



COUNCIL MINUTES

March 19, 2012

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 19, 2012 at 5:00 p.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

Scott Smith
Alex Finter
Dina Higgins
Dennis Kavanaugh
Dave Richins
Scott Somers

COUNCIL ABSENT

Christopher Glover

OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady
Debbie Spinner
Linda Crocker

Mayor Smith excused Councilmember Glover from the entire meeting.

1. Review items on the agenda for the March 19, 2012 Regular Council meeting.

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

Conflict of interest: None.

Items removed from the consent agenda: 5-d continued to April 2.

2-a. Hear a presentation, discuss and make final funding recommendations for the FY 2012/13 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Human Services programs.

Director of Housing and Community Development Tammy Albright displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**See Attachment 1**) and provided a brief overview of the federal funding timeline for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Human Services programs. She advised that the Annual Action Plan would need to be submitted to Housing and Urban Development (HUD) by May 15th and requested that the Council approve the Community and Cultural Development Committee's funding recommendations. (See Page 4 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Albright briefly highlighted the direction previously received from the Council at the March 8, 2012 Study Session as follows:

- Maintain CDBG funding for six Code Compliance Officers (potential General Funding to be discussed during budget presentations)
- Maintain CDBG funding for Economic Development positions (potential General Funding to be discussed during budget presentations)
- Switch eight CDBG applications to Human Services funding and two Human Services applications to CDBG funding
- Accept allocation recommendation for CDBG, ESG and Human Services
- Designate any future unallocated funds that may become available to the La Mesita Shelter Project

Ms. Albright summarized the HOME funding recommendations as follows:

- Reduce Save the Family's Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) funding from \$350,000 to \$141,462
- Take remaining funds (\$610,158) and work with non-profits to design an open process to fund construction ready projects
- All HOME funds should be expended in the new CDBG target areas
- The open process would be on a first come first serve basis until all funds were expended
- Non-profits could apply for funds as projects arise throughout the year

Ms. Albright advised that staff participated in a conference call with HUD and determined that the open process did comply with the Citizen Participation Plan and the Five Year Consolidated Plan. She briefly summarized the HOME fund activities within the Consolidated Plan, which included 61 homeownership assistance projects and 58 rental unit rehabilitation projects. She recommended that \$200,000 be designated for the rehabilitation of rental units and that \$410,000 be applied towards the homeownership assistance projects.

In response to a question from Mayor Smith, Ms. Albright explained that once a non-profit agency identified a location and completed their due diligence they could approach the City to request funding. She said that staff would perform an analysis to ensure that the project was financially sound and that all of the paperwork was completed before making a recommendation to the Housing Board.

Responding to a question from Mayor Smith, Ms. Albright explained that there were pros and cons to both systems and that the only disadvantage would be to the non-profits who would no longer receive a pre-award.

Councilwoman Higgins commented that since the non-profits had already submitted their applications for this year's funding she would prefer to wait and have the open process implemented next year.

In responds to a question from Councilwoman Higgins, Ms. Albright explained that staff would perform an analysis of the projects as they were submitted and that the Housing Advisory Board would make the final funding decision.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the Housing Advisory Board or the City Council should make the final funding decisions.

Councilmember Richins commented that it was unreasonable for the Council to micro-manage the \$600,000 in HOME fund allocations and that the Housing Advisory Board should have the final authority to approve the projects. He said that the open process would be a little more competitive and would allow the City to write contracts as projects were presented instead of allocating a lump sum that if not utilized would need to be reallocated.

Mayor Smith expressed his support for the open process so long as there was some level of review.

Vice Mayor Somers stated that he was concerned that the open process could potentially allow projects to be developed that might not be in the best interest of the City.

City Manager Christopher Brady explained that with the open process agencies would be required to provide extensive details regarding their projects unlike the current system where money is allocated without having any information about the project.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Somers, Ms. Albright explained that agencies applying for funds would need to show that their project meets all of the HOME grant requirements, such as:

- Is the project an eligible activity
- Are there different funding sources and has other funding been committed
- What is the long-term maintenance of the facility
- Has the agency demonstrated that the project is feasible and sustainable

Mayor Smith commented that with the open process projects would be funded throughout the year on a first come first serve basis.

Councilmember Richins remarked that the open process would also reduce staff's workload.

Councilmember Kavanaugh summarized the three options provided in the Council report (**See Attachment 2**) as follows:

- Option 1: Accept the recommendations made by the Community & Cultural Committee to implement an open mixed application process for HOME funds in FY 2012/13
- Option 2: Accept the original recommendations made by staff to the Committee and defer the implementation of an open, mixed application process to FY 2013/14
- Option 3: Revise the funding recommendations made by staff or the Community & Cultural Development Committee

Councilmember Kavanaugh expressed his concerns with regards to initiating the new open process this year. He suggested that the open process be explored to ensure that the Housing Advisory Board, the City's federal partners and the applicant community were comfortable with this innovative process.

Mr. Brady briefly summarized the options that had been presented and explained that with the open process the applicants would be required to provide specific details regarding their project, unlike the current process where funds are allocated into broad categories.

Councilmember Higgins expressed her support for Option 2, which she said demonstrates fairness to the applicants who have already spent a significant amount of time preparing their applications.

It was moved by Councilmember Richins, seconded by Councilmember Finter, to accept the recommendation of an open, mixed application process for the HOME funds.

Discussion ensued regarding the funding approval process for the Escobedo project, the A New Leaf project and the senior housing project which also require the approval of a development agreement.

City Manager Christopher Brady clarified that approval of the Escobedo project, the A New Leaf project as well as the senior housing project would be made by the Council and that all other HOME funding projects would be presented to the Housing Advisory Board.

Mayor Smith called for the vote.

Upon tabulation of the votes, it showed:

AYES - Smith-Finter-Richins-Somers
NAYS - Higgins-Kavanaugh

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

Mayor Smith clarified that all HOME projects would go before the Housing Advisory Board for approval with the exception of the projects that require the approval of a development agreement.

Mr. Brady clarified Council's direction that staff would move forward with the final funding recommendation for CDBG, ESG and Human Services.

Mayor Smith thanked staff for their efforts.

2-b. Hear a presentation and discuss the Police Department Five Year Aviation Plan.

Commander Bill Peters introduced Assistant Chief of Police John Meza, Commander Kathleen Kirkham and Lieutenant Anthony Abalos who were prepared to address the Council. Commander Peters displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**See Attachment 3**) and provided an update on the Mesa Police Department's Aviation Configuration and Strategic Five Year Plan. He said that the mission of the Aviation Unit was to enhance the level of protection of the community as well as that of police and fire personnel through:

- Improved safety and assistance to public safety units and citizens
- Rapid response to calls for service
- Criminal deterrence and apprehension through airborne patrol operations

- Airborne search and rescue capabilities
- Provide diverse and wide-range services to other City departments

Commander Peters said that the presentation would include information related to the department's current aircraft, personnel structure, budgetary impacts, flight schedules, the P210 fixed-wing aircraft project and the Five Year Plan.

Commander Peters stated that the Aviation Unit consisted of a Cessna 172N Skyhawk, Cessna P210 and three MD500f helicopters. (See Page 4 of Attachment 3) He said that personnel assigned to the Aviation Unit included one police sergeant, eight rotor-wing and/or fixed-wing pilots /Tactical Flight Officers (TFO), seven part-time TFOs and two mechanics.

Commander Peters said that flight hours for both the helicopters and airplanes total 55 hours per week. (See Page 7 of Attachment 3) He briefly highlighted the budgetary impacts that have affected the aviation section as follows:

- Patrol operation flight hours reduced by 612 hours or 38% for the FY 2010/11
- Reduced staff
- Flight training and certifications for rarely used services were eliminated
- Use of the Cessna P210 for patrol operations

In response to a question from Councilwoman Higgins, Commander Peters explained that the Police Department utilizes aircraft during the hours of the day when the City would be experiencing the most criminal activity.

Commander Peters advised that for the past year the Police Department had been using the P210 fixed-wing in a patrol type of capacity. He discussed the pros and cons of the P210, as follows:

PROS:

- Capable of high altitude covert operations
- Fast response time when airborne
- Superior mapping system that allows TFO to identify street names and call out moving targets
- Greater comfort for pilot and TFO on extended flights
- Lower maintenance costs
- Can stay in the air longer
- Improved infrared camera system for day and night usage

CONS:

- Lacks a patrol computer
- Large area searches are more difficult for the TFO
- Does not deter criminal activity
- Cannot provide spotlight support to patrol officers
- Does not have theft detection or tracking systems to aid in robbery or stolen vehicle calls
- Cannot provide public address announcements

Commander Peters continued with the presentation and outlined the pros and cons of using a helicopter as follows:

PROS:

- Response times (7 minutes from the ground, 4 minutes when in air)
- Tight orbit allows 360 degree view
- Mobile Data Terminals (MDT) for mapping, call comments, communicating by computer and screen for camera use
- Unaffected by cloud cover
- Altitude allows better field of view for pilot/TFO than on an airplane
- Searchlight capacity
- Equipped with Pronet and Lojack
- Has a public address system
- 10 minutes to hot fuel versus one hour for an airplane
- Other potential uses (rescues, aerial photos of crime scene, SWAT insertions, water bucket dumps for fires, incident/fire command)

CONS:

- Difficult to use for surveillance as it can be detected
- Flight time is two hours compared to 4 hours with an airplane
- TFO must be skilled in multi-tasking due to the amount of equipment to operate and monitor
- Higher maintenance costs (fuel and parts are \$235 per flight hour compared to \$142.48 for an airplane)

Commander Peters advised that utilizing three helicopters allows the Police Department to balance the maintenance costs between the aircrafts and maximize their service life. He said that to avoid overhaul costs an MD500F helicopter should be replaced between 10,000 and 15,000 flight hours. He displayed a table that outlined each aircraft, manufacture date, dates of service and number of flight hours. (See Page 12 of Attachment 3)

Commander Peters briefly reviewed the Five Year Plan, which included the costs for routine and non-routine equipment purchases. He advised that the Five Year Plan included a 2% inflation rate per year for contract labor costs and equipment as well as a 3% inflation rate for fuel. (See Page 13 of Attachment 3)

In response to a question from Mayor Smith, Commander Peters explained that having a sense of security overhead was important to the officers on the ground. He also said that having airborne resources available during emergency situations was extremely valuable.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Richins, Commander Peters explained that while some aircraft maintenance was contracted out, City mechanics have been able to do a phenomenal job of keeping costs down by transferring systems from one aircraft to another in order to maximize efficiency. He stated that unlike a City employed mechanic, a contracted mechanic might not be concerned with the amount of flight hours an aircraft had.

Mayor Smith commented that having a mechanic that was familiar with the different units and could swap parts from one helicopter to another was beneficial.

Councilmember Richins expressed concern with regards to the expense of maintaining the aircraft. He requested that staff continue to explore ways to save the taxpayers money with regards to maintenance expenses.

Councilmember Kavanaugh remarked that lawsuits brought against cities involved in high-speed pursuits were expensive. He said that the liability of a high-speed pursuit was intense and risked the lives of law enforcement officers and the public. He stated that having an Aviation Unit saves lives and reduces the liability to the community. In addition, he said that over the course of five years the maintenance costs would be money well invested.

Councilmember Finter expressed his support for the Aviation Unit and encouraged staff to continue to implement cost-saving measures. He stated that other agencies have requested the assistance of the City's aircraft and that while the City wants to be a good neighbor he believed that the aircraft should not be used outside of the City. He suggested that some type of cost recovery system be implemented to cover the operational expenses of aircraft used outside of the City.

Mayor Smith thanked Commander Peters for the presentation.

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

3-a. Audit, Finance and Enterprise Committee meeting held February 27, 2012

This item was continued to the March 22, 2012 Study Session.

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

There were no reports on meetings or conferences attended.

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Thursday, March 22, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

6. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

7. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

SCOTT SMITH, MAYOR

ATTEST:

LINDA CROCKER, 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 19th day of March 2012. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

LINDA CROCKER, CITY CLERK

bdw
(attachments 3)

Community Development

Block Grant (CDBG) Program

HOME Investment

Partnership (HOME) Program

Emergency Solutions Grant

(ESG) Program

Human Services Funding



Presentation to Council at a Council Study Session – March 19, 2012

ALLOCATION PROCESS

- Applications for FY12/13 CDBG, HOME, ESG and Human Services Funding received in early January
- Staff recommendations presented to the Community and Cultural Development Committee on February 23rd and March 1st
- Community and Cultural Development Committee recommendations presented to full council on March 8th
- Seeking Council Direction on funding allocations

Federal Funding

Program	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2-Year Difference
CDBG	3.7 million	3.1 million	3.2 million	15% decrease
HOME	1.5 million	1.3 million	943,000	37% decrease
ESG	151,000	151,000	269,000	79% increase
ABC/Human Services	620,000	657,000	620,000	0%

Reduction of CDBG and HOME programs over the last two years – over 1.1 million

Federal Fund Timeline

ACTIVITY	DATE(S)
Council Study Session – Approval of Community & Cultural Development funding recommendations by Council	March 19, 2012
Annual Action Plan – 30-day public comment period	March 29 – April 30, 2012
Public Hearing #2 – Annual Action Plan review	April 5, 2012
Council Meeting – Annual Action Plan approval by Council	May 7, 2012
Annual Action Plan to HUD	May 15, 2012

Human Services and ABC funding allocations are final with council direction today

March 8th – Consensus from Council

- Maintain CDBG funding for 6 Code Compliance Officers
 - potential General Funding will be discussed during budget presentations
- Maintain CDBG funding for Economic Development position – potential General Funding will be discussed during budget presentations
- Switch 8 CDBG applications to Human Services funding and 2 Human Services applications to CDBG funding
- Accept allocation recommendations for CDBG, ESG and Human Services
- Designate any future unallocated funds that may become available from past or current program years to the La Mesita Shelter Project

HOME allocations to be discussed on March 19th

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Code Enforcement	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	COM Development and Sustainability – Code Enforcement Program – 6 FTE Code Officers	\$620,491	\$510,000
CDBG	COM Development and Sustainability – Demolition and Hazardous Abatement Program	\$100,000	\$50,000
CDBG	<i>Code Enforcement Subtotal</i>	<i>\$720,491</i>	<i>\$560,000</i>

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Economic Development Applications	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	COM Economic Development Department – Downtown Project Mgr.	\$115,000	\$115,000
CDBG	Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO) – Business Development Program	\$81,500	\$81,500
CDBG	Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO) – Light Rail Business Assistance Program	\$300,000	\$250,000
CDBG	West Mesa CDC – Economic Development Program	\$90,000	\$90,000
CDBG	<i>Economic Development Subtotal</i>	<i>\$586,500</i>	<i>\$536,500</i>

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Acquisition and/or Rehabilitation (Housing Needs) Applications	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	Arizona Bridge to Independent Living (ABIL) – Mesa Home Accessibility Program (MHAP)	\$65,000	\$65,000
CDBG	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – Homeowner Rehabilitation Program	\$1,086,592	\$500,000*
CDBG	Habitat for Humanity of Central Arizona – Housing Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resale Project	\$315,000	--
CDBG	Marc Center – Freestone Community Center Renovation	\$242,000	\$242,000
CDBG	Acquisition and/or Rehabilitation (Housing Needs) Subtotal	\$1,708,602	\$807,000

*The Rehabilitation funds will be targeted for emergency rehab efforts in the new CDBG areas but will most likely be expended by mid-year.

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Public Facility Applications	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	A New Leaf – East Valley Men’s Center Renovation Project (Phase III)	\$135,000	\$135,000
CDBG	A New Leaf – La Mesita Shelter Project	\$1,505,925	\$852,545*
CDBG	COM Parks & Recreation – Drew Street Pocket Park Renovation	\$144,000	--
CDBG	Project Veterans Pride – Project Veterans Pride	\$230,000	--
CDBG	Public Facility Subtotal	\$2,014,925	\$987,545

*A New Leaf – La Mesita Shelter Project funding recommendation includes:

- \$371,436 from available prior year funds;
- \$380,925 from a repurposed prior year plumbing contract at this location;
- \$100,184 from a FY 12/13 allocation;
- This leaves the project with a \$650,000 shortfall.
- All funds left from this year or prior years that are uncommitted can be awarded to La Mesita – available funds are unknown at this time.

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Public Service Applications (15% Maximum Allowable Amount - \$476,449)	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	COM Neighborhood Outreach Division – Community Engagement Program – 1 FTE Outreach Coordinator	\$102,435	\$102,435
CDBG	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – FSS Support Services	\$30,000	\$30,000
CDBG	COM Parks and Recreation Department – Washington Activity Center	\$200,000	--
CDBG	Housing Our Communities – Homeownership Counseling, Foreclosure Prevention, and Client Intake/Referral	\$93,890	--
CDBG	Mercy Housing Mountain Plains – Mercy Housing Live in Hope Financial Literacy Program	\$25,000	--

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Public Service Applications – Continued (15% Maximum Allowable Amount - \$476,449)	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	Save the Family Foundation of Arizona – Homeless Families Intervention Project	\$35,000	\$35,000
CDBG	Valley of the Sun YMCA – Mesa Family YMCA/Washington Park Community Partnership	\$100,000	--
CDBG	Save the Family – Transitional Housing Program	\$180,360	\$116,749
CDBG	A New Leaf – East Valley Men's Center	\$150,000	\$118,196
	Public Service Subtotal	\$783,325	\$402,380

- Represents contracts switched from Human Services funds.

CDBG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Administration	Agency Request	Recommendation
CDBG	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – Administration	\$635,266	\$635,266
	<i>Administration Subtotal</i>	\$635,266	\$635,266

The Committee recommended exchanging 8 CDBG contracts for a total sum of \$235,826 for 2 Human Services contracts in the sum of \$234,945 an effort to reduce the federal contracts.

Human Services funds are usually used as the City's required ESG match. The exchange in contracts would create a ESG activity match shortfall of apx. \$63,000. Staff is comfortable that we can work with the agencies to comply with all match requirements.

ESG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	City Department Applications	Agency Request	Staff Recommend
ESG	COM Housing and Revitalization - Administration	\$20,169	\$20,169
ESG	COM Housing and Revitalization - Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program	\$88,505	\$173,352*
ESG	City Department Subtotal	\$108,674	\$193,521

*Includes a mid-year FY 11/12 allocation of \$84,847 from HUD that cannot be used for shelters or street outreach. Cultural and Community Development Committee supports staff's proposal to allocate these funds for Homeless Prevention/Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) using existing Housing staff members. The City has already operated a HPRP program and can move quickly with this requirement.

The City must file a Substantial Amendment with HUD prior to May 15th in order to obtain the funds. HUD has release new rules for ESG.

ESG FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non-Profit Agency Applications – (60% cap on Shelters and Street Outreach Activities)	Agency Request	Staff Recommend
ESG	A New Leaf – Autumn House	\$42,500	--
ESG	A New Leaf – East Valley Men’s Center	\$80,000	\$80,000
ESG	A New Leaf – La Mesita Family Homeless Shelter	\$42,500	\$42,500
ESG	Community Bridges Inc., - Homeless Navigator Services in Mesa	\$37,752	\$37,752
ESG	Project Veterans Pride – Project Veterans Pride	\$100,000	--
ESG	<i>Non-Profit Agency Subtotal</i>	\$302,752	\$160,252

A New Leaf would like to be able to determine which shelters to fund between Autumn House, EVMC and La Mesita. They will finalize this decision prior to filing with HUD. The total amount would not change from \$122,500.

Human Services/ABC FY 12/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non Profit Agency Applications	Agency Request	HSAB Recommend
HS/ABC	United Food Bank – Food Distribution Program to Social Service Agencies	\$20,000	\$17,100
HS/ABC	Community Bridges – Substance Abuse Services	\$65,000	\$52,927.35
HS/ABC	A New Leaf, Inc. – Autumn House Emergency Shelter	\$32,500	\$21,464.78
HS/ABC	A New Leaf – MesacAN	\$125,000	\$107,355.70
HS/ABC	A New Leaf – Court Advocacy Program	\$15,000	\$11,875
HS/ABC	Marc Center – Job Training Support for the Disabled	\$10,000	\$9,500
HS/ABC	A New Leaf – La Mesita Homeless Shelter for Families	\$45,000	\$37,513.98
HS/ABC	American Red Cross – Disaster Assistance Program	\$25,000	\$7,500
HS/ABC	Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS) – Shelter services for homeless women	\$30,000	\$10,068

Human Services/ABC FY 12/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non Profit Agency Applications	Agency Request	HSAB Recommend
HS/ABC	East Valley Adult Resources (EVAR) – Meals on Wheels Program	\$20,000	\$13,038.18
HS/ABC	Child Crisis Center – Emergency Shelter for Children	\$11,000	\$10,450
HS/ABC	Tumbleweed Center for Youth Development – Supportive Services to Homeless Youth	\$10,000	\$7,500
HS/ABC	Lutheran Social Services – IHelp Shelter Program for Homeless Women	\$29,000	\$21,612.50
HS/ABC	Paz de Cristo – Evening Meal Service	\$43,000	\$24,700
HS/ABC	A New Leaf – Empower Program	\$8,000	\$4,845
HS/ABC	House of Refuge – Employment Support Program for Homeless Shelter Residents	\$21,000	\$10,000
HS/ABC	Teen Lifeline – Teen Crisis/Suicide Prevention Hotline	\$10,000	\$7,500
HS/ABC	Sirrine Adult Day Care – Adult Day Care Services	\$11,250	\$10,000

Human Services/ABC FY 12/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non Profit Agency Applications	Agency Request	HSAB Recommend
HS/ABC	East Valley Adult Resources, Inc. – Assistance for Independent Living (AIL) Program	\$22,000	\$22,000
HS/ABC	Community Legal Services – Removing Barriers to Justice for Low-Income Mesa Residents	\$45,000	\$45,000
HS/ABC	Labor’s Community Service Agency – Foreclosure Intervention Program	\$30,000	\$30,000
HS/ABC	House of Refuge, Inc. – Roadway Repair Project	\$38,826	\$39,000
HS/ABC	Community Legal Services – Mesa Tenants Rights Helpline	\$40,000	\$40,000
HS/ABC	West Mesa CDC – Community Compliance Program – 1 FTE Community Compliance Specialist	\$30,000	\$30,000
HS/ABC	West Mesa CDC – Community Safety/Crime Prevention Program	\$10,000	\$10,000
HS/ABC	West Mesa CDC – Neighborhood Academy	\$20,000	\$20,000
HS/ABC	A New Leaf – Desert Leaf Supportive Services	\$12,500	--
HS/ABC	Arizona Brain Food – Provide food to hungry children	\$50,000	--

• Represents contracts transferred from CDBG Program.

Human Services/ABC FY 12/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non Profit Agency Applications	Agency Request	HSAB Recommend
HS/ABC	Community Information & Referral – 211 Arizona Social Service Helpline	\$30,000	--
HS/ABC	Sun Sounds of Arizona – Reading aloud to Mesa residents that are blind or visually impaired	\$30,258	--
HS/ABC	Salvation Army – Food, Rental, and Utility Assistance	\$40,000	--
HS/ABC	Big Brothers Big Sisters – Community-Based Mentoring for Youth	\$20,000	--
HS/ABC	Gene Lewis Boxing Club – Boxing for a Better Life Program	\$32,000	--
HS/ABC	Christian Assistance Network (CAN) – Emergency Utility Assistance	\$9,200	--
HS/ABC	Family Service Agency – Community Re-Integration Program for Ex-Offenders	\$20,000	--
HS/ABC	Stardust Non-profit Building Supplies – Home Repair Services for Low-Income Mesa Residents	\$10,000	--
HS/ABC	Chicanos Por La Causa – PATTERNS Teen Pregnancy Program	\$65,000	--
HS/ABC	Project Veterans Pride – Short-term emergency assistance, transitional housing, case management, counseling and employment services for homeless veterans	\$450,000	--
HS/ABC	Non Profit Agency Subtotal	\$1,535,534	\$620,950

HOME FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	Non Profit Agency Applications	Agency Request	Staff Recommend	Committee Recommend
HOME	ARM of Save the Family – Affordable Rental Movement (Acquisition and Rehabilitation)	\$537,600	--	\$0
HOME	ARM of Save the Family – CHDO Operating (5% max of allocation)	\$50,000	\$47,154	\$47,154
HOME	Community Bridges, Inc. – Center for Hope Permanent Supportive Housing	\$286,045	--	\$0
HOME	Habitat for Humanity – Land Acquisition & Rehabilitation	\$435,750	\$401,620	\$0
HOME	Housing Our Communities – CHDO Operating	\$50,000	--	\$0
	Open application for construction ready projects			\$610,158
HOME	<i>Non Profit Agency Subtotal</i>	\$1,359,395	\$448,774	\$657,312
Funding Source	CHDO Set-Aside Applications (15% Minimum Required - \$141,462)	Agency Request	Staff Recommend	Committee Recommend
HOME	ARM of Save the Family – Affordable Rental Movement	\$537,600	\$350,000	\$141,462
HOME	Housing Our Communities – New Opportunities for Homeownership Program	\$300,000	--	\$0
HOME	<i>CHDO Set-Aside Subtotal</i>	\$837,600	\$350,000	\$141,462

Committee HOME Fund

Recommendations

- Reduce Save the Family's CHDO funding to the minimum set-aside from \$350,000 to \$141,462.
- Take remaining funds(\$610,158) and have staff work with non-profits to design an open process for funding construction ready projects.
- All HOME funds should be expended in the new CDBG target areas.
- Design would be based on first come, first serve until all funds are expended.
- This would permit the non-profits to apply for funds throughout the year as projects arise.

HOME FY 2012/13 Applications for Funding

Funding Source	City Department Applications	Agency Request	Staff Recommend
HOME	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – HOME Administration	\$94,308	\$94,308
HOME	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – Security Deposit Program	\$50,000	\$50,000
HOME	COM Housing and Revitalization Division – Re-construction and Major Rehabilitation Program	\$533,372	--
HOME	<i>City Department Subtotal</i>	\$677,680	\$144,308

Questions and Discussion



Housing and Revitalization Division

City Council Report

Date: March 19, 2012

To: City Council

Through: Trish Sorensen, Assistant to the City Manager

From: Tammy Albright, Housing and Community Development Director
Mary Berumen, Housing and Revitalization Director
Ray Thimesch, Development Project Coordinator

Subject: Community and Cultural Development Committee's Funding Recommendations for:
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),
HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME),
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Human Services Programs
FY2012/13 Projects and Allocations

Council District: Citywide

Strategic Initiatives



Purpose and Recommendation

The purpose of this report is to present the Mesa City Council with the Community and Cultural Development Committee's funding recommendations for the FY 2012/13 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Human Services Programs.

20 E. Main Street, P.O. Box 1466, Mesa, AZ 85211-1466
480.644.3536 Tel, 480.644.2923 Fax, 711 (AZ TDD Relay)

Office Hours: Monday-Thursday 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., closed Friday.

If you are a person with a disability and require a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the programs and services at the City of Mesa, please contact the Division Director at 480-644-3536 (Voice). You may be required to provide information to support your reasonable accommodation request.



As part of the preparation process of the City's Annual Action Plan for FY 2012/13, staff is requesting that the Council review, modify and/or approve the attached recommendations so they can be included in the City's FY 2012/13 Annual Action Plan for review by the public on March 29, 2012.

Background

Mesa used an application process to solicit proposals from non-profit agencies and City departments for FY12/13 CDBG, HOME, ESG and Human Services funding. Applications were received in early January.

The review and scoring process included an application review by Housing and Community Development staff (70% of score) and a presentation review by the respective Board (30% of score). Presentation reviews were conducted by either the Housing Advisory Board or the Economic Development Advisory Board in early February 2012.

Funding recommendations were presented to the Community and Cultural Development Committee on February 23rd and March 1, 2012. The Committee's recommendations were presented to the full Council on March 8, 2012.

Discussion

At the March 8, 2012 City Council Study Session, there was consensus by the Council to accept the following key recommendations:

- Maintain CDBG funding for 6 Code Compliance Officers – potential General Funding for these positions will be discussed in upcoming budget presentations
- Maintain CDBG funding for the Economic Development position – potential General Funding for this position will be discussed in upcoming budget presentations
- Accepting staff's funding recommendations for CDBG, ESG and Human Services programs – this includes switching 8 CDBG applications to the City's Human Services program and switching 2 Human Services applications to the CDBG program (see Attachments A, B, C & D)
- Designating any future unallocated funds that may become available from past or current program years to the La Mesita Shelter Project

HOME funding allocations would be brought back to the full Council on March 19th for further discussion and direction.

Alternatives

The HOME funding recommendations proposed to Council on March 8th are being brought back for further discussion and direction. There are three options for HOME funding:

1. Accept the recommendations made by the Community and Cultural Development Committee to implement an open mixed application process for HOME funds in FY12/13. Required HOME activities such as CHDO Set-Aside, CHDO Operations and Administration would be funded at the minimum required levels. In addition, the CHDO Set-Aside allocation to Save the Family would also be set at the minimum amount required by HUD (\$141,462). The remaining HOME funds (\$610,158) would not be allocated at this time but rather be made available for future projects through an open application process.
2. Accept the original recommendations made by staff to the Community and Cultural Development Committee. An open mixed application process would be deferred for implementation in FY13/14 funding.
3. Revise the funding recommendations made by staff and/or the Community and Cultural Development Committee.

Fiscal Impact

The City has been notified of its FY2012/13 allocations by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. CDBG funding remained stable from last year but a 37% reduction has occurred in the HOME program. Allocations from HUD are as follows:

HUD Program	FY2012/13 Allocation	FY2012/13 Proposals Recd.
CDBG	\$3,176,330	\$6,449,109
HOME	\$943,082	\$2,874,675
ESG	\$268,926	\$411,426
Total	\$4,388,338	\$9,735,210

FY 2012/13 Human Services program funding is expected to remain stable and is based on last year's initial allocation amounts. Anticipated amounts are as follows:

Human Services Program	FY2012/13 Allocation	FY2012/13 Proposals Recd.
General Fund & ABC Contributions	\$620,950	\$1,535,534
Total	\$620,950	\$1,535,534

Coordinated With

The proposed CDBG, HOME, ESG and Human Services programs have been reviewed with applicants, citizens, other city departments, the Economic Development Advisory Board, the Housing Advisory Board and the Human Services Advisory Board.

Final funding recommendations by Council will be included in the City's Annual Action Plan (Plan) that serves as its formal application to HUD for funding of the CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs. The Plan will be available for review on March 29th and the residents of Mesa are encouraged to provide feedback during the required 30-day comment period beginning that ends on April 30, 2012. Residents can also provide feedback during Public Hearing #2 that will occur on April 5, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. in room 170 of the Mesa City Plaza Building. On May 7th, 2012, Council will approve the Plan, and it will be submitted to HUD no later than May 15, 2012.

These meetings meet the Citizen Participation requirements set by HUD for participation in these federal programs.

Mesa Police

Aviation Section

Configuration & Strategic 5 Year Plan





Aviation Section Mission

To enhance the level of protection and service to the community and its police and fire personnel through safe and professional operations by providing:

- Improved safety and assistance to public safety units and citizens
- Rapid response to calls for service
- Criminal deterrence and apprehension through airborne patrol operations
- Airborne search and rescue capabilities
- Diverse and wide-ranging services to other city departments



mesa·az

- **Current Aircraft**
- **Personnel Structure**
- **Budgetary Impacts**
- **Current Flight Schedule**
- **P210 – Fixed Wing**
- **Five Year Fiscal Plan**



Current Aircraft

- Cessna 172N Skyhawk - single engine, fixed wing
- Cessna P210 - single engine, pressurized fixed wing
- Three MD500F helicopters



Personnel

- Unit Sergeant (non-pilot)
- Eight rotor-wing and/or fixed-wing pilots
- Pilots are also proficient as Tactical Flight Officers (TFO)
- Seven part-time Tactical Flight Officers
- Two mechanics



Budgetary Impacts

- Reduced patrol operation flight hours by 612 hours, or roughly 38%, for the FY 10/11 budget
- Reduced Staff
- Eliminated flight training and certifications for rarely used services
- Explored the use of the Cessna P210 for patrol operations



Current Schedule

- Helicopters – 43 Flight Hours
- Airplanes – 12 Flight Hours

Total Weekly Use: 55 Hours





P210 Fixed-Wing

PROS:

- High altitude operation is covert
- If airborne, response time is fast due to the address-based AeroComputers system
- Mapping system is superior for allowing the TFO to identify street names and call out moving targets for responding ground officers
- Lower maintenance costs (fuel and parts since we purchased airplane is \$142.48/hour and helicopter is about \$235.00/hour)
- Greater comfort for pilot and TFO for extended flights
- Airplane has more endurance (can stay in the air longer on a tank of fuel)
- Better Infrared camera for both day and night usage



P210 Fixed-Wing

CONS:

- The lack of a patrol computer (MDT) requires all call information and messages to be transmitted via radio
- Large area searches are more difficult for the TFO as the TFO is limited to what is observed in a camera system
- Because the Cessna P210 operates undetected, its presence does not deter criminal activity. This includes a reduced role as a "back-up" for patrol officers
- Cannot provide spotlight support to patrol officers
- Does not have theft detection and tracking systems to aid in robbery and stolen vehicle calls
- Cannot provide public address announcements (missing persons/warn citizens of dangerous suspects)



Helicopter

PROS:

- Response Time: 7 minutes from ground
4 minutes when in air
50 second average
- Tight orbit allows 360 degree view every 10 seconds
- MDT for mapping, checking call comments, communicating by computer, and a screen for use with the camera system (FLIR)
- Unaffected by cloud cover
- Altitude allows better field of view for pilot/TFO than airplane
- Searchlight capacity/back up
- Pronet and Lojack equipped
- PA system
- 10 minutes to hot fuel and return to scene – one hour for airplane
- Other potential uses: rescues, aerial photos of crimes scenes, SWAT insertions, water bucket dumps to help put out fires, incident command, and Fire command



Helicopter

CONS:

- Surveillance more difficult than airplane
- Flight time is just over 2 hours as compared to 4 hours with the airplane
- TFO must be skilled in multi tasking due to the amount of equipment to operate and monitor
- Higher maintenance costs (fuel and parts are \$2335.00 per flight hour compared with \$142.48 per hour for the airplane)



Five Year Fiscal Plan

Utilizing three helicopters allows the Mesa Police Department to disperse maintenance costs between the aircraft to maximize their service life. Major part and frame overhauls are based on flight hours. An MD500F helicopter is best replaced between 10,000 and 15,000 flight hours to avoid costly overhauls.

Aircraft	Manufacture Date	Mesa In-Service Date	Flight Hours
Helicopters			
504	1994	1994	19,003
505	2002	2003	9,138
506	1998	2010	5,025
Airplanes			
172	1978	1994	9,055
P210	1981	2009	3,877





Five Year Fiscal Plan

The five year plan outlines the costs for routine, non-routine, and equipment purchases for the Aviation Section. The plan incorporates a 2% inflation rate per year for contract labor costs and equipment and a 3% inflation rate per year for fuel.

Engine Overhauls	\$1,101,781
Non-Routine Equipment Maintenance	
(Main Rotor Blades/Main Rotor Hub Overhaul/Horizontal Stabilizers)	\$466,382
Equipment Replacement	
(Replacement Helicopter for 504/Fuel Truck/Facility DVR/EZ Go-Cart)	\$2,245,000
Equipment (new)	
(APU Unit/Automatic Security Gate/Downlink System)	\$155,111
Fuel	
(Jet "A" Fuel)	\$1,131,297
Accreditation by ALEA	<u>\$11,000</u>
Total	<u>\$5,110,571</u>





QUESTIONS?

