

# COUNCIL MINUTES

March 3, 2005

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 3, 2005 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

Mike Hutchinson  
Debbie Spinner  
Barbara Jones

### 1. Review items on the agenda for the March 7, 2005 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: None

Items removed from the consent agenda: 4c, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, 9a

Items deleted from the consent agenda: 7d, 7e

Planning Director John Wesley advised the Council that agenda item **Z03-64** will be added to the March 7, 2005 Regular Council Meeting agenda, but will not be on consent.

### 2. Hear a report, discuss and consider the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Griswold, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee, reported that the Committee was originally charged with determining how to implement redevelopment and infill as the City continues to age. He explained that two-thirds of Mesa has reached build-out and it may be necessary for staff and the Council to implement new procedures to accomplish such tasks. He added that the Committee has developed various recommendations to accomplish the goals.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, City Attorney Debbie Spinner clarified that Mayor Hawker, Vice Mayor Walters, Councilmember Jones and Councilmember Whalen have historically declared potential conflicts of interest regarding this Committee, which would leave only three Councilmembers to act on the Committee's recommendations. She explained that per A.R.S. 38-508 (B), if a public body cannot take action because the majority of its members have a conflict of interest, all members may participate in the decision after declaring the conflict in the official record. Ms. Spinner stated that this is known as the "rule of impossibility."

Mayor Hawker declared a potential conflict of interest for the reason that his business owns property located in the downtown square mile.

Vice Mayor Walters declared a potential conflict of interest for the reason that she does special projects for Mesa Schools, whose main office is located in downtown Mesa.

Councilmember Whalen declared a potential conflict of interest for the reason that several of his customers have businesses located in the Town Center area.

Councilmember Jones declared a potential conflict of interest for the reason that his parents reside in the Town Center area.

Neighborhood Services Manager Lisha Garcia introduced Tom Verploegen, Executive Director of the Mesa Town Center Corporation (MTCC), who was prepared to make a presentation to the Council.

Mr. Verploegen reported that the primary role of the MTCC, which recently celebrated its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary, is to promote, market and manage many of the City's business and redevelopment efforts in the downtown area. He explained that during the MTCC's existence, there have been approximately 263 commercial developments and renovations throughout the downtown square mile, 231 City-assisted demolitions and 11 projects that are currently underway. Mr. Verploegen stated that the successful completion of the projects has been the result of a public, private and nonprofit collaboration. He also displayed a slide presentation in the Council Chambers depicting a series of "before and after" residential, commercial and retail projects in the downtown area.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson acknowledged the efforts of the MTCC and commented that although there have been many controversial issues associated with the downtown area over the years, the new commercial development/renovations reflect a more appealing appearance and business environment for Mesa's Town Center area.

Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committeemember Steve Adams addressed the Council and expressed appreciation to his fellow Committeemembers for their service and dedication during the Committee's tenure. He noted the various speakers who made presentations to the Committee and also thanked the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) and the Neighborhood Services Department for their support and expertise. Mr. Adams said that it became apparent to the Committee that the DDC plays a vital role in the development of the Town Center area and commented that it was the consensus of the Committee that the DDC continue to perform such a role.

Mr. Adams referred to the Committee's recommendations as contained in the March 3, 2005 City Council Report and offered a brief overview of **Recommendation I, Town Center Development Area**. (See Attachment 1.)

Committeemember Art Jordan provided a short synopsis of **Recommendation II, Town Center Development Area – Additional Issues**. He also thanked Councilmember Griswold for "opening the perspective in the dialogue" throughout the year when the Committee met and complimented Deputy City Manager Paul Wenbert for "crystallizing the open dialogue into the Committee's final recommendations."

Committeemember Joe Shipley highlighted **Recommendation III, Create new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas (NBIA) in Mesa that focus on economic development within neighborhoods**. He suggested that potential sites that the Council may wish to consider for NBIA include the Fiesta Mall area; the west Mesa area near Dobson and Broadway Roads; and land along Broadway Road from Center Street to Gilbert Road.

Committeemember Alex Finter discussed the various elements contained in **Recommendation IV, Citywide Infill**. He commented that the Committee acknowledged that development in Mesa has changed over the years and that the City is now beginning to focus its efforts on various infill projects in the older areas of the community.

Committeemember Dave Richins briefly highlighted **Recommendation V, Additional Revitalization Recommendations**.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, City Manager Mike Hutchinson clarified that because the Committee's report contains a significant number of recommendations, he suggested that the Council set aside time at several Study Sessions to review the individual recommendations on a more in-depth basis. He also voiced appreciation to the Committeemembers for their accomplishments and dedication throughout this long and arduous process.

Mayor Hawker commented that when the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Committee was originally formed, it was his intent that the members would consider the City of Mesa's role regarding downtown redevelopment in light of the Bailey's Brake Shop matter. He stated that the Committee's recommendation that the DDC would function as the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board would be an entity that the Council could consider a model to streamline various processes not only in the redevelopment area, but also throughout the entire City. Mayor Hawker noted, however, that he wished the Committee "had not carved that out as part of the downtown redevelopment area" and excluded the Councilmembers who have declared conflicts, because in his opinion, it would have been a topic that the entire Council could have discussed. He added that he is unsure how the Council should prioritize the various recommendations and how much time should be spent considering the individual items.

Vice Mayor Walters concurred with Mayor Hawker's comments regarding the fact that the Committee broadened its charge and thereby excluded four Councilmembers from discussing various issues, although the "rule of impossibility" now allows the entire Council to address such issues.

Ms. Spinner clarified that the only thing certain Councilmembers have consistently declared conflicts on is establishing the redevelopment area, but indicated in terms of instituting

procedures and streamlining City processes, such members would not have conflicts. She added that the question upon which the conflicts were declared was: Should the City maintain, change or eliminate the redevelopment area.

Vice Mayor Walters commented that the Council should have that discussion sooner rather than later and allow everyone to participate. She stated that it seems illogical that the only Councilmembers who cannot participate are those individuals who have the most knowledge about the subject. Vice Mayor Walters suggested that staff divide up the recommendations into smaller presentations so that the Council will have more time to consider the individual items.

Mayor Hawker and Councilmember Griswold concurred with Vice Mayor Walters' suggestion.

Councilmember Whalen stated the opinion that it is very evident that the City should engage in a marketing campaign to encourage more developers to do business in Mesa.

Mr. Shipley, on behalf of the entire Ad Hoc Redevelopment Committee, expressed appreciation to Councilmember Griswold for the leadership he provided to the members and stated that it was a pleasure working with him.

Mayor Hawker thanked the Committeemembers for their efforts and hard work during their tenure on the Committee.

3. Discuss and consider a proposed Request for Proposals for 51-55 East Main Street.

Vice Mayor Walters declared a potential conflict of interest and said she would refrain from discussion/consideration of this agenda item.

Senior Town Center Development Specialist Patrick Murphy provided the Council with a brief overview of this agenda item. He reported that in 2002, Hunter Interests conducted an analysis of the subject property and proposed a concept that would include a two-story building with approximately 30,000 square feet of floor space to accommodate a destination restaurant (that would have the ability to cater services to the Mesa Arts Center) and an arts-oriented specialty retail operation. Mr. Murphy explained that developers have approached Mayor Hawker and the Town Center Development staff recently expressing their interest in revitalizing the property and as a result thereof, staff is requesting Council authorization to issue the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Mr. Murphy indicated that the proposed RFP is more flexible and inclusive than previously issued RFPs and addresses a number of concerns that have surfaced in the past. He noted that the RFP was revised to include individuals from the Downtown Development Committee (DDC), General Development Committee, Mesa Arts Center, Museum and Cultural Advisory Board, Mesa Community College, Mesa Public Schools and Mesa Town Center Corporation Board on the proposal review team.

Mr. Murphy further commented that the RFP contains language which states that the City is not interested in selling the property, but rather desires to enter into a long-term lease with the developer to ensure that the uses the City wishes to encourage at that location are achieved. He added that the lease could be structured in such a way to enable a developer to obtain the necessary financing for the project.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that on September 22, 2004, the Town Center Corporation Board recommended that the City solicit private sector bids for development of the property as opposed to continuing to utilize the existing RFP process, which is the reason why staff amended the process to become more transparent and flexible; that on January 10, 2005, the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee recommended that the City implement the recommendations outlined in the Hunter Report and that staff use the revised RFP system to develop City-owned properties; and that on February 17, 2005, the General Development Committee recommended that the City issue the RFP and consider proposals that would include both lease and sale options for the property and also that staff include the Mesa Arts Center Foundation's request that potential developers consider its request to provide retail space for the Foundation.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, City Manager Mike Hutchinson explained that he is extremely concerned about the sale of the property. He stated that although it is difficult to foresee the future, because of the City's substantial investment in the Mesa Arts Center, it would be in the City's best interest to retain control of the property to ensure that an appropriate use is selected for the site. Mr. Hutchinson added that if the RFP is modified to suggest that the City may consider selling the property, such a message might mislead the development community.

Councilmember Jones expressed support for the RFP including both lease and sale options and stated that from a development standpoint, he would not like the RFP to include only a lease option because Mesa could potentially "lose out" on some great projects. He added that he would expect a developer to propose a quality project that would be complementary to the Mesa Arts Center rather than a project of lesser quality.

Councilmember Griswold concurred with Councilmember Jones' comments and stated that if the RFP only allowed a developer to lease the property, it could inhibit the developer's ability to obtain the necessary financing for the project.

Councilmember Rawles commented that although his first choice would be to sell the property outright, he would be amenable to include sale and lease options in the RFP. He stressed that he does not like the idea of the City controlling private development endeavors or offering incentives to the developer.

Councilmember Thom concurred with Councilmember Rawles' comments.

Further discussion ensued between the Council and Assistant City Attorney Monica Michelizzi regarding the possible structuring of various contract options in terms of a lease as compared to the sale of the property; the fact that the City is encouraging the development of restaurants in the downtown area to serve the needs of its visitors; that the Mesa Arts Center staff is already turning away rental opportunities, such as the Arizona Commission on the Arts' annual luncheon for 450 guests, because the Center only has the capacity to serve 300 guests; and that staff suggested that one of the RFP requirements be that the restaurant/catering service include 15,000 square feet as part of the redevelopment project to provide catering to the Arts Center and a seating capacity of 450.

Councilmember Whalen commented that this is the first time he has heard about the requirement to provide seating capacity for 450 individuals at the facility. He noted that it was his understanding the caterer would prepare the food at the restaurant facility and serve it at

various Art Center locales (i.e., on stage, one of the theaters, in the shadow walk) but not require that the caterer provide dining room accommodations and therefore be in competition with other banquet facilities. Councilmember Whalen added that he believes the RFP is encouraging a restaurant and an arts-related retail establishment. He also said that it is important that the Council consider whether offering incentives to the developer would be appropriate.

It was moved by Councilmember Whalen, seconded by Councilmember Jones, to direct staff to issue the Request for Proposals, but allow the developer to bring back either a lease or purchase proposal for evaluation (including the RFP's Section 5, Submission Requirements, Item 9.)

Councilmember Whalen, in clarifying his motion, stated that some incentives may be discussed, but added that a decision on those would be made at a later date. He stressed the importance of finding out what the developer wants from the City. Councilmember Whalen added that because of the sizeable investment the City has made to construct the Mesa Arts Center, it may be necessary for the City to offer a developer some type of incentive to ensure the success and viability of a development at that location.

Councilmember Griswold expressed support for the motion and suggested that the following language be included in the Ground Lease provision of the RFP: "For exceptionally high quality projects that may require flexible financing, sale of property may be considered."

Mr. Hutchinson stated that staff would refine the language in the RFP and bring it back to the Council for review.

Mayor Hawker concurred that the RFP should include lease and sale options, but commented that he is not interested in offering development incentives. He stated that to "artificially try to put a restaurant" at this site and offering incentives to ensure its success is unfair to a similar business located nearby that is using private funding for its operation.

It was moved by Councilmember Rawles, seconded by Councilmember Thom, to amend Councilmember Whalen's motion that the City sell the property outright for the best price available in today's market.

Councilmember Whalen stated that he was unwilling to change his original motion, but would be willing to table his motion so the Council could first vote on Councilmember Rawles' motion.

Councilmember Jones, who seconded the original motion, concurred with Councilmember Whalen's suggestion.

Mayor Hawker called for the vote and reiterated that the motion was to sell the property outright with no RFP being issued.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Rawles-Thom  
NAYS - Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Whalen  
ABSTAIN - Walters

Mayor Hawker declared the motion failed by majority vote of those voting.

Councilmember Whalen stated that his idea for incentives on this property is no greater than what any other business would acquire in the downtown area. He stated that such incentives would include a government lease and the abatement of property taxes for eight years. Councilmember Whalen also concurred with Mayor Hawker's comments that he would not like similar businesses placed at a disadvantage if the City offered incentives to the proposed development.

Additional discussion ensued relative to further modifications to the RFP including incorporating the language suggested by Councilmember Griswold; that any reference to incentives be removed from the document; and that staff would bring back a final draft of the RFP for the Council's review in the near future.

Councilmember Whalen restated his original motion that staff be directed to issue the Request for Proposals that would allow the developer to bring back either a lease or purchase proposal for evaluation.

Mayor Hawker called for the vote.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Rawles-Thom-Whalen  
NAYS - None  
ABSTAIN - Walters

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

4. Hear a presentation, discuss and consider the proposed funding recommendations for FY 2005-2006 CDBG/HOME/ADDI/ESG programs.

Due to time constraints, this matter was continued to the March 7, 2005 Study Session.

5. Acknowledge receipt of minutes of boards and committees.

- a. Board of Adjustment meeting held February 8, 2005.
- b. Human Relations Advisory Board meetings held December 1, 2004 and January 26, 2005.
- c. Parks and Recreation Board meeting held February 9, 2005.
- d. Police Committee meeting held February 10, 2005.
- e. Utility Committee meeting held February 3, 2005.

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

Carried unanimously.

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

Councilmember Jones	Mesa Police Academy Graduation Ceremony; Cactus League Breakfast
Councilmember Griswold	Mesa Police Academy Graduation Ceremony; ADOT meeting; Sam's Club meeting
Vice Mayor Walters	Cactus League Breakfast
Councilmember Thom	Mesa Police Academy Graduation Ceremony
Councilmember Whalen	SRP Line Siting Meeting

7. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Monday, March 7, 2005, TBA – Study Session

Monday, March 7, 2005, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, March 10, 2005, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, March 17, 2005, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

8. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

9. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

10. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 10:23 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 3<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2005. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pag  
attachment

## COUNCIL REPORT

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee:

#### **I. Town Center Development Area**

- a. Retain existing redevelopment area designation, and retain existing Downtown Development Committee (DDC) structure whereby the DDC functions as the Planning and Zoning Board and the Design Review Board. The DDC also acts in an advisory capacity to the City Council regarding projects in the redevelopment area.

#### **II. Town Center Development Area ---Additional Issues**

- a. Recognize the limitations that proposition 105 impose on economic development efforts, and that new development and/or redevelopment will be done without the use of eminent domain.
- b. Continue working with Mesa Community College to expand their campus in Downtown Mesa.
- c. Support a volunteer non-City board whose purpose is to champion the revitalization of Downtown Mesa. This board will maintain communications with the City Council on innovative ways to continue implementing the City's vision for revitalizing the downtown as set forth in the 1999 Mesa Town Center Concept Plan as amended from time to time.
- d. Continue the practice of only assessing impact fees for the service demand that the new development may create over and above what previously occurred on the site.
- e. Develop and implement a pro-active aggressive marketing plan to attract new development (retail, restaurants, office, and residential) in the TCRA.
- f. Implement the recommendations outlined in the Hunter Interests Inc. report dated September 12, 2002 including the use of, but not limited to the flexible and revised Request for Proposals system to develop city owned properties in the TCRA.
- g. Encourage new residential development, including multi-family, to help stimulate non-residential downtown development.

#### **III. Create new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas (NBIA) in Mesa that focus on economic development within neighborhoods**

- a. Develop criteria for designating NBIA areas and obtain neighborhood and business input into the development of these criteria.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 7

- b. Develop a list of available tools for NBIA.
- c. Facilitate the development of NBIA specific plans to address economic development of designated geographic areas.
- d. Develop and implement a pro-active aggressive marketing plan to attract new development (retail, restaurants, office, and, residential) in the new neighborhood business investment areas.
- e. Establish Neighborhood Business Investment Areas which allow the City Council to permit some waivers of development related fees (the waiver or rebate to be paid by the general fund) and relief from development standards within specific districts to encourage area revitalization.

**IV. City-wide Infill**

Including, but not limited to one or more of the following options:

- a. Define Infill.
- b. Implement a city review process for infill & NBIA's that mirrors the current DDC one stop shop process. Establish a new advisory board that reviews infill cases and/or all projects in the NBIA's, which would follow the DDC structure. The new committee may include members from several existing boards, such as Planning and Zoning, Design Review, and the DDC, as well as neighborhood representatives.
- c. Facilitate the development of specific plans to address land uses, development standards, and economic development of designated geographic areas.
- d. Delegate City Council authority to the Planning and Zoning Board to approve site plan modifications with an appeals process in place;
- e. Utilize a Zoning Hearing Officer to recommend minor rezoning cases or modifications to zoning conditions to the City Council (instead of going before the Planning and Zoning Board); The Zoning Officer's actions will be guided by adopted Council policy and direction founded in long term community vision.
- f. Expand the City's Project Coordination efforts within the Building Safety Division to include assigning a project coordinator to each NBIA's who will serve as the customer's primary point of contact through the entire development process (beginning with planning/zoning through building permits ending with certificate of occupancy).
- g. Develop modifications to the existing zoning ordinance requirements: such as creating modifications to existing standards in order to enable infill development to be more economically competitive.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 8

- h. All development codes and standards should be reviewed to address barriers to infill development and rehabilitation of older buildings, and systems should be designed to expedite this development.
- i. Expand the list of permitted uses in zoning districts to create opportunities for mixed land use zoning districts i.e. permit residential uses in commercial districts or small service or office uses in residential districts through a Special Use Permit.
- j. Establish Infill Development Incentive Districts which allow the City Council to permit some waivers of development related fees (the waiver or rebate to be paid by the general fund) and relief from development standards within specific districts to encourage area revitalization.

**V. Revitalization Recommendations**

- a. Provide City staff availability to assist the formation of Community Development Corporations (CDC) within these areas.
- b. Develop funding strategies for CDC(s). Assist in identifying grant opportunities, including possible CDBG application, etc.
- c. Consider establishing anti-slum lord laws.
- d. Support State legislation to allow Business Improvement Districts outside of a redevelopment area if so desired by the property owners within the proposed district.

**Fiscal Impact:**

The recommendation to retain the existing Town Center Redevelopment Area (TCRA) designation does not have an immediate fiscal impact on the City of Mesa. The intent of investing in Neighborhood Business Investment Areas and the TCRA is to enhance their economic viability and tax base. The committee believes that the City has a strong role to play as the facilitator of public and private partnerships in the TCRA and the new Neighborhood Business Investment Areas.

City staff will be considering recommending adding or reallocating resources to devote to Neighborhood Business Investment Areas and infill as part of the 2005/2007-budget process.

**Concurrence**

The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee comply with the City of Mesa's 2025 General Plan:

*Land Use Element, Goal LU-6* --- Provide for a diverse and dynamic Town Center within the City of Mesa that exhibits Mesa's historic character, supports the

governmental campus, and offers opportunities for reinvesting in neighborhoods and businesses that offer a unique character or history.

*Land Use Element, Objective LU-2.1* --- Promote Mesa's unique identity by encouraging the revitalization, preservation, or development of community sub-areas throughout the City.

*Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1 b* --- Through the use of public and private funding mechanisms, provide the infrastructure needed to support mixed use, high intensity development within the employment centers/corridors.

*Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1 c* --- Use incentives to attract high quality commercial and industrial development to the employment centers/corridors.

*Economic Development Element, Policy ED-2.1 e* --- Encourage the continued development and revitalization of office and retail centers within Mesa Town Center, Fiesta Quadrant, and Superstition Springs.

*Economic Development Element, Objective ED-3.2* --- Support a comprehensive educational system to produce a competitive workforce that supports the employment centers/corridors.

*Economic Development Element, Objective ED-3.4* --- Maintain a well-rounded community in terms of recreational, cultural, educational, and health care opportunities.

*Growth Area Element, Policy GA-1.1d* -- Promote infill and new residential development in areas convenient to the City's Economic Activity Areas.

*Growth Area Element, Objective GA-1.2* -- To maximize public investment in both residential and employment uses that will directly and indirectly generate municipal revenue in growth areas.

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-1.1d* -- Promote mid and high rise mixed residential (i.e. 40 du/ac) and office uses in the Town Center, reserving ground floor space for retail and other supportive uses in the Pedestrian Overlay Area.

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Goal RR-2* --- Attract development to vacant areas within an urbanized community through the use of infill incentives and innovative design.

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Goal RR-3* --- Promote the active participation of citizens and local business leaders in addressing the needs of their neighborhoods.

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Objective RR-7.2* --- Encourage private investment and development within established and mature areas of the City.

COUNCIL REPORT

PAGE 10

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-7.2a* --- Provide technical assistance to existing businesses and investors/developers proposing projects within the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan and other redevelopment plans.

*Revitalization and Redevelopment Element Policy RR-7.2d* --- Consider the creation of business improvement districts within redevelopment areas to provide enhanced municipal and management services.

*Housing Element Objective H-1.1* --- Identify and recognize the changing needs of the City's maturing neighborhoods and take steps to stabilize and upgrade these areas.

*Housing Element Policy H-1.1 b* --- Identify and prioritize neighborhoods where reinvestment will result in net improvement.

*Housing Element Policy H-1.1f*--- Explore other alternative techniques for the stabilization of existing neighborhoods, including financial incentives and loan programs.

*Housing Element Objective H-1.3* --- Encourage development and revitalization projects in all areas of Mesa that provide a variety of housing types to meet the needs of the growing population.

*Housing Element Objective H-1.4* --- Encourage redevelopment and/or renovation of substandard residential neighborhoods.

As stated earlier in the report, the Ad Hoc Redevelopment Advisory Committee, conducted a public meeting on September 14, 2004. At this meeting the stakeholders were very supportive of the proposal to maintain the revitalization efforts of the Downtown. In the 2000 City of Mesa Community Survey, 91 % said redeveloping older parts of the community was very important or somewhat important (50% Very Important, 41 % Somewhat Important).

**K:Redev/adhoccommittee/ccrptadhocrevised11405**