

# COUNCIL MINUTES

February 2, 2006

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 February 2, 2006 at 7:30 a.m.

## COUNCIL PRESENT

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

## COUNCIL ABSENT

None

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady  
Debbie Spinner  
Barbara Jones

### 1. Review items on the agenda for the February 6, 2006 Regular Council meeting.

All of the items on the agenda were reviewed among Council and staff and the following was noted:

Conflicts of interest declared: 3c (Whalen); 4c, d, e, f (Hawker)

Items added to the consent agenda: None

Items removed from the consent agenda: 5d

### 2. Hear a report on Reed Park Opportunity Zone project and discuss and consider selection of the next Opportunity Zone.

Neighborhood Outreach Director Ray Villa displayed a PowerPoint presentation (a copy is available for review in the City Clerk's Office) that provided an overview of the vision, key components, and history of Mesa's Opportunity Zones. He reported that some of the major accomplishments of the Reed Park Opportunity Zone include the following:

- Five neighborhood teams were formed to address the issues.
- 123 Code cases were closed due to voluntary compliance.
- 77 new streetlights are to be installed.
- 1,500 volunteer hours were invested.
- 17 alleys were cleaned of debris and overgrown vegetation.
- 125 "Clean Sweep" roll-offs removed over 250 tons of debris.
- Crime-free multi-housing relationship established.
- Five percent reduction in Police calls for service.
- Private sector investment activity included \$162,968 in private home improvements, a new business investment of \$260,000 and \$550,000 for infill development of two vacant parcels.

Mr. Villa advised that the internal partners (representatives of various City departments, such as Neighborhood Services, Parks and Recreation, Solid Waste, Police, Transportation and Fire personnel) identified two Neighborhood Action Program Areas (NAPA) in each of the six Council districts. He stated that staff's recommendation to conduct the next Opportunity Zone in the "Webster" area (which encompasses a section of District 3 located from University Drive to Main Street between Alma School Road and Sycamore Street) was based on the following criteria:

- Neighborhood capacity.
- Demographics.
- Crime statistics.
- Code violations.
- Poverty status.
- Housing stock.
- Infrastructure.

Mr. Villa provided the following information on the Webster Neighborhood:

- 59% of the single-family homes are owner occupied.
- An established commercial corridor presently exists.
- The area includes the future site of Light Rail Transit.
- Significant community assets are present (Webster Elementary and Webster Recreation Center).
- Two registered neighborhoods are in place.

Mr. Villa advised that 48 residents attended the first Webster NAPA meeting, which resulted in the formation of seven resident teams. He said that retail businesses in the area provide a tremendous partnership opportunity. Mr. Villa added that the success of an Opportunity Zone depends on the commitment of both the internal and external partners.

Councilmember Rawles stated that he was not impressed with the first two Opportunity Zones, and said that he discussed with Mr. Villa some alternative methods of providing long-term, sustainable assistance to the neighborhood. He further stated that if sufficient resources were available and the Council decided to move forward with the program, he would participate in the effort and provide assistance. Councilmember Rawles explained that although he prefers not to utilize tax resources for these types of programs, he expressed the opinion that his philosophical viewpoint should not preclude his Council District's participation in the program.

In response to a comment by Vice Mayor Walters, Councilmember Rawles confirmed that his proposed alternative budget eliminates most of the department that provides support to OZ Programs.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are the major funding source for Opportunity Zones; that General Fund dollars in the amount of \$6,500 are being requested in the current fiscal year and an additional \$6,500 in the next fiscal year for the Webster Neighborhood OZ; that the General Fund allocations do not reflect the cost of staff time; that Opportunity Zones experience a reduction in criminal activities; and that a reduced dependence on City services results from building neighborhood capacity and educating residents regarding methods of addressing problems.

Vice Mayor Walters stated the opinion that the first two Opportunity Zones were successful. She explained that although she supports the OZ concept, she expressed reluctance to awarding an Opportunity Zone to a district represented by a Councilmember who does not endorse the program or support funding the department responsible for implementing the program.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Thom, Neighborhood Services Manager Lisha Garcia advised that an Opportunity Zone has the same planning and zoning requirements that apply to the entire City.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, Ms. Garcia stated that the City does not abandon an Opportunity Zone at the end of the program. She advised that City staff continues to respond to issues in all of the City's neighborhoods, and she noted that residents in the OZ areas are more knowledgeable regarding City services. Ms. Garcia reported that the prior OZ programs were allocated \$50,000 from the General Fund, and that expenditures for the recent OZ were less than the allocated amount. She added that some CDBG funds are available to continue the "Clean Sweeps" and other small programs.

Councilmember Jones noted that the future status of City funding is unknown at this point in time. He suggested that staff continue their efforts within the NAPA framework, and that the implementation of a new OZ be deferred until a later date.

Mayor Hawker expressed the opinion that the proposed OZ could move forward due to the fact that staff resources are in place, and he added that \$6,500 is a minimal investment on the part of the City.

Councilmember Rawles stated that he concurred with the comments of Mayor Hawker, and he expressed the hope that residents of his district would not be penalized due to the fact that the Webster Neighborhood OZ selection was based on objective criteria.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that the allocation of Federal funding does not coincide with the City's fiscal year or the calendar year; and that planning for the OZ was completed utilizing the NAPA process.

Councilmember Walters expressed concern that although a Councilmember votes in opposition to certain projects and proposals, the represented Council District continues to benefit from the project or the revenue source.

Councilmember Rawles advised that he would support delaying a Council decision regarding the OZ until the status of future City revenues is determined. He further stated the opinion that if future budget cuts do not impact the Neighborhood Services Department, District 3 residents should receive the same consideration as the residents of other Council Districts.

Councilmember Griswold expressed support for moving forward due to the fact that the neighborhood, which is eligible for CDBG funding, has requested a partnership with the City in order to address their problems. He also noted that an area in proximity to the Webster Neighborhood is presently the target of private investment.

Councilmember Thom stated a preference for delaying the Council's decision regarding the next Opportunity Zone.

Mayor Hawker advised that the consensus of the Councilmembers is to postpone a decision on the next Opportunity Zone until more information is available regarding the City's budget. He thanked staff for the presentation.

3. Hear a report on the emergency repair of the sanitary sewer line on Southern Avenue, west of Stapley Drive.

Water Division Director Bill Haney displayed a PowerPoint presentation (a copy is available for review in the City Clerk's Office) that identified the location of the Southern Avenue sewer line that requires emergency repair. He advised that the line was constructed in 1963, and that a video inspection conducted in January 2006 identified severe deterioration since the last video inspection in 1999. Mr. Haney reported that the sides of the sewer pipe have completely corroded and that the top of the pipe collapsed onto the bottom of the pipe. He stated that staff is unable to predict when the sewer line would completely fail.

Mr. Haney outlined the repair and replacement options (see Attachment 1) that are available to the City. He advised that staff is recommending the installation of a "slip-line" to the existing 600 feet of pipe, which is considered to be a permanent repair with a life expectancy of approximately 75 years. Mr. Haney advised that Brown and Caldwell, a consultant retained by the City, has addressed all of the major pipe rehabilitation projects in the Valley. He explained that staff is adding a supplementary "scope of work" clause to an existing Brown and Caldwell contract, and that Engineering would issue a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to select a Construction Manager at Risk in order to complete the repair. Mr. Haney further advised that staff anticipates that the sewer line repair should be completed in approximately four weeks. He explained that this presentation to the Council is an update and that the contracts related to the project would be brought forward for future Council action.

City Engineer Keith Nath advised that in order to minimize the inconvenience to area residents, sewage would be diverted and pumped through surface pipes during the repair process.

Mayor Hawker thanked staff for the update.

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

- a. Historic Preservation Committee meeting held November 17, 2005.
- b. Parks and Recreation Board meeting held January 12, 2006.
- c. Finance Committee meeting held on January 12, 2006.

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

Carried unanimously.

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

- Councilmember Thom: Addressed a senior class at Heritage Academy.
- Vice Mayor Walters: Attended the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration of the Center Against Family Violence.
- Councilmember Griswold: Attended the groundbreaking ceremony for a new Corporate Center near Falcon Field.  
Toured the Marc Center.  
Attended the Chinese Restaurant Association Benefit Dinner for the Mesa Arts Center.  
Attended a Friends of the Library Meeting.

6. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

City Manager Christopher Brady stated that the meeting schedule is as follows:

Friday, February 3, 2006, 8:00 a.m. – Council Budget Priority Session

Monday, February 6, 2006, 2:30 p.m. – Utility Committee

Monday, February 6, 2006, TBA – Study Session

Monday, February 6, 2006, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, February 9, 2006, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, February 9, 2006, 8:30 a.m. – Finance Committee

Mr. Brady advised that District Town Meetings are in the process of being scheduled, and that each session would begin with an open house at 6:00 p.m. followed by a short staff presentation and an opportunity for public comment at 6:30 p.m.

7. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

8. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

9. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 8:53 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 2nd day of February 2006. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

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

baa

Attachment (1)

## ***Repair/Replacement Options***

- Replace failed nine section
  - Repair likely will not be successful
  - Does not address potential downstream repairs
  - Not recommended
  
- Replace pipe from manhole to manhole
  - Estimated construction cost \$475,000 (plus engineering)
  - Permanent repair
  - No loss of pipeline capacity
  - Most disruptive to traffic and neighborhood
  
- Slip-line existing pipe from manhole to manhole
  - Estimated construction cost \$330,000 (plus engineering)
  - May result in some loss in capacity at failed section, but not likely an issue
  - Considered a permanent repair

Utilities Department  
Water Division

Attachment 1