



Minutes

December 12, 2000

Joint Meeting of Tempe City Council and Mesa City Council

Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Tempe City Council and the Mesa City Council held on Tuesday, December 12, 2000 in the Council Chambers, 4:00 p.m., 31 E. Fifth Street, Tempe, AZ.

TEMPE CITY COUNCIL PRESENT:

Mayor Neil Giuliano
Vice-Mayor Leonard Copple
Councilmember P Ben Arredondo
Councilmember Dennis Cahill
Councilmember Barbara Carter
Councilmember Hugh Hallman

TEMPE CITY COUNCIL ABSENT:

Councilmember Mark Mitchell

MESA CITY COUNCIL PRESENT:

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

TEMPE STAFF PRESENT:

City Manager John Greco
Chief Financial Officer Patrick Flynn
Senior Planner Neil Calfee
Pub Info Ofcr Mary Fowler
City Clerk Kathy Matz
Council Aide Sheri Nunemacher
Mayoral Aide Carlos Pastor
Mgmt Asst Edith Ross
Urban Des & Dev Mgr Mark Vinson
Neighborhd Mgmt Asst Shauna Warner

Chief of Staff Randy Gross
Dep City Clerk Karen Brittingham
Mgmt Asst Gloria Carlson
Dep Pub Wks Dir Glenn Kephart
Redev Dir Steve Nielsen
Fin Svcs Dir Rich Oesterle
Council Aide Theresa Pulido
Ec Dev Mgr Jan Schaefer
Govt Rel Dir Shannon Wilhelmsen
Media Svcs Prod Jason Wolf

Tempe Mayor Neil Giuliano called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

The members of both City Councils introduced themselves.

Agenda Item: Staff Report Regarding Status of the Joint Mesa/Tempe Stadium Site

Mayor Giuliano introduced Mike Hutchinson, Mesa City Manager, who made a presentation on the Mesa-Tempe joint stadium site.

Hutchinson stated that there are several complex site issues.

- Val Vista Water Line. One of the major issues is the relocation of a major water transmission line under the site. His staff has had a meeting with Phoenix to discuss the complexities of this move, as well as with Hunt Corp, the stadium builder. Hunt Corp. feels there are opportunities to coordinate this move with proper planning. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he believes this can be accomplished.
- Maricopa County Animal Control Facility. This facility would also have to be moved to make way for the stadium. Staff has met with Maricopa County Animal Control to discuss their current and future space needs. Mesa is willing to help relocate this facility. The County would like to have a larger facility in the East Valley, but Mesa will replace only the space they currently have. The County would have to pay for anything larger. City Staff has already started to look at different sites in west Mesa. Staff is also working on a temporary location in Mesa for the animal control operation so they could move before a new facility is built. Mr. Hutchinson stated he believes this issue will not hamper the stadium siting.
- ASU Property. Staff had a productive meeting with ASU representatives. The animal research facility component is the most complex part of the issue. ASU would like to relocate that facility closer to campus and is investigating a temporary facility. The plant farm and warehousing operation seem to be facilities that could work with temporary facilities, as well. Staff will continue to work on this issue. Mr. Hutchinson stated that these issues could be resolved for the benefit of the joint stadium site.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that staff will continue to work with Hunt Corp. and all of the involved parties to determine ways to locate the stadium on the site, and to minimize some of the conflicts, particularly with the ASU facilities. They will also look at how to deal with the utility lines. Construction possibly may be done in phases to provide a little more time to resolve some of these issues. With everyone working together, this site could be available in the August timeframe that the Authority has set forth.

Agenda Item: Discussion and Direction to Staff Regarding the Joint Site

Mayor Giuliano asked whether it will be necessary for the joint Councils to approve the final proposal and, if so, what the time frame would be.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that the material is due by the end of the first week of January. The west side representatives plan to have their material submitted by end of the last week of December.

Mayor Giuliano asked that whenever the joint site proposal is put together, both Councils will need to agree on it. The Mayor suggested that perhaps another joint meeting of the councils could be held.

Mr. Hutchinson added that the financing for the site is complex, and that both staffs will need to work together to finalize it.

Tempe Councilmember Hugh Hallman stated that he is concerned that the property has to be available to the Authority by August 1 in order to meet the requirements of the Hunt Corp contract. Phoenix is the player who might potentially submit a new site that might get substantial support. Phoenix is also the entity that is in charge of determining whether or not the Val Vista waterline can be moved on a timely basis. He asked whether there is any way we can contractually bind Phoenix to a timeline that would assure that we can meet the August 1 schedule.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that he had addressed that specific issue with Phoenix and he is confident that Phoenix would deal fairly and professionally in terms of relocating this waterline. He hasn't investigated putting anything in writing yet, though. Staff will look into that. Mesa has had a good relationship with the Phoenix staff over the years, and he feels we are going to have to depend on that to make sure they will act in good faith.

Mesa Vice-Mayor Jim Davidson asked whether there was joint ownership of that waterline. Mr. Hutchinson responded that the sole owner is the City of Phoenix.

Mayor Giuliano stated that it appears there have been a lot of discussions taking place in gathering information on the challenges of the joint site and he's pleased that progress is being made.

Tempe Councilmember Barb Carter stated that Tempe has been trying to move a waterline on the north side of Tempe Town Lake for years so that development can take place there, but has been unsuccessful so far. She asked Mr. Hutchinson why he thinks Mesa will be successful getting Phoenix to do this now.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that there are no guarantees, but again, his staff has had a good relationship with Phoenix. From all the feedback received so far, they have been very cooperative. He doesn't get the sense that their response would be otherwise.

Mesa Mayor Keno Hawker stated that the proposal would also list these constraints to the Authority. He would think that the Authority would contact Phoenix and ask if they are going to work with

Mesa/Tempe to move the waterline. Politically, it would be a difficult thing for Phoenix to say “no.” Whoever is selected by the Authority will have some political will to make sure that the project is brought in at cost and on time. Once the site is selected, more things will come on line, rather than become problems, because everyone will try to work together to make sure it’s happening.

Tempe Councilmember Ben Arredondo said that the most important thing that has not been mentioned, so far, is the cost associated with the number of the people who may be displaced if the stadium is built on the joint site. It is in the interests of both Mesa and Tempe to find out how many people could lose their homes. That must be figured into this proposal.

Mayor Giuliano responded that Tempe staff has started to assemble this type of information regarding the part of the site that is in Tempe.

Councilmember Arredondo added that this might include some apartments in Tempe, where Mesa has none that would be affected.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that the site does not touch on any apartments nor does it currently impact the mobile home complex that is south of the site. Over time, however, if there was an increase in the size of the facility or in the parking areas, it could.

Councilmember Hallman stated that looking at the list of issues, it appears there are really only two that are a concern, and that everything else can be handled through temporary accommodations. The only two that seem to be problematic are the waterline and the ASU Research Facility.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that the plant farm is a component of the research facility and federal contracts are at issue. But ASU’s ultimate goal is to build a facility closer to campus.

Councilmember Hallman asked if Tempe, like Mesa, should also be looking for a new location for the Animal Control Facility?

Mr. Hutchinson responded that Mesa and Tempe could both be looking, but that Mesa uses the facility much more than Tempe, and so it’s probably in their best interests to relocate it in Mesa. One location that was suggested was at the County Complex on South Mesa Drive/US 60. Mesa staff didn’t think that was as appealing as a site in west Mesa, but discussion is continuing.

Mesa Councilmember Bill Jaffa stated that he concurs with the thoughts on the issues with the Val Vista waterline. He would assume that most of the dialogue has been oral to this point, but to move our position along, he would suggest beginning written documentation. He asked whether there have been any other sites available for the ASU property other than the main campus.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that that was just one component. Other sites are being considered for the other pieces of that facility. ASU identified the Animal Research Facility as the one they would like close to campus, as well as the warehouse facility, because there is a lot of traffic back and forth to that.

Councilmember Jaffa added that he hoped some of those ASU options could be put in writing as soon as possible because that issue seems to be a little more difficult even than the Val Vista waterline. He asked if there were any other viable sites in Mesa after thorough analysis of the possibilities.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that the joint Tempe-Mesa site is the only site they're pursuing and staff is not investigating any other sites.

Councilmember Jaffa stated that the only viable site for Mesa is the joint site. He believes that is the consensus at this point. With respect to the housing items that Councilman Arredondo addressed, one of the things he truly likes about the joint site, as well as the development opportunities there, are the redevelopment opportunities. In west Mesa, there are some redevelopment needs and this gives both Mesa and Tempe an opportunity to look at redevelopment over a very large area. He sees this as an opportunity to do some good things.

Vice-Mayor Davidson asked if the waterline issues get resolved, then don't some of the ASU property concerns go away, and whether he was correct in his assumption that land swaps don't enter the picture once the City of Phoenix waterline is resolved.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that staff has discussed land swaps as part of the financing, but it depends on the final location of the stadium on the site. Wherever the stadium sits, there will likely be some need to interact with ASU and the Board of Regents. The stadium doesn't sit on the ASU property, but the parking does.

Vice-Mayor Davidson asked that if Mr. Hutchinson put a numerical scale on the five issues, where would land swapping with the ASU property rank and whether that is the biggest hurdle to overcome.

Mr. Hutchinson responded that the issue with the ASU animal research facility is a serious issue. They would push to do a temporary facility and he thinks it is doable.

Mesa Councilmember Claudia Walters asked what the package would look like. Is it going to have what Tempe is committing to, what Mesa is committing to, and what ASU is committing to? Will ASU have signed off on it? How hard will those negotiations be before a site is actually determined?

Mr. Hutchinson responded that he thinks there will be an incremental approach. We will submit a written proposal to the Authority. There won't be an iron-clad agreement, and not all issues will be worked out. He anticipates that the Authority will spend a considerable amount of time, probably into February, reviewing all the issues associated, and if they have questions, we will have time to respond then.

Councilmember Walters asked if it was Mr. Hutchinson's impression that Hunt Corp. would be

willing to work with whatever site is chosen, perhaps in the phasing of the construction, when the land has to be cleared, etc. For example, concerning the plants that have to be moved, if they didn't have to get to that part of the property until later, that would help in terms of clearing it. Would Hunt Corp. be willing to discuss that?

Mr. Hutchinson responded that they are. They had a discussion about phasing the construction concerning the waterline and they are willing to talk about phasing regarding the other issues.

Mesa Councilmember Mike Whalen stated that economic development is the key to this site. The numbers that have been presented, the \$60M-\$70M figure, does not include any economic development on the periphery of this site. Has there been any contact with any developer wishing to partner in this endeavor, or are we really working in a vacuum dealing only with City resources?

Mr. Hutchinson responded that, to date, the financing plan just includes the City issues on the site itself. When we began talking about this site, both staffs thought one of the appealing things was the ability to have economic development surrounding the stadium parking lot. No detailed discussions have taken place, however. Because of its location and the draw of other activities, this should be an appealing site. Staff has not used those estimates in the financial forecast because it is unknown when that development will come to fruition.

Councilmember Whalen stated he felt it is important that this be marketed as a multi-purpose facility, which includes the economic development surrounding this facility.

Councilmember Hallman stated that he would agree with Councilmember Jaffa's suggestion to get any discussions with third party authorities in writing. For us to put the best project proposal forward for this site, it is important not only to identify the issues, but make sure those issues are as resolved as possible. Even if we can't have a final agreement, we should be in a position of demonstrating the level of certainty on which they can select this site. He is concerned that we not end up with any hurdles before the Authority that would undermine their view that this site is a terrific site. If ASU will commit in writing to some kind of statement of the level to which they will assist, as well as the County and Phoenix, that would help advance this site dramatically. Concerning the waterline and phasing of construction, the thought that somebody is going to be held responsible for delays concerns him and he would like to find out as soon as possible what Hunt Corp. is willing to do in that respect and what back door they are going to want to build into that agreement. That should be put in writing so the Authority will understand we are not undermining the certainty of their project as they saw it roll out during the election.

Councilmember Jaffa stated that he didn't want to appear cynical, but with respect to the timeframe for all of this, he recalls attending a meeting with Vice-Mayor Davidson and the attorneys from Fennemore-Craig, representing the Authority, concerning the deadlines. Even though we had all thought there was a certain deadline for submitting sites, it became clear that there really wasn't a deadline. He continues to feel that to some extent Phoenix will continue to drive the timetable on deadlines, in spite of the Hunt Corp. contract. If there is going to be an increase in cost, it will most likely be because of Phoenix rather than Mesa and Tempe. As we move forward, he would hope

there could be more dialogue with the attorneys who are working on this so that if there is information that is not as public as we would like it to be, maybe we can get it more out in the open so that we could all play from a level playing field.

Mayor Giuliano thanked Mr. Hutchinson and his staff. He felt the news on the joint site is good news. We know that there are some obstacles and challenges, but those are being worked on, information is being gathered, staff is trying to get everything put together so that this submission can be as competitive as we know it is for the Authority to consider. The site holds a lot of promise. He appreciates the direction that Mesa has taken to gather a lot of this information and call some of these meetings and put this together. He has said all along that we, which means the collective we, not just Tempe and Mesa, but including Scottsdale, Chandler, Gilbert and this whole half of the Valley, need a united effort to say that the locations offered in this part of the Central Valley hold a lot of promise. Tempe staff has been and will continue to be involved with that.

Agenda Item: Discussion Regarding Other Sites

Mayor Giuliano stated that it is Tempe's desire to bring its partner, Mesa, up to date on the site that is located only in Tempe. Tempe's desire is to have as many viable sites for consideration as possible. Tempe has submitted a letter of intent to submit documentation and respond to the Authority's RFP for a piece of land between the 202 Freeway and Washington, just east of Priest. He realizes that we have not been able to provide Mesa staff members or councilmembers with as much information as they may have liked so far, but everyone needs to know that the Tempe City Council has not even had a full briefing yet on the financial possibilities of this site, or a lot of the other aspects of this site as its being developed. We got a late start. Tempe staff is doing a good job getting this one ready for presentation.

Tempe Redevelopment Director Steve Nielsen stated that this site is located at the southeast corner of Priest Drive and Washington, with the Red Mountain Freeway (202) located on the south edge of the site. It is approximately 68 acres, and falls within the Papago Park Center Planned Development Project. All in all, this is a 450-acre, mixed-use development project that has been master-planned. This site falls under a single ownership of Papago Park Center and has previously been used as a plant nursery. There was a mixed-use development proposed on this site by Lennar Development of California. That has recently fallen through, which made this site available for consideration. Staff has been focusing its efforts on some of the requirements for an RFP response to the Authority, such as archeological, environmental, geo-technical, noise, and traffic impact analysis. This intense effort was started just over two weeks ago, so all of those studies are still on-going. The information presented today is sketchy, and there is still a lot of work to be done.

Mayor Giuliano asked about parking issues.

Mr. Nielsen responded that they are attempting to fall within the RFP requirement of 6,000 to 9,000

spaces on site. Staff's interpretation is that the RFP requires a stadium with a roll-out grass field, a plaza around the stadium and surface parking of approximately 6,000 spaces. The proposed light rail system currently under design from Phoenix through Tempe and on into Mesa parallels this site on the north boundary. The study shows that the system equates to approximately 6,000 parking spaces. Because this is a planned development, predominantly office, which is a good shared use for a stadium site, there are currently 12,000 parking spaces already constructed within a one-mile radius of this site.

Councilmember Hallman asked whether there are any other players, besides SRP, that we need to get the support from.

Mr. Nielsen responded that staff currently has a draft letter of intent from Papago Park Center which is the landlord of this facility. It is a single ownership so this site doesn't have too many entanglements.

Councilmember Hallman asked about the noise issue since this is an area with aircraft overflights.

Mr. Nielsen responded that staff has worked with the FAA on a noise study and has a preliminary clearance in terms of their requirements. A noise study for the joint site would be pretty basic, since that site is outside of the primary area for the FAA.

Councilmember Hallman asked whether staff would be working on getting some kind of indication in writing from the FAA that this is an acceptable location.

Mr. Nielsen responded that staff is geared up to do that.

Vice Mayor Davidson noted that the Tempe site looks more like just a stadium than the joint site. He asked if they planned more being associated with it than simply a stadium.

Mr. Nielsen replied yes. This is starting from a Phase I, looking at the numbers and from there staff will do land use planning studies. Basically, this is to show how some of the surface parking would transition into office and commercial development.

Vice-Mayor Davidson asked if the joint site has the opportunity to bring in more economic development, more retail, commercial and office than the Tempe-only site, or is the Tempe-only site basically land-locked by canals, freeways and SRP's plans for office environment in that area.

Mr. Nielsen responded that the Tempe site is no doubt being developed as an office park, but it should drive some hospitality/hotels and limited entertainment/retail. It is constrained, however. This is a 68-acre site, whereas the joint site is much larger.

Vice-Mayor Davidson noted that in terms of just shuffling existing money around vs. bringing new money into our economy, it seems like the Tempe site is limited in that it will just shuffle money around within an already existing retail and entertainment type of zone.

Mr. Nielsen responded that this site is predominantly office, but a multi-purpose facility will drive hospitality/entertainment/retail wherever it is located. The site will determine the absorption rate and how quickly that will occur. Certainly, the farther out it is from the central core of the valley, the longer that absorption rate and the timing will be.

Vice-Mayor Davidson responded that staff should consider land absorption around the Tempe site compared to the joint site. It would be interesting how much growth each one will be able to absorb. He asked if Tempe staff had looked at the financing. On the joint site, Mesa staff has worked out a pretty good financing plan based on lease payments and some stretch goals.

Mr. Nielsen responded that the Phase I plan was generated only two days ago, so staff will be meeting during the next two days to do a cost study, and from there they will transition to a finance study.

Councilmember Hallman stated he hadn't seen the current finance plan for the joint site and asked if there was a financing plan available for review. He would like to see what's available for the joint site and get a sense of where that's heading.

Mayor Giuliano asked to agendaize that for review with Council.

Councilmember Hallman asked whether there are currently buildings on the parcels at the Tempe site.

Mr. Nielsen responded that in the peripheral areas there are, but not on this site.

Councilmember Hallman asked when the aerial map was done. Mr. Nielsen responded that it was done three months ago.

Councilmember Hallman noted that there's currently nothing built on this site immediately to the north or to the east, so it's currently undeveloped open space. He asked if it was Mr. Nielsen's sense that a stadium facility would actually drive development to kick off that area. Currently, there's the old SRP headquarters and the new headquarters.

Mr. Nielsen responded that he felt it will drive some emerging markets that aren't there today, i.e. it's being developed as a two- to three-story relatively low intensity office development. This will stimulate more commercial, more retail, hospitality, and probably higher density office.

Councilmember Hallman stated that he could imagine that SRP has lots of pretty pictures. He remembers seeing a picture of a resort style hotel operation with a 27-hole golf course. He asked, given where development has occurred, whether Mr. Nielsen thinks this will be a stimulator for that development. Mr. Nielsen responded that he thought it would be. This should not inhibit that development at all.

Councilmember Hallman stated that if the stadium were put in this place, we would not be losing development, but actually providing development.

Mr. Nielsen responded that currently, the park itself is being developed at about a 40% level, based upon its approved master plan. This should get it closer to its target planned area development.

Councilmember Hallman asked if someone could provide a comparative analysis to look at current absorption, what the anticipated absorption rate would be, and what the mixed use would be on this site. He would like to see the same thing done on the joint site. There's a lot of open space on the joint site. Does anyone have any plans for that? Tempe has just annexed some of the county island and he recalls seeing some proposals for buildings on some of those sites. He would like to see that on either site we are not merely moving dollars around, but that development would be enhanced in those two locations.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated that many in the Central Valley have concerns over the adverse impacts of the proposed fourth runway. He asked if there would there be any concern with the FAA if Phoenix moved ahead with its proposed fourth runway with this site. Is there any concern that makes the City of Phoenix lobby even harder against any site here in the Central Valley.

Mr. Nielsen responded that staff has run this by the FAA at the regional level. The FAA has a computer model where a building can be plugged in based on latitude, longitude and height and determine if it impacts the airport. The answer is that the stadium does not. It meets their parameters for location. Staff did that in a preliminary manner and still has to make a final application to the FAA. He doesn't believe there's an impact at this time.

Councilmember Hallman added that he assumes if this did have an impact on the fourth runway, that would actually be a good thing for Mesa so that Williams Gateway Airport could actually get kicked off.

Councilmember Whalen added that the most important thing is that whichever site is selected, we work together to ensure that this thing stays in the East Valley. Having fought so long to get this thing done, we don't want to see it stolen out from under us at the last minute and put in an area of the valley that doesn't need any further sports venues. Once it comes down to site selection, we need to get on board and work together to ensure that we keep the stadium in the East Valley.

Councilmember Hallman stated that he would worry most about the cost benefit analysis for Mesa, Tempe, and the Central Valley entirely with respect to either site. His hope is that both staffs would continue to work together to put together the best packages possible for both sites. We don't know what the final set of criteria is going to look like in making the selection, whether it's going to depend most on timing and certainty of getting the site available vs. cost vs. access to additional freeway vs. additional synergistic development. His hope would be that we push forward jointly on both sites as best we can to put forth the strongest proposals for both sites and do our best to see that one of those sites becomes the selected site. Both sites have different costs, different benefits, different advantages and different disadvantages and we don't know what the Authority will select

from. He thinks the Mesa/Tempe partnership is important, not just for this particular project, but also in making the Central East Valley the place to be for business and residents.

Councilmember Walters stated that we are fortunate that the two best sites are in the East Valley. Every site has negatives. Every site has positives. We've got some of the greatest positives going. We need to continue to work together on both sites and make sure that the Authority is getting the message that the best site for this stadium is in the East Valley, that the Cardinals need to stay here and that the Fiesta Bowl needs to stay here.

Tempe Councilmember Dennis Cahill added that he agrees with everyone who has spoken. Both sites are good. He looks forward to working with Mesa and he knows we will prevail with one of these sites.

Councilmember Jaffa stated that he recognizes Tempe's concern to do the best job it needs to do to retain the current business it has, which is the Fiesta Bowl and the Cardinals, regardless of whether it is at the Tempe-only site or the joint site. Hopefully, the Authority will recognize that as an important component. The best likelihood we have of being successful is if we work together. Only as a strong partnership are we going to be successful at retaining the stadium in the East Valley. He feels the joint site offers the best possibility of a presentation as a joint effort. He does agree that it's unclear what the Authority is going to look at and how they are going to judge the attributes. When he looks at the joint site, he sees a vision for development along the Rio Salado going east from what Tempe has already done and looking at what Mesa has already planned for the Rio Salado, as well as further development along that entire bank. He sees the opportunity for substantial new residential and commercial development and perhaps even some light industrial development along that corridor. He also sees the opportunity for substantial redevelopment along that corridor. He sees the opportunity to rehabilitate property that needs remediation as well. He sees tremendous opportunities for new and refocused economic development and he would hope the Authority will recognize the joint site is the best location for the Valley as a whole. As we move forward, if the joint site doesn't represent the best site in the opinion of the Authority, he will throw his full support behind the Tempe-only site, because he thinks it is critical. Phoenix has gotten it's fair share of public funding for projects and it's time to see some of that come out to the East Valley.

Councilmember Arredondo stated that at the conclusion, whichever site is chosen, there needs to be a commitment to continue to work together to keep the sports venues in the East Valley. He said that these 2 councils need to keep meeting on issues that effect both of our communities and this region, because we have put off too long a strong commitment of the airport issue and what's best for Mesa and Tempe. That issue is equally as important to the East Valley as anything else.

Vice-Mayor Davidson stated that he is supportive of the stadium. Financing will drive this. And if we are stepping on toes, if we're hurting feelings, actually that makes for a better process. He doesn't think we should be so thin-skinned about it that we can't go after this thing aggressively. Financing will make this thing come to the East Valley. Given that, we should care less about what Phoenix is doing, what they're planning or what they have on the table. It is irrelevant to the process. Don't muddy the water. Everything else is secondary to the financing. We have to prevent

as much burden on the taxpayers as possible.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated that he wanted to echo what has been said tonight. We know there are no deal-breakers with respect to the joint site. We have challenges, but there are no deal-breakers. The financing is doable. The infrastructure costs can be significantly reduced without asking for additional monies from our communities. That is an important element. We need to look toward support from our neighbors in Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima Indian communities, because for both of these sites, those communities will benefit. There is no question about that. Again, the Central Valley is the best location and these two sites are the best sites.

Councilmember Carter echoed the sentiments previously stated. She expressed appreciation to both the Mesa staff and the Tempe staff for working together so diligently to bring us the figures and she hopes they continue to work on both sites. We need to continue to have these meetings.

Councilmember Pomeroy stated that he will be disappointed if we could not able to work together on the joint site. We have an almost 18-20 month history of working that area and he hopes we could bring that project there. He understands that finances will drive this. He would hope that attention could be devoted to the joint site first. It would be a good opportunity to work together and it would be good for both communities.

Mayor Hawker stated that it appears the joint site is still a viable site. There are no impediments in our way to say we shouldn't proceed with that joint location. If, for some reason, that doesn't come to the top of the Authority's radar screen, then Mesa would certainly support the Tempe site to keep it in the East Valley. Mesa has spent a great deal of money on the joint site to look at the economic benefits so he thinks it is only right that Tempe has had to create a good deal of effort to put the same studies into their sole site. He would be anxious to see how the financing works because he also thinks that financing will definitely drive this. The joint site does have a financing proposal and Mesa will certainly share that with the Tempe City Council. There is a huge public perception that the stadium will cost nothing, that this is all a tourism tax and there will be no citizen assessment of cost to have this located in their community. That was the campaign theme and he thinks there needs to be a reality check with the Authority and that there may be some creative proposals submitted to them to make the financing possible for the whole city. At some point, they will need to acknowledge that, and hopefully they will acknowledge that prior to the submittals in January.

Mayor Giuliano thanked the Mesa Councilmembers, Mayor Hawker, Mr. Hutchinson and his staff for their hard work on the joint site, and thanked the Tempe staff for their work on the Tempe-only site. He is enthusiastic after this meeting. We have two strong, viable, contending sites that the Authority will be able to consider and the proposals will be finalized in the next few weeks. He think it's full steam ahead on both the joint site with Mesa in partnership, and the Tempe-only site, hopefully as we progress, in partnership as well. We are going to be more successful when we're working together and we need to expand our partnership to Scottsdale, Chandler, Gilbert, Queen Creek, and to Phoenix as well. This really is a regional project no matter where it goes. There should be interest from everyone in the region because it is a multi-use facility. We can compete with any of the other sites that have been or may be offered, and we will do so. We have a great

Minutes - 12/12/00

spirit and a great cause in trying to retain these businesses and grow businesses in the tourism industry in this part of the region.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Kathy L. Matz
City Clerk