

## COUNCIL MINUTES

June 3, 2004

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 June 3, 2004 at 7:30 a.m.

### COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker  
Rex Griswold  
Kyle Jones  
Dennis Kavanaugh  
Janie Thom  
Claudia Walters  
Mike Whalen

### COUNCIL ABSENT

None

### OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson  
Joe Padilla  
Barbara Jones

### COUNCIL-ELECT PRESENT

Tom Rawles

1. Review items on the agenda for the June 7, 2004 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: 13 k and 13 l (Hawker).

Items removed from the consent agenda: 13 m; 14 b; 14 d.

Items deleted from the consent agenda: 15 l; 16; 18 a.

2. Discuss and consider various issues associated with the proposed FY 04-05 budget.

Deputy City Manager Debbi Dollar addressed the Council relative to this agenda item. She reported that since Council's last budget briefing, staff has incorporated several recommendations of the Council in the FY 2004/05 tentative budget. Ms. Dollar advised that per State law, when the tentative budget is adopted, it establishes the maximum amount that is allowable in the City's budget for final adoption on June 21, 2004. She also stated that the budget figures may be lowered, but never increased once the tentative budget has been approved.

Budget Director Jamie Warner distributed copies of a document entitled "City of Mesa, Arizona – Tentative Budget, Summary of Five Year Capital Improvement Program" and provided the Council with a brief overview of the item. (See Attachment 1.) He explained that this summary is somewhat different from the preliminary CIP document that the Council was provided in that it identifies projects that will not be completed this year, but carried over to FY 2004/2005. Mr. Warner also briefly summarized a series of adjustments, as previously recommended by Council, from the FY 2004/05 preliminary detail budget plan to the FY 2004/2005 tentative budget.

Discussion ensued relative to the potential for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to assume the operational costs of the Williams Gateway Airport contract tower and staff; the payment of an in lieu tax to Pinal County relative to Mesa's Pinal County water farm; and the recommended \$1 million increase in funding for street maintenance.

3. Discuss and consider the proposed changes to the Wireless Communications Design and Placement Guidelines for Parks and Recreation facilities.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson reported that over the years, Mesa has been a leader in assisting cell phone providers in the placement of commercial wireless communication towers at various City locations, including Mesa fire stations. He explained that in the past, the Parks and Recreation Board has expressed concerns regarding the siting of such towers in City parks because of their negative visual appearance and the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Hutchinson stated that the City was approached recently by individuals who requested that Mesa reconsider this issue and added that staff is prepared to update the Council regarding what has transpired up to this point.

Parks and Recreation Management Support Administrator Tim Barnard addressed the Council relative to this agenda item. He reported that he and Senior Planner Gordon Sheffield have been working together to revise Mesa's Commercial Communications Tower Guidelines, which were initially adopted by the City Council in 1997. He explained that in an effort to accomplish this goal, they have solicited input from various citizen boards and commissions including the Parks and Recreation Board, the Downtown Development Committee and the Planning & Zoning Board. Mr. Barnard stated that the placement of the commercial wireless communication towers in City parks and recreation facilities would bring a new source of revenue to the City in an area where there was previously no opportunity to do so.

Mr. Sheffield provided a brief overview of the Commercial Communications Tower Guidelines, which established the manner in which the City would place wireless communication facilities within Mesa. He commented, among other things, that based on the guidelines, such facilities are generally located in commercial or industrial districts and avoid residential districts; that because of the increased popularity of wireless communication, more towers are needed to meet the demand and the wireless companies are now looking into not only commercial sites but those encroaching into residential areas; that the City has been approached by several wireless carriers to consider the placement of towers in City parks, however, the 1997 guidelines prohibit such placement; that technology has improved to the point that a wireless communications installation could give the appearance of, for example, a faux palm tree, faux pine tree or other "stealth" design that would hide such a facility; and that the proposed guidelines are stringent and would only allow a stealth-type facility (i.e., faux palm tree or pine tree) and not a more industrial looking mono-pole currently utilized in industrial areas.

Mr. Barnard commented that at the April 8, 2004 Parks and Recreation Board meeting, the members voted 6-1 recommending approval of the proposed guidelines, with the stipulation that language be added to the document requiring wireless providers considering a park location to notify neighbors within 300 feet of the site when hearings would be held on the proposed installation. Mr. Barnard added that the proposed guidelines would only allow for the placement of wireless communication equipment in those parks that encompass five acres or more (less than 20% of the City's parks).

In response to a question from Councilmember Griswold, Mr. Barnard clarified that any Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land that the City has acquired for the purpose of City parks, such as Red Mountain Park, would not be considered an appropriate site for the wireless communication equipment. He stated that because of the patent that the City has with the BLM regarding this type of land, revenue could not be generated from those areas.

Councilmember Walters commented that the Parks and Recreation Board's stipulation that the revised guidelines include language regarding neighborhood involvement in the placement of the wireless facilities is, in her opinion, a crucial component in the process. She stated that although the City would be unable to generate revenue from the placement of towers in Red Mountain Park, it may still be appropriate to locate towers there to provide additional cell phone reception, but not cause a disturbance to the area. Councilmember Walters expressed support for proceeding forward with the proposed revisions to the guidelines, but noted that she would like to discuss further the revenues generated by the towers and whether those monies could be allocated to not just the particular park in which a tower is located, but the entire parks and recreation system as a whole.

In response to a question from Councilmember Thom, Mr. Hutchinson clarified that the City generates approximately \$500,000 annually on cell tower leases throughout the community.

Councilmember Thom voiced support for proceeding forward with the matter. She noted that in reading the minutes from the January 8, 2004 Parks and Recreation Board meeting, she was pleased to see comments from various boardmembers relative to using the revenue generated from the wireless communication towers for the purpose of developing and enhancing Mesa's park system.

Mayor Hawker concurred with the comments of the other Councilmembers. He also suggested that staff consider the possibility of incorporating wireless communication equipment as an element of the freeway landmark monuments and generating revenue from those sites as well as conventional cell towers.

Mayor Hawker stated that it is the consensus of the Council that staff prepare a resolution for Council adoption regarding the proposed changes to the Wireless Communications Design and Placement Guidelines.

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

Councilmember Walters

Salt River Project's "Growing Smart Communities" conference

Councilmember Griswold

ADOT/neighborhood meeting

Councilmember Whalen

International Shopping Center conference;  
Emergency Preparedness conference

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Thursday, June 3, 2004, 6:00 p.m. – Farewell Reception for Vice Mayor Kavanaugh

Monday, June 7, 2004, TBA – Study Session

Monday, June 7, 2004, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, June 10, 2004, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, June 17, 2004, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Monday, June 21, 2004, TBA – Study Session

Monday, June 21, 2004, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

6. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

7. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

8. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 9:00 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 June 2004. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pag

Attachment

*CITY OF MESA, ARIZONA - TENTATIVE BUDGET  
 SUMMARY OF FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
 2004-2009 BY FISCAL YEAR - Capital Expenses*

FISCAL YEAR	GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS		HURF BONDS	UTILITY REVENUE BONDS	REPLACEMENT EXTENSION RESERVE	GENERAL FUND	SALES TAX	UTILITY FUND	INTERNAL SERVICES FUND	PUBLIC ART
	6%	20%	HB	BONDS UR	RER	010	011	020	FUND 070	440
2004/05	14,607,765	20,681,718	22,897,476	94,100,109	4,052,927	26,062,081	21,693,619	3,537,268	458,000	606,000
2005/06	24,863,481	17,041,243	17,981,620	119,284,894	3,861,710	22,619,609	2,100,292	4,281,461	0	420,250
2006/07	31,930,110	19,425,846	16,072,491	65,382,300	4,002,640	20,862,644	2,299,162	1,696,932	0	430,756
2007/08	13,912,144	28,146,325	12,114,109	97,626,875	4,188,229	10,314,425	1,232,030	1,486,189	0	441,525
2008/09	15,465,728	40,559,831	73,972,146	33,963,094	4,268,307	3,106,379	0	1,120,857	0	452,563
TOTAL	110,779,228	125,854,963	143,037,842	410,357,272	20,373,813	82,965,138	27,325,103	12,122,707	458,000	2,351,094

  

FISCAL YEAR	PARKS IMPACT FEES	CULTURAL IMPACT FEES	HIGHWAY USER REV FUND	GAS FINANCING	FEDERAL AID FA	STATE AID SA	ELECTRNC STREET FINANCING E/S	LIGHT RAIL REIMBURSE. O, FTA, PHX & MAG	JUNIOR LEINS-SEWER JRL	TOTALS
	453	454	470	GSF	(Including 421)					
2004/05	94,200	913,000	0	500,000	5,905,438	735,510	350,338	(offsets 010) (11,608,398)	4,004,249	209,591,300
2005/06	0	0	993,891	7,879,688	28,416,641	2,324,777	0	(4,156,218)	2,847,838	250,761,177
2006/07	0	0	0	0	6,638,814	2,538,759	344,739	(6,782,205)	0	164,842,988
2007/08	0	0	0	0	27,520,330	1,973,029	0	(3,567,523)	0	195,387,687
2008/09	0	0	0	0	21,043,514	76,370	0	(3,668,365)	0	190,360,424
TOTAL	94,200	913,000	993,891	8,379,688	89,524,737	7,648,445	695,077	(29,782,709)	6,852,087	1,010,943,576