

# COUNCIL MINUTES

September 24, 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 September 24, 2001 at 4:00 p.m.

## COUNCIL PRESENT

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

## COUNCIL ABSENT

None

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson  
Barbara Jones

(Councilmember Whalen participated in the meeting through the use of teleconferencing equipment.)

### 1. Review items on the agenda for the September 24, 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:

Vice Mayor Davidson declared a potential conflict of interest on agenda item 5.1 a (Ratifying the action of the Utilities Manager in signing a contract with Enron Power Marketing, Inc.) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation on this item.

### 2. Discuss and consider various issues associated with the update of the General Plan.

a. Consider revised schedule for completion of the General Plan.

Planning Director Frank Mizner provided the Council with an update of this agenda item. He reported that as a result of the September 17, 2001 Special Council Meeting, Council directed staff to attempt to complete the General Plan within 60 days in order

to schedule the required Citywide election to ratify the General Plan for May 21, 2002. He explained that the extension of time from the originally targeted March 2002 election date was to garner sufficient public comment and also to ensure that the Council would have the opportunity to review the Land Use Map and the General Plan elements in greater detail.

Dan Hartig, a representative of the consulting team Parsons-Brinkerhoff, addressed the Council and discussed a revised timeline which includes deadlines not only for the completion of the General Plan, but for the Parks and Recreation Plan, the Transportation Plan and the Economic Development Plan. (See Attachment) Mr. Hartig highlighted some of the key dates including:

- October 15, 2001, Complete revision/formatting of General Plan elements.
- November 12, 2001, Begin mandatory 60-day review period.
- November 29, 2001, Public Hearing No. 1 on Draft General Plan.
- January 10, 2002, Public Hearing No. 2 on Draft General Plan.
- January 11, 2002, End mandatory 60-day review period.
- January 21, 2002, Public Hearing on General Plan and City Council approval of the General Plan.
- January 21, 2002, Send Notice of Election to Maricopa County Elections Department.
- February 5, 2002, Send Ballot Language to Maricopa County Elections Department.
- May 21, 2002, City Election.

Mayor Hawker voiced concerns regarding the Council's inability to receive the General Plan elements until October 15, 2001. He stated that he and Councilmember Walters have already provided staff and the Joint Master Plan Committee (JMPC) with suggestions/comments relative to the first draft and encouraged staff to provide the Council with a revised draft prior to October 15. Mayor Hawker added that he is in opposition to the scheduling on January 21, 2002 of both a public meeting on the General Plan and its adoption by Council on the same evening.

Councilmember Pomeroy concurred with Mayor Hawker's comments and noted that January 21, 2002 is a legal holiday (Martin Luther King Day) and urged that the matters be rescheduled.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated the opinion that at the September 17, 2001 Special Council Meeting, the Council agreed to give staff, the JMPC and the consultants a sufficient period of time to complete the General Plan elements, and if the Council is now requesting a revised draft prior to October 15, it could erode their ability to accomplish such a task.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson regarding the fact there are only two public hearings scheduled during the 60-day mandatory review period, Mr. Hartig explained that if substantive input is received during this process, it could potentially trigger another 60-day review period.

Vice Mayor Davidson stressed the importance of soliciting citizen input during this process and urged staff to schedule additional public meetings.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that only a summary of the elements of the Transportation Plan, the Parks and Recreation Plan and the Economic Development Plan is required to be submitted with the General Plan and that it will not be taken into consideration during the General Plan's 60-day review period.

Councilmember Kavanaugh expressed support for the revised timeline and emphasized that if staff is unable to place the General Plan on the ballot of the May 2002 election, he would be willing to postpone its submission to the voters until a future date. Councilmember Kavanaugh also requested that Interim City Attorney Joe Padilla conduct an investigation regarding the 120-day notification requirement to the Maricopa County Elections Department which would fall on January 21, 2002, a legal holiday.

Councilmember Walters stated that she is comfortable with the revised timeline. She also voiced concerns regarding the 60-day review period and the fact that substantive citizen comment prior to such a date could trigger a new 60-day review period. Councilmember Walters suggested that the Council conduct a public hearing addressing the General Plan at its November 5, 2001 Council meeting which would allow for citizen input prior to commencement of the mandatory 60-day review period. City Manager Mike Hutchinson assured the Council that such a meeting will be scheduled.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced a variety of concerns including the fact it was his understanding at the conclusion of the September 17 Special Council Meeting that staff should proceed forward regarding completion of the General Plan, but not to complete the process; the fact that the determination of an appropriate ballot date is dependent upon the JMPC and public input; the fact that the first draft of the General Plan was incomplete and contained many obvious mistakes, and the fact that he has concerns with staff's "hard and fast" schedule and does not want the public to misinterpret its efforts in this regard.

In response to Councilmember Jaffa's comments, Mr. Mizner reiterated his previous remarks that as a result of Council's direction on September 17, staff has revised its schedule in an attempt to meet the necessary guidelines to place the General Plan issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election. He emphasized that if the schedule is not adhered to, such a goal will not be achieved. Mr. Mizner assured the Council that although the revised schedule is an aggressive one, it can be met with the cooperation of staff, the JMPC and the consultants.

Councilmember Jaffa stated that it is imperative that the JMPC be cognizant of the fact that the Council wants an effective General Plan, and if that requires that this issue is placed on the ballot of a future election, that would be an appropriate course of action to pursue.

Mayor Hawker said that if this issue is placed on the ballot of the March Primary Election or the May 2002 General Election, City Council candidates would have an opportunity to debate this issue. He also noted that if the cost of a November election is about the same, thought could be given to placing it on that ballot. He reiterated that he prefers placing the issue on the ballot of a City-wide Council election.

Councilmember Whalen voiced support for staff's revised schedule and the placement of the General Plan on the ballot of the May 2002 election. Councilmember Whalen also stated the opinion that it is imperative that the Council participate throughout this ongoing process and stressed the importance of scheduling additional public hearings.

Councilmember Pomeroy advised that he was unable to attend the September 17 Special Council Meeting and would have been supportive of giving staff, the JMPC and the consultants additional time to compile all the necessary documentation to complete this matter. He noted, however, that he will support staff's revised timeline.

Vice Mayor Davidson stressed the importance of giving staff, the JMPC and the consultants until October 15 to complete the final draft of the General Plan. He also concurred with Councilmember Walters' suggestion of scheduling additional public hearings prior to the commencement of the 60-day mandatory review process. Vice Mayor Davidson added that the Council supports the Mayor's efforts to complete this process in a timely manner and voiced confidence that staff will succeed at this task.

Mayor Hawker responded to comments from Councilmember Jaffa and noted that although he voted in support of placing this issue on the ballot of the May election, he had anticipated that several meetings with the Council would take place to provide direction to the JMPC and staff. He said that the meetings have been cancelled. He added that on an individual basis, Councilmembers have offered numerous comments/suggestions and he hoped that those would be incorporated in the revised documents.

b. Consider revision to the General Plan coordination and Public Involvement Plan – Resolution No. 7733.

Mr. Mizner noted that it is the recommendation of staff that Addendum No. 3 to the Coordination and Public Involvement Plan be adopted by Council. He explained that the minor revisions would reflect that the October 11 and 18, 2001 Planning and Zoning Board (P&Z) public hearings and the November 19, 2001 City Council public hearing will be rescheduled.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Walters, that Resolution No. 7733 be adopted.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson, Mr. Mizner clarified that the Resolution would provide for the same amount of meetings and merely revises the dates.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced support for the motion.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson, Mr. Mizner assured the Council that in addition to the public meetings, staff will also distribute household and business surveys to solicit suggestions and comments from Mesa residents.

Carried unanimously.

c. Consider changes to the General Plan Land Use Map.

Mr. Mizner addressed the Council relative to this agenda item. He explained that the Council's packets contain the General Plan Land Use Map which was adopted by the JMPC at its September 13, 2001 meeting. He requested that Council offer input regarding the Land Use Map prior to its resubmission to the JMPC.

Jon Vlaming, a representative of BRW, provided brief background information relative to the General Plan Land Use Map. He stated that the map encompasses the entire 170 square miles of the City's planning area and that the overall plan would reflect a population of 638,000 at build-out, an employment base of 369,000, and a jobs-per-capita ratio of .58.

In response to a series of questions posed by Mayor Hawker, Lynn Kusy, Executive Director of Williams Gateway Airport (WGA), discussed aircraft noise contours and the development of approach and departure routes for WGA, Falcon Field Airport and the Chandler Regional Airport.

Mr. Mizner noted that at the September 17 Special Council Meeting, Council requested the opportunity to review the General Plan Land Use Map. He emphasized that the JMPC primarily focused its efforts on southeast Mesa and to a lesser degree throughout the remainder of the City. Mr. Mizner added that a large percentage of the map outside of southeast Mesa reflects either existing development or approved development (entitled land).

Mr. Mizner informed the Council that it is the recommendation of staff that several areas on the proposed Land Use Map be modified due to the currently existing character or the approved development in the area.

Mayor Hawker stated that at this time, he would prefer Council input.

Councilmember Walters stated that she is unprepared at this time to make specific comments relative to the Land Use Map. She requested that staff provide the Council with an overlay to demonstrate specific land use types within the City (entitled land, existing development, annexations).

Mayor Hawker requested that Mr. Mizner briefly outline staff's recommendations regarding modifications to the Land Use Map.

Mr. Mizner outlined staff's recommendations relative to modifications to the JMPC's Land Use Map including:

- The intersection of US 60 and the Loop 202. The Map should designate Medium Density Residential 6-10 (6 - 10 du/ac).
- The northwest corner of Signal Butte and Guadalupe Road. The Map should designate Medium Density Residential 4-6 (4 – 6 du/ac).
- The northeast corner of Higley and Thomas Road. The Map should designate Light Industrial.
- The area northwest of Greenfield Road on either side of McDowell Road. The Map should designate Light Industrial.
- Dana Park Village Square Project at the northwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Baseline Road. The Map should designate Community Commercial.

Mr. Mizner advised that staff will re-address the General Plan Elements and the Land Use Map in greater detail at an upcoming Council Study Session.

Councilmember Whalen urged the development community to familiarize itself with Mesa's General Plan elements and Land Use Map and provide input to the JMPC and City staff regarding this issue.

Councilmember Walters requested that when this topic is presented at an upcoming Study Session, that staff provide the Council with an explanation as to why modifications have been suggested for several previously designated areas. She also requested assurance from staff that the General Motors (GM) property has been designated appropriately on the General Plan.

Councilmember Jaffa expressed a variety of concerns including Mesa's future build-out; the protection of flight paths surrounding the GM property; why the Mixed Used Residential is proposed south of the power lines, and the fact there has been a change proposed to the definition of "Light Industrial."

Councilmember Kavanaugh questioned whether the current designation of Community Commercial at the intersection of McKellips and Greenfield should remain. He also expressed disappointment relative to the proposed modifications to the Dana Park Ranch project.

Mayor Hawker stated the opinion that staff and the JMPC have not sufficiently addressed redevelopment areas along the Main Street corridor for a light rail or rapid transit system, including the location of transit stations and additional geographic space to accommodate future redevelopment in the area. He also voiced opposition to the designation of Medium Density Residential south of the power lines.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated that he would like further discussion relative to the designation of Mixed Use Residential in the area of Ellsworth Road and Elliot Road and also staff's suggested modifications as outlined by Mr. Mizner. Vice Mayor Davidson also requested that the City Attorney's Office render an opinion regarding General Plan vision versus existing hardcore entitlements. He also requested assurances that the colors depicted on the map are accurate designations.

Councilmember Pomeroy concurred with the suggestions of the Councilmembers. He also spoke in favor of most of staff's recommended modifications and voiced support for their implementation. Councilmember Pomeroy said that it might be premature for Council input on the General Plan elements and said he would first like to review the JMPC's revisions to the General Plan.

Mr. Mizner stated that as a result of the September 17 Special Council Meeting, it was his understanding that the Council wished to discuss policy-related issues in the General Plan, and at the upcoming Study Session, if Council determines that certain policies are inappropriate, such policies will be deleted from the General Plan's second draft.

Councilmember Pomeroy expressed concerns regarding the formatting issues of the General Plan and encouraged staff to rectify those issues prior to returning to the Council.

3. Discuss and consider the proposed League of Arizona Cities and Towns 2002 resolutions.

Government Relations Assistant Kevin Adam addressed the Council relative to this agenda item. He reported that Mayor Hawker has been appointed to represent the City of Mesa at the League of Cities and Towns' 2002 Resolutions Committee meeting to be held on September 28, 2001. He explained that Mayor Hawker will vote on which League resolutions will be placed on the consent agenda for adoption at the annual League Conference to be held October 23-26 in Yuma.

Mr. Adam outlined the City's proposed resolutions which will be submitted by Mayor Hawker at the Resolutions Committee meeting.

Mayor Hawker requested feedback from the Council relative to the proposed resolutions.

4. Acknowledge receipt of minutes of various boards and committees.

- a. Design Review Board meeting held September 5.
- b. Economic Development Advisory Board meeting held August 7.

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

Carried unanimously.

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

It was moved by Councilmember Pomeroy that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendation and the appointment be confirmed.

In response to a question from Councilmember Jaffa, Mayor Hawker clarified that he has received Council input regarding an additional appointment to the above-listed Board and would recommend that confirmation of this appointment be delayed until a future Study Session.

Councilmember Pomeroy withdrew his motion.

It was moved by Councilmember Pomeroy, seconded by Vice Mayor Davidson, that consideration and action on this issue be continued to a future Study Session.

Carried unanimously.

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

Due to time constraints, this item was continued to a future Study Session.

Mayor Hawker excused Councilmember Whalen from the Regular Council Meeting to be held immediately following the Study Session.

7. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Thursday, September 27, 2001, Study Session Canceled

Thursday, September 27, 2001, 10:00 a.m. – Transportation Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 4, 2001, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

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

Tuesday, October 9, 2001, 6:00 p.m. – Joint Dinner Meeting with Apache Junction City Council

Thursday, October 11, 2001, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

8. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

9. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 5:40 p.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 24<sup>th</sup> day of September 2001. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

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

pag  
Attachment

**MESA 2025 – A SHARED VISION  
 Combined Schedule  
 Revision (9/21/01) (DRAFT)**

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Purpose/Activity</b>	<b>Action</b>
September 20, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Advisory Committee</li> <li>• JMPC Chairs, Subcommittee Chairs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Revised Work Plan &amp; Schedule</li> <li>• Review Presentation to Council on September 24, 2001</li> <li>• Review Land Use Map Approved by JMPC</li> <li>• Discuss Method of Revising Elements, with Focus on Policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve Information to Be Presented to City Council</li> </ul>
September 24, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Work Plan, Revised Schedule, Land Use Map, &amp; Amendment to Public Involvement Plan</li> <li>• Provide Summaries of JMPC Meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept Work Plan &amp; Schedule</li> <li>• Approve Amendment to Public Involvement Plan</li> <li>• Accept Land Use Map Approved by JMPC for Public Review</li> </ul>
Week of October 1, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss General Plan Element Policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Direction on Policies</li> </ul>
October 15, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete Revision and Formatting of General Plan Elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribute Revised Document to TAC, JMPC, and City Council</li> </ul>
Week of October 15, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress Briefing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Information</li> </ul>
October 17-24, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JMPC Subcommittees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review General Plan Elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend Elements to JMPC</li> </ul>
October 25, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Master Planning Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Eight General Plan Elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve Eight Elements For Inclusion in Draft General Plan</li> </ul>

9-21-01 (Shaded activities relate to the completion and approval of the General Plan)

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Purpose/Activity</b>	<b>Action</b>
November 1, 2001	• Joint Master Planning Committee	• Discuss Four Elements (Land Use, Transportation, Parks & Recreation, & Economic Development)	• Approve Four Elements for Inclusion in Draft General Plan
November 5, 2001	• City Council	• Review Results of JMPC Meetings	• Provide Final Comments on Draft Plan.
November 9, 2001	• Consultant Team	• Complete Preparation of General Plan Document for Public Review.	• Distribute Draft General Plan • Place Draft General Plan on Mesa 2025 Website
November 12, 2001	• Agencies • General Public	• Begin Mandatory 60-day Review Period.	
November 14, 2001	• Public Notice (15-day requirement)		• Notice Planning & Zoning Board Public Hearing No. 1.
November 29, 2001	• Planning & Zoning Board	• Public Hearing No. 1 on Draft General Plan.	• Receive Public Comments.
December 6, 2001	• Joint Master Planning Committee	• Review Status of Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.	• For Information
December 26, 2001	• Public Notice (15-day requirement)		• Notice Planning & Zoning Board Public Hearing No. 2
January 4, 2001	• Public Notice (15-Day Requirement)		• Notice City Council Public Hearing.
January 10, 2002	• Technical Advisory Committee	• Review Draft Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.	• Recommend Revisions
9-21-01	(Shaded activities relate to the completion and approval of the General Plan)		

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Purpose/Activity</b>	<b>Action</b>
January 10, 2002	• Planning & Zoning Board	• Public Hearing No. 2 on Draft General Plan.	• Receive Public Comments. • Approve General Plan for Submittal to City Council.
January 11, 2002	• Agencies • Other Interested Parties	• End Mandatory 60-day Review Period.	
January 17, 2002	• Technical Advisory Committee • JMPC Co-Chairs & Subcommittee Chairs	• Review Draft Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.	• Identify Issues For Consideration By Subcommittees.
January 21-29, 2002	• JMPC Subcommittees	• Review Draft Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans	• Recommend Revisions
January 21, 2002	• City Council	• Public Hearing on Draft General Plan.	• Council Approval of General Plan.
January 21, 2002	• Notice to Maricopa County Elections Department (120 days prior to election.)	• Notice of Election for General Plan.	• Send Notice of Election to County Elections Department
January 31, 2002	• Joint Master Planning Committee	• Review Draft Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.	• Reach Consensus On Draft Plans For Presentation To Public.
February 5, 2002	• Ballot Language to Clerk (105 days prior to election.)	• Ballot Language Regarding General Plan.	• Send Ballot Language to County Elections Department
February 11- 21, 2002	• Public Open Houses	• Public review of Draft Transportation Plan, Parks and Recreation Plan, & Economic Development Plan.	• Receive Public Comments.
March 4-22, 2002	• Transportation, Parks, and Economic Development Advisory Boards	• Review Respective Draft Plans.	• Provide Comments & Recommend Revisions.
9-21-01	(Shaded activities relate to the completion and, approval of the General Plan)		

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Purpose/Activity</b>	<b>Action</b>
March 7, 2002	• Technical Advisory Committee	• Review Results of Public Meetings.	• Recommend Revisions To Transportation Plan, Parks and Recreation Plan, and Economic Development Plans.
March 14, 2002	• Technical Advisory Committee • JMPC Co-Chairs and Subcommittee Chairs	• Review Results of Public Meetings.	• Identify Issues For Consideration By Subcommittees.
March 18-21, 2002	• JMPC Subcommittees	• Review Results of Public Meetings.	• Recommend Revisions To Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.
March 28, 2002	• Joint Master Planning Committee	• Review Results of Public Meetings and Other Public Comments.	• Reach Consensus On Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.
April 15 - July 1, 2002	• City Council	• Review Transportation Plan, Parks & Recreation Plan, and Economic Development Plan.	• Council Approval of Transportation, Parks & Recreation, and Economic Development Plans.
May 21, 2002	• Election	• Election on General Plan	• Voter Approval
9-21-01	(Shaded activities relate to the completion and approval of the General Plan)		