Meeting.

Ms. Kelly discussed the City's policy guidelines and funding criteria used to develop recommendations. She commented on the importance of considering an applicant's ability to perform and advised that Housing and Urban Development (HUD) recently announced that in the future, funds will be withheld for jurisdictions that do not perform in a timely manner.

Ms. Kelly referred to the handout provided to Councilmembers outlining staff's recommendations and commented on the applications submitted and funding recommended by staff. She reported that applications received from non-profit organizations totaled \$2.2 million and that of that total, \$996,000 is recommended for funding. She also reported that \$3.5 million of CDBG funds are available and applications received for these funds totaled \$7.4 million.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that staff recommends that the Day Labor Center be considered for funding as an alternate project only.

In response to questions and concerns voiced by Vice Mayor Davidson regarding staff's recommendations concerning the Day Labor Center, Ms. Kelly explained that this project is recommended as an alternate based on the fact that Council has not approved the site, the fact that additional detail work must be conducted concerning project costs, and the fact that funding this project would eliminate other projects that are ready to proceed.

Further discussion ensued regarding alternate projects and the circumstances and process related to proceeding with alternate projects.

Ms. Kelly reported that staff solicits the input of the Housing and Human Services Advisory Board concerning all applications under these programs, particularly the ESG program. She noted that a handout was provided to Councilmembers that outlines the accomplishments resulting from the funding allocated this fiscal year under these various programs.

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

In response to a question from Councilmember Kavanaugh concerning staff's rationale related to approving \$500,000 for the East Valley Addiction Council (EVAC) project, Ms. Kelly reported that EVAC has also secured significant funding from other sources and explained that staff's recommendation is based on the fact that funding EVAC's application will ensure that this project goes forward and that the additional funds awarded to EVAC for this project are captured for the benefit of the community.

Councilmember Kavanaugh voiced concerns relative to a disproportionate share of available funds being awarded for one project.

In response to a question from Councilmember Jaffa regarding the consideration of Council districts when approving funds for various applications, Ms. Kelly advised that Council districts are not considered during the selection process.

Councilmember Pomeroy indicated opposition to distributing Federal funds based on Council districts.

5. Acknowledge receipt of minutes of boards and committees.

- a. Downtown Development Committee meeting held February 21, 2002.
- b. Economic Development Advisory Board meeting held February 5, 2002.
- c. Museum and Cultural Advisory Board meeting held February 20, 2002.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Davidson, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that receipt of the above-listed minutes be acknowledged.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

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

Councilmember Kavanaugh reported on his participation in meetings of the Information Technology and Communications Committee at the recent National League of Cities Conference. He reported that this Committee selected three focus areas for the coming year including cable regulation, spectrum allocation for public safety communications and the "right-of-way" issue. Councilmember Kavanaugh further reported that he also participated in meetings of the Telecommunities advocacy group at the conference and advised the Councilmembers that he would provide them with written details regarding these meetings.

Vice Mayor Davidson reported on his activities at the National League of Cities Conference and voiced appreciation for the efforts of Mesa's lobbyist for arranging meetings relative to transportation and transit issues. He noted that a meeting with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) officials concerning the City's request that FAA assume responsibility for the Williams Gateway tower, was productive. He also commented on the fact that available Federal transportation and transit funding is limited and that numerous communities throughout the U.S. are competing for light rail funds.

Mayor Hawker commented on his participation at the National League of Cities Conference and on his new involvement on the Transportation Steering Committee. He stressed the importance of the City and the State being represented on this Committee, particularly with respect to transportation appropriations.

7. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Monday, March 18, 2002, TBA – Study Session

Monday, March 18, 2002, 5:45 p.m. - Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, March 21, 2002, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session (May be cancelled)

Monday, March 25, 2002, 3:30 p.m. – Police Committee

8. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

- a. Hear from Howard Trucks regarding petition from northeast citizens regarding the 202/Recker Interchange.

Howard Trucks addressed the Council and stated that the petition he is submitting to the City, which requests the City to recommend to the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) that the Recker Road interchange be deleted from the initial 202 Freeway construction, has been signed by 1726 residents from the neighborhood north of McDowell Road between Recker Road and Power Road. Mr. Trucks said that there are approximately 2800 homes uniquely isolated in this area and that Recker Road is used extensively by residents for ingress/egress to the neighborhood. He voiced the opinion that a freeway traffic interchange at Recker Road will result in increased traffic and traffic signals on Recker Road.

Mr. Trucks read the text of the petition and commented on the history of this issue. He stated that throughout the process of gathering signatures door-to-door, approximately 50% of residents were at home and approximately 90% of those at home were opposed to the interchange and signed the petition.

Mr. Trucks requested that the Council recommend to ADOT that the Recker Road traffic interchange be deleted from the initial freeway construction.

9. Items from citizens present.

David Wayne, 3851 E. Juniper Street, addressed the Council and spoke in support of the Recker Road interchange. Mr. Wayne commented on the Council's previous consideration and action regarding this issue and the recommendations from the Fire Department in support of the interchange and voiced opposition to the Council's reconsideration of this issue. He stated the opinion that eliminating the Recker Road interchange will result in excessive traffic at the Higley and Power Road interchanges and generally exacerbate traffic in the entire area.

David Cooper, 6446-34 E. Trailridge Circle, addressed the Council and stated opposition to the Recker Road interchange. He commented on the traffic projections in the Maricopa Association of Governments' (MAG) study that were utilized in connection with the Council's consideration of this issue in 2001 and on a recent traffic study of this area conducted by the City and voiced the opinion that the traffic counts between the two studies are inconsistent and that the MAG traffic projections are excessive. He also stated the opinion that there is no source for significant future traffic growth in the area. Mr. Cooper also discussed the Fire Department's previous comments that elimination of the interchange would result in increased response times and stated the opinion that elimination of the interchange would only increase response time by approximately two minutes for a very small portion of emergency calls.

Susan Franchuk, 6137 E. Roland Street, addressed the Council and voiced opposition to the Recker Road interchange. She voiced the opinion that the Higley Road and Greenfield Road exits will serve the various industries and businesses in the Falcon Field industrial area and that the Recker Road interchange is not needed for this purpose. She also stated the opinion that the nearest and most logical freeway exit to be utilized by Las Sendas residents is the Power Road interchange. She also commented on the fact that the City did not support interchanges

at Mesa Drive or Center Street to serve the downtown area because of neighborhood opposition. She also stated the opinion that an interchange at Recker Road will increase traffic on Thomas Road and exacerbate traffic concerns at the Red Mountain Elementary School and also increase boat traffic through the Red Mountain neighborhood.

Discussion ensued concerning the Council's options relative to responding to speakers.

It was moved by Councilmember Jaffa to place the Recker Road traffic interchange issue on the April 1, 2002 Regular Council meeting agenda.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised that although placing this item on a future agenda requires the concurrence of three Councilmembers, a motion is not required.

Councilmember Whalen stated support for placing this issue on a future agenda.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated reluctant support for placing this item on a future Regular Council Meeting agenda and voiced concerns regarding the amount of misinformation that exists concerning this issue.

Mayor Hawker stated that this issue will be added to the April 1, 2002 Regular Council Meeting agenda and urged staff to be prepared to comment on traffic projections, safety issues and freeway development timeframes.

10. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 10:13 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 14th day of March 2002. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK