



COUNCIL MINUTES

September 17, 2001

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in a Special Council Meeting in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on September 17, 2001 at 7:00 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

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

COUNCIL ABSENT

Pat Pomeroy

OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson
Barbara Jones

Mayor Hawker excused Councilmember Pomeroy from the meeting.

1. Discuss and consider General Plan and schedule.

Mayor Hawker complimented the members of the Vision 2025 General Plan Committee who are reviewing multiple elements of the General Plan update and overseeing the City's Master Plan update process as it pertains to Parks and Recreation, Transportation, Economic Development and the item before the Council today, the Land Use Element. The Growing Smarter Program that was actually passed by the Governor contained dates and times in which municipalities, every ten years, must review their general plans, update relevant information and implement long-term land use plans. There are also some sub-elements that must be looked at and addressed, such as water resources, transportation, housing, recreation and open space.

Mayor Hawker said that some of the elements that are required to be updated include the Transportation element and Parks and Recreation element, and noted that the City will conduct in-depth studies on those elements and will prepare separate plans that will stand on their own. He added that this does not eliminate the need for at least addressing those issues and letting the public know that those elements will be fully developed at a future date. Mayor Hawker stated that if the master planning process remains on track, a lot of those elements will actually be completed prior to the March election. Some of the information, such as census statistics, will not arrive in time to update all of the forms in a proper manner and will have to be included as they are made available. Multiple studies are also being conducted relative to transportation networks in the East Valley, including a commuter rail possibility utilizing the existing rail lines and a joint study with the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) and Pinal County looking at roads of significance that will potentially cross jurisdictional boundaries and actually go into Pinal County. Those studies, as they are received, will be implemented

into the City's documents and attempts will be made to predict their impacts as the plan is drafted. Mayor Hawker explained that a General Plan is a report of what the City anticipates will happen over a period of years and said that this is the first time he can ever remember looking at the General Plan and not going out 25 years, but instead looking at almost a build-out model. The City of Mesa, within the next 25 years, will be substantially built out and by 2040, the City will probably be more involved in redevelopment efforts than in new growth areas.

Mayor Hawker reiterated that he appreciates the time and energy expended by staff and the citizen committee to develop the report and the land use maps as far as they have to date. He added that he is disappointed with some of the consulting services and time frames and the fact that the time frames have not been closely followed. Mayor Hawker said that he has received comments that the elements are not in the proper form to be placed on the ballot and need more work before going out for a vote.

Mayor Hawker added that the City Attorney's Office has rendered an opinion regarding what can be modified during the 60-day comment period. He advised that it is important to know what can and cannot be modified during that time frame without triggering another 60-day comment period so that deadlines can be met. Mayor Hawker said that the documents must be published and ready for distribution by September 20th so that the 60-day comment period can begin.

Planning Director Frank Mizner addressed the Council and commended the members of the committee for the very hard work they devoted to this important project. Mr. Mizner provided an overview of Growing Smarter and said that State statutes in Arizona have required municipal planning for many years. In 1998 and again in 2000, the State adopted Growing Smarter and Growing Smarter Plus in response to the threat of a citizen initiative which was placed on the 2000 ballot and defeated. As a result of the State's action, municipal planning legislations have changed dramatically. Several new elements, such as cost of development and water resources, are now required, language identifying major and minor amendments had to be adopted, and General Plans in municipalities, not counties, are now subject to ratification by the voters. Whenever the Council adopts a new General Plan, it must now go on the ballot of an election.

Mr. Mizner said that the City began the 2025 process late last spring and it became obvious that the City was embarking upon updating three major plans, the Parks and Recreation Plan, the Transportation Plan and the General Plan. He added that later on, the City also got involved in the Economic Development Plan. Direction to staff was to coordinate the three plans so that they all fell under one "umbrella" project.

Discussion ensued relative to issuing an RFP, hiring the consultant team Parsons-Brinkerhoff, which has subcontracts with a variety of other firms, the formation of the Joint Master Plan Committee, (JMPC) composed of 31 citizens, the formation of four sub-committees for the respective plans, the fact that the General Plan is the only one that, in accordance with State statutes, must be adopted by the Council and placed on a ballot for the vote of the citizens, the initial target date of adopting the plan by December 31, 2001, the fact that it soon became apparent that it would be extremely difficult to meet the targeted adoption date, and the challenges that arose as a result of General Motors' closure and relocation announcement.

Mr. Mizner noted that earlier this summer and fall, presentations on the status of the project were provided to the Council. He stated the opinion that staff may not have been as clear as they should have been in explaining that they might not be able to meet the December 31st deadline because they wanted to go as far as they could and accomplish as much as possible before making that decision.

Mr. Mizner added that the timetable became extremely compressed and required the JMPC to complete its work by last week, the public comment period would have to begin on Thursday of this week, Planning and Zoning public hearings would be scheduled for October, and the plans would have to be approved by the Council in November in order to be placed on the ballot of a March 2002 election. The results of that process are the maps and elements that are before the Council today. The JMPC struggled with the land use part of this and meetings were held on August 30, September 6, and again on September 13th, and it was extremely difficult to develop plans for this much land in a compressed timeframe without benefit of information that the JMPC wanted to review and consider. Mr. Mizner said that there are some members on the committee who were not very comfortable with the process and felt they were pressured and their decisions were being made in a vacuum. He added that information such as input from property owners and adequate information about other aspects of the plan have not been made available to the members of the Committee.

Mr. Mizner informed the Council that an adopted plan was arrived at, but said it would be fair to state that the attitude of the members of the JMPC last week was that "they were not adopting this plan or endorsing the plan, they were moving it along to meet the schedule required to place the plan on the ballot of a spring 2002 election." He emphasized that the map has been voted on and received a couple of negative votes, very little time was spent reviewing the elements, and that a great deal of work remains to be completed.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the current document is the result of eight different authors and contains blanks, typographical errors, formatting problems, and a variety of other issues; staff's belief that they can address many of those issues prior to this Thursday when the document is scheduled to go out for a 60-day comment period, and the fact that based on the legal opinion rendered by the City Attorney's Office, staff cannot "reinvent" or "materially change" the plan during the 60-day comment period.

Mr. Mizner said a major concern is that once the process begins on September 20th, a large amount of input, suggestions and criticisms will be generated, especially from the large number of property owners throughout the City. He explained that staff will document all of the input that is received and develop a report to present to the Planning and Zoning Board, which will also receive many comments throughout the public hearing process, and all of that information will then be forwarded on to the Council for their review and consideration. Mr. Mizner stated that the Council will then have to decide the type and scope of changes they want to make and the City Attorney's Office will have to make a determination in November as to whether the City is on-track with the General Plan.

Mr. Mizner discussed the fact that City elections, in accordance with State law, can only be held on four dates in March, May, September and November. He noted that the law does not state that the general plan must go to the next available election following City Council action (March 2002) but if that remains the direction of the Council, staff will endeavor to meet that goal. As many comments as possible would then be incorporated, the public comment period will take place, the Planning and Zoning Board will hold their public hearings on October 11 and 18th, and adoption by resolution will be scheduled for a November 19, 2001 City Council meeting. Mr. Mizner added that if the Council's direction is to work towards a May 2002 election, the additional two months will provide staff time to do a better job with the narrative material and will provide an opportunity for the general plan subcommittee and the JMPC to meet, either jointly or separately, to revisit the land use part of the plan and to solicit additional comments from various parties and interest groups. Mr. Mizner said that if the Council's direction is to place this item on the ballot of a November 2002 election, staff will develop a schedule to meet that timeframe as well.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that other cities are experiencing similar difficulties, and the City of Peoria is planning to hold a November 2002 election for this issue while the City of Phoenix is making plans to place the issue on their March 2002 ballot, but is not certain whether this will be able to occur.

Mayor Hawker thanked Mr. Mizner for his presentation

Mayor Hawker said that he believes the first thing the Council must do is review the documents that are before them and determine whether it is possible to work with the existing materials and have that accomplished by September 20th. If that is not the case, then the March election date will no longer be a possibility.

Mr. Mizner commented that the schedule is extremely tight and no extra time exists.

Mayor Hawker said that another option would be to proceed forward with the document on September 20th and then take another look at it on November 19th. If substantial changes have been or need to be made, then the date will be set in accordance with those findings.

Mr. Mizner clarified that the County requires a 105-day notice in order to be placed on the ballot and therefore a decision would have to be made in January for this issue to be voted upon at the May election.

Mayor Hawker commented that November 19th would be the target date to either acknowledge that the City proceeds forward with the March election or selects another date.

Mr. Mizner said that if the Council decides that as many changes as possible should be made and that staff should continue efforts to place this issue on the ballot of the March 2002 election, the changes during the 60-day public comment period would then have to be minimized. On the other hand, if the Council should decide at this time to place the issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election, sufficient time would exist in which to solicit significant input and to make extensive changes.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, Mr. Mizner said that if the Council wanted to go out for a 60-day public comment period and still meet the County's requirements for this issue to be placed on the ballot of the May 2002 election, the public comment period would have to commence by approximately November 20th.

Mayor Hawker said that a viable option would be to take the document out for the 60-day public comment period now while staff begins work on the document, modifying and correcting as needed, and then in November request a legal opinion as to whether substantial changes have been made to the document. If not, the issue can be placed on the March ballot, but if significant changes have occurred and an additional 60-day public comment period is required, the issue can still be placed on the ballot of the May election.

City Clerk Barbara Jones confirmed that the Clerk's Office will be calling the election on approximately January 21st. She added that at the time of calling the election, staff typically advises the voters what items will appear on the ballot. The actual ballot language must be submitted to the County 105 days prior to the election.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the County has advised that they have approximately one inch of space remaining on the back side of their ballot, which is significantly less than the space required for the General Plan Update; the possibility of going on a second ballot and problems associated with that process; the fact that citizens who request early ballots for the March election are automatically placed on a list to receive a ballot for the May general election unless they decline the offer to be sent one; the fact that delaying the placement of this issue until the March 2004 election would most likely not be acceptable; Mayor Hawker's preference that the issue be placed on the ballot of a City-wide election where members of the Council are being elected, such as the March and possibly the May 2002 elections, and the importance of allowing the citizens to hear the various candidates' opinions on issues such as job-to-housing ratios, growth and what they envision at build-out for Mesa.

Mayor Hawker requested input from the Council as to whether it is feasible that the September 20th deadline will be met for a March 2002 election and if not, to provide recommendations for an alternate election date.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson stated that one of the major issues in the community is transportation and funding for this important issue. He said that in the off year, March 2003, the potential exists for scheduling a transportation election and added that the Council may want to consider placing the transportation issue on the ballot. He expressed the opinion that it would be difficult to hold off on this critical issue until the March 2004 election and added that placing the transportation issue on the ballot with the General Plan Update might generate a larger voter turnout.

Mr. Mizner stated that from a staff point of view, in order to maximize public involvement, input and changes reflecting other people's concerns, it would be better to state right now that the issue will be placed on the ballot of the May 2002 election. He added that the public comment period would not begin until the third week in November and this would allow sufficient time to incorporate the appropriate revisions into the document.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that a number of significant policy changes still have to be made by the City Council, the fact that the various elements contain numerous policy issues, and the fact that staff is working on an "unreleased" 200 page draft and is attempting to address formatting and typographical errors and weed out a number of the policy proposals.

Councilmember Walters said that she doesn't regret that the Council pushed to move this forward and added that some very important information has been gained. She said that she appreciates the work that has gone into this time-consuming process by the JMPC. Councilmember Walters stated that she is still not comfortable that sufficient input has been received from everyone on the new revisions as well as some of the initial revisions. She added that she is not comfortable sending even the revised document out to the public for comment. Councilmember Walters said that she would support placing the issue on the ballot of the November 2002 election or the March 2003 Primary election and commented that the committees working on the various plans need more time in order to incorporate their plans into these elements. Councilmember Walters stated that she would like staff to prepare a timeline showing how it all fits together and when and what steps have to be taken in order to place the issue on the November ballot. She added that a detailed work plan should be developed that shows, for example, the Parks plan feeding into the Parks and Open Space element, the Economic Development plan feeding into this plan, and should list specific steps and target dates.

Councilmember Jaffa thanked the community that has participated to date and said that a great effort has been expended. He agreed with Councilmember Walters' comment that a fair amount of work remains to be done and the project is not finished. He said it is paramount that the City present to the public a document that everyone can be proud of, particularly in view of the fact that the document will be utilized over the next ten years. Councilmember Jaffa said that if the Council intends to follow the plan as a blueprint for the City, it is imperative that it meets all of the Council's goals. He added that he had concerns regarding the size of the JMPC from the onset and said it is difficult to conduct meetings when that many people are involved. He added that he is also concerned that the development community has not had the opportunity to weigh in on the proposal. Councilmember Jaffa commented that although minor concerns appear to be included in the document, many major issues are not specific enough and lack definition. He said he concurs with Councilmember Walters that the process should be delayed. He suggested that staff proceed with the public process and when everyone feels comfortable that a good document is in place, the issue will be moved along to the public comment period. He said he is not able to recommend a specific election date at this time, but commented that he believes a good product to present to the voters would be in place by the 2003 elections. He said he does not believe a specific date should be targeted and added that everyone should be directed to continue working and report back to the Council as soon as possible. Councilmember Jaffa said that the Council needs to meet to consider the various policy decisions that must be made.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated that the members of the JMPC have been charged with a task that has resulted in being as much or more work than the Freeholder's development of the City's initial Charter. He said he believes that the members of the committee understand the complexities involved in this issue. Councilmember Kavanaugh added that he would prefer not to place this issue on the ballot of the March 2002 election and said that there are too many pitfalls in pushing for that date at this time. He stated that the plan is still incomplete and needs more work. He said he supports placing the issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election and noted that early voting ballots that are mailed to citizens for the March election will automatically be sent to the same voters for the May election. He said that this is an important factor in encouraging a good turnout. Councilmember Kavanaugh added the opinion that the May 2002 timeframe would allow sufficient time in which to complete the work and is both workable and doable.

Mayor Hawker recommended that the Council target the March 2002 election and said that sufficient time would exist in which to change the date to the May election if substantial changes occur and it became necessary. He added that the Council should not "back off" from the March election. He advised that he has gone through all of the elements and has rated two of them "poor," one is a land-use element and the other is a growth area element. He said he believes that part of the problem is that the land use plan was just developed. He added that there are several elements that require policy changes and other changes and he had one that he rated "good," and the remainder "okay." Mayor Hawker said there are other areas that need substantial work, but he believes the job can be accomplished.

Mayor Hawker commented that if plans to target the March election fail and substantial changes must be made to the plan, he would then recommend that the issue be placed on the ballot of the May 2002 election. He said he likes the idea of having the issue on the ballot of an election where members of the Council are being elected so that the candidates can debate the issues and the citizens are provided an opportunity to hear their views on this important matter. He added that his third choice would be March 2004 and said that if the general plan is supposed to have a ten-year life, a 2004 election should work.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson as to whether effort will be expended to coordinate all of the policies, Mr. Mizner advised that the process has been very fast and many authors have been involved, but it is staff's intention to address this area.

Vice Mayor Davidson stressed the importance of not generating a document that contains conflicting policy statements and said that it will take time to thoroughly review and revise the plan. He added that census data from the Federal Government relative to housing has not yet been received and will not be available until April. He said that a meaningful housing plan element cannot be developed without this important information. He added that beyond that, he is disappointed in the manner in which the proposal was framed and presented and he agrees with Councilmember Walters that a timeline must be established and closely monitored and any deviations must be made known.

Discussion ensued regarding the land use map and plan, the fact that the JMPC did approve the land use plan and accepted and moved the elements along to the public comment process.

Vice Mayor Davidson stressed the importance of clarifying exactly what "adopted or approved the land use plan" means and asked Interim City Attorney Joe Padilla to look into this.

City Engineer Keith Nath said that the JMPC took the areas of the City piece by piece and approved everything prior to September 13th except Area L, which is General Motors and the surrounding area. At the meeting on the 13th, after considerable discussion, the JMPC approved a concept for Area L and then the entire map.

Vice Mayor Davidson asked if this meant that the land use plan cannot be changed. Mr. Mizner explained that the Committee is an advisory one and the Council has the authority to make any changes it deems appropriate.

Vice Mayor Davidson said he initially spoke in support of a March 2002 election, but after attending two of the meetings it became apparent that the plan cannot be completed by that date. He commented on the large amount of information that is missing from the document and said the City would be "selling itself short" if it tried to move the process along that quickly. He noted that the difference in time between March and May is not significant and said that he does not believe he can support placing the plan on the ballot of a 2002 election. He said that if a majority of the Council decides to proceed with a 2002 election, he would prefer it be in March rather than May, but emphasized that placing the issue on the ballot of the March 2003 election, as recommended by Mike Hutchinson, is the correct manner in which to proceed.

Councilmember Whalen said that he is not comfortable moving forward and added the opinion that the Council should give the JMPC input on what they have already done and ask them what they believe they can accomplish within the next 60 days. He stressed the importance of providing the members of that committee both time and support and said the Council delegated this project to the members and should let them carry out their task. He said that the Council could then make a decision on whether the issue can be placed on the May ballot and if that is not possible, the Council will have to select another date.

Councilmember Walters commented on the importance of selecting a date and said that this decision will dictate the entire schedule. She said that if the March 2002 election is not a feasible target date, she would support placing the issue on the ballot of the November 2002 election or the March 2003

Councilmember Jaffa stated the opinion that the March 2003 election date is achievable and agreed that turnout for that election would probably increase if bond issues are also placed on the same ballot. He said that an extremely aggressive effort would have to occur in order to complete the necessary work and place the issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election. Councilmember Jaffa said placing this issue on the March 2003 ballot will provide Council an opportunity to address numerous policy issues and added that the development community will have an opportunity to provide input and hear Council's concerns. He reiterated that although May 2002 may be feasible, an extremely aggressive effort would have to be put forth by all concerned. He said that the Council should move forward with the premise that something can be done within the next 60 days and added that March 2003 would be a more definite alternative date.

Additional discussion ensued relative to deadline dates that would have to be met in order to place the issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated the opinion that Council and staff should strive to place the issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election and said if that date turns out not to be attainable, he would prefer placing the matter on the ballot of the March 2003 election.

Councilmember Whalen stated the opinion that staff should work on getting a plan to the Council in January so that a decision can be made as to whether to move forward with the May 2002 election. He said that based on the status of the plan at that time, the Council can decide either to place the plan on the May 2002 election ballot or defer the matter to the March 2003 election.

It was moved by Councilmember Whalen, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that staff be directed to work towards compiling the documents that must be published to allow the Mesa General Plan issue to be placed on the ballot of the May 2002 City of Mesa General Election.

Mayor Hawker noted that citizens have submitted speaker slips to talk on this item.

Mark Metzger, a Chief Pilot representing the Boeing Company, indicated his company's intention to provide whatever information and assistance is required throughout this process. He added that the Council will have to decide the appropriate time to place this on the ballot for the citizens to consider.

Teresa Brice-Heames, speaking on behalf of the Housing Roundtable that has been addressing housing elements, stressed the importance of providing residents throughout the community with as much information as possible regarding the proposed plan. She added that the public opinion workshops, which were eliminated from the timeframe, represent the most critical aspect of this process. She stated that housing data reflecting the value of homes in Mesa will not be available until April, and if the Council decides to place this issue on the ballot of the May election, that information will not be available in time for public participation. Ms. Brice-Heames noted that by that time, the 60-day public comment period will already be in process and if the data does show that there should be significant changes in housing policies, that would constitute a significant change and would necessitate an additional 60-day public comment period.

Alan Parker, speaking as a citizen of Mesa and a member of the Planning and Zoning Board, expressed the opinion that content rather than dates should be the topic of conversation at this time. He noted that the General Plan will map the future for the entire City and added the opinion that the earliest date the plan should appear on an election ballot would be November. This would allow open dialogue to occur on all of the elements and the policies. Mr. Parker added the opinion that the City

would be selling itself short if it attempted to "hurry the process along" and stressed the importance of being open and inclusive.

Dave Udall, representing property owners near Signal Butte and Southern, stated that he supports the motion for the additional 60-days and said he would like to see it move forward and not be put off for another year or two. He added that the development community is on hold waiting for the new plan and the process must move ahead. Mr. Udall stated that he concurs with Councilmember Jaffa's comments relative to the fact that if major/minor amendments can only be made once a year, the developers won't wait and will take their business to another community. He expressed the opinion that a closer look needs to be taken at this particular element in an effort to ensure that amendments can be made in a more simplified manner.

Jack Sellers, representing General Motors Proving Grounds, said that his company is encouraged by the 60-day extension to allow more time to take a look at development in the extremely critical area around Williams Gateway Airport (WGA). He added the opinion that in order to do justice to a plan for that area, his company would prefer placing the General Plan on the ballot of the March 2003 election. He added that he still has concerns as to whether the City is considering modifying the land plan in the area around WGA and said it is important to step back and take another look at this important issue to make sure that the most appropriate long-term plan for the area is approved.

Barbara Carpenter, a Mesa resident, agreed that additional time is necessary for this important matter and said that the 60 days is warranted, not only for public participation, but also to provide potential candidates an opportunity to become well informed on this matter. She noted that no official candidates have yet come forward for two of the three Council districts that will hold elections in 2002. Ms. Carpenter commented that additional time is necessary to review and consider this important issue that will impact Mesa for many years.

Vice Mayor Davidson said that he will not support the motion for placing this issue on the ballot of the May 2002 election. He commented on the fact that the housing element is one of the more critical elements of the General Plan and reiterated that updated housing data will not be available until April 2002. He said that he cannot support rendering decisions on the General Plan without first having this important information on housing from the Federal Government to review. He added that if the Council proceeded in this manner, they would be asking people to rely on plans that are not yet developed but are referenced in the document. He added that significant policy statements need to be addressed and once again stated that the earliest date this issue should be placed on the ballot of an election would be March 2003.

Councilmember Jaffa clarified that his vote is not necessarily for a May date, but to determine if all of the goals can be met by that time so that the Council feels comfortable placing the matter on the ballot of that election. He said that although this might not be possible to accomplish, proceeding forward at this time will allow the public process to begin. He stated that his vote is to move the process along with the hope that all of the required information will be obtained and added that he still has significant concerns regarding definitions that are contained in the plan.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated that he wanted to re-emphasize that should the motion pass at this time, another vote will still be taken in January to formally adopt a Resolution calling a May election and designating the issues that will be placed on the ballot. He added that although this is not the final vote on this issue, it is an important vote and said that he does have concerns about delaying this matter to later years. He noted that next June, two and maybe three new Councilmembers will be elected and

will not have the benefit of all the experience and work that the current Council has put into this important issue. He said he is hopeful that the Council and the community can come together to develop a good, workable and worthy plan. He commented that based on the fact that the Council will have an additional opportunity to vote on this matter, he is comfortable supporting the motion.

Councilmember Walters stated the opinion that the Council's decision point is 60 days from now rather than in January since the Council will have to make a decision on whether to go out for public comment on the plan in 60 days. She said that her concern is whether the product will be ready within that 60-day timeframe. Councilmember Walters commented on Mr. Udall's statement that the development community does not know what to do at this point, particularly in the southeastern portion of the City where changes have been made to the Land Use Map. She asked what legal options the Council would have if the issue was delayed to the March 2003 election, the 1996 General Plan was readopted, and a developer submits a request for a zoning change.

Mr. Mizner expressed the opinion that the Council would proceed with zoning and redevelopment cases if they were consistent with the 1996 General Plan since the plan would be re-ratified for a year to a year and a half depending on the actual election date. He said that problems would arise if someone wants to move ahead with development that reflects the City's new plan, which has not yet been ratified and is inconsistent with the current plan. He added that staff would then be in the position of presenting a zoning case to the Council that does not match the official General Plan. He said he does not believe that cases such as that could be approved since all changes must be consistent with the General Plan.

Councilmember Walters stated that she will still not support the motion, but said she is cognizant of the problems associated with moving forward with his item for placement on a 2002 election ballot.

Vice Mayor Davidson commented that the timeline that will be set effectively places everyone on a treadmill to reach a deadline that may not be achievable. He added that if the Council agrees to place the item on the March 2003 ballot, it is still possible that the work can be accomplished earlier, but he stressed the importance of providing all of the resources sufficient time in which to complete their tasks.

Councilmember Whalen reiterated that the intent of his motion is to provide everyone an additional 60 days in which to continue to work on the document. He said that at the end of the 60-day period, the Council will meet and decide whether the plan should be placed on the ballot of the May 2002 election. He added that staff, the members of the Committee and the consultants have been given the responsibility of developing the Plan and have been under significant pressure to complete the task. He said that they have been working on the Plan for over a year and deserve an additional 60 days. Councilmember Whalen also commented on the fact that he does not want to place this issue so far out in the future that developers decide to build their projects in the County rather than waiting until Mesa finally places this matter on an election ballot.

Mayor Hawker thanked everyone for their input and requested a roll call vote on the motion.

Mayor Hawker:	Aye
Vice Mayor Davidson:	Nay
Councilmember Jaffa:	Aye
Councilmember Kavanaugh:	Aye
Councilmember Walters:	Nay
Councilmember Whalen:	Aye

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

Mayor Hawker requested that the Council discuss the input that they will provide regarding the General Plan. He stated that the document contains several policy issues that must be addressed, and stated the opinion that the process may move along faster if the Council undertook a quick review of those elements on a broad scale, indicating the important issues that they would like included.

Councilmember Whalen said that he has not reviewed the document in as thorough a manner as he would like prior to discussing it. He suggested that a Study Session be scheduled within the next week, perhaps after the next JMPC meeting. He added that the Council could also schedule a joint meeting with the JMPC to discuss some of the issues.

Mayor Hawker commented that after reading through the entire document, he believes that there are a number of issues that need to be addressed by the Council before the JMPC spends too much time on them. He said that he would prefer that the Council, after refining the language and taking into account some of the comments they made individually to staff, review the revised document and provide input as they schedule another JMPC meeting. He noted that it may be two or three weeks before the members of the Committee meet together as a group.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson suggested that staff be given time to work on a detailed schedule as requested. He recommended that next Monday, September 24, 2001, the Council devote some time to discussing a detailed schedule at the Study preceding the Regular Council Meeting. He added that in the meantime, the Councilmembers should provide input and suggestions to Frank Mizner.

Councilmember Walters said that she recognizes the fact that there is no plan in place to put the whole JMPC together, but said that she hopes that some of the comments that she has made will not be lost. She suggested that the Parks, Economic Development and the Transportation people get together and discuss how their specific elements are being addressed in the Plan. She agreed with Mayor Hawker that a policy discussion must be scheduled as part of the work plan and said it should take place before the JMPC meets again.

Mayor Hawker commented on the importance of reviewing all of the elements as one group because there are a number of conflicting statements contained in the various elements. Mayor Hawker agreed with Mr. Hutchinson's suggestion that a Study Session be scheduled one week from today, prior to the Regular Council Meeting, to review a detailed schedule that will be prepared by staff. He requested that time be allocated to provide additional feedback.

Vice Mayor Davidson noted that the document contains statements such as "very small scale" and "policy" and asked that they be more clearly defined. He added that the section referring to big box development states "one-half mile from residential" and questioned where this statement originated. He stated the opinion that the statement represents a big box policy and the Council should have some in-depth discussions regarding it.

Mayor Hawker indicated that he will provide significant input to staff regarding the proposed document.

Councilmember Jaffa said that he has a substantial amount of questions as well regarding the report and the drawing for the General Plan.

Mayor Hawker said that it is the consensus of the Council at this time that the May 2002 election be targeted for placement of the General Plan on the ballot. He added that the public comment period and the revised schedule will be addressed at the Monday Council Study Session.

Mayor Hawker stated that one week ago tomorrow, an attack on America took place in both New York and Washington, D.C. He reported that shooting incidents occurred on Saturday in Mesa that have the potential of being religiously and/or racially motivated. He said that the shootings are currently under investigation. The Mayor stated that this is a time for people to be rational and calm and stressed the importance of not becoming "vigilantes" in response to the terrible tragedy that has struck our country. Mayor Hawker noted that the United States has the strongest military in the world and will protect American citizens on our own soil. He instructed the citizens to let the government take the necessary military action and emphasized the importance of not initiating action on their own.

2. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Special Council Meeting adjourned at 8:51 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 Special Council Meeting of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 17th 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

lgc