

COUNCIL MINUTES

May 17, 2001

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 May 17, 2001 at 7:30 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker
Bill Jaffa
Dennis Kavanaugh
Pat Pomeroy
Claudia Walters
Mike Whalen

COUNCIL ABSENT

Jim Davidson

OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson
Neal Beets
Barbara Jones

Mayor Hawker excused Vice Mayor Davidson from the meeting.

1. Review items on the agenda for the May 21, 2001 Regular Council Meeting.

All of the items on the agenda were reviewed among Council and staff with no formal action taken. There was specific discussion relative to the following items:

Mayor Hawker declared potential conflicts of interest on agenda items 4n (Main Library Entry Improvements), 4o (Baseline Road Widening, Horne to 24th Street) and 6a (Authorizing the annual assessments for the Mesa Town Center Improvement District No. 228) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation in these items.

Councilmember Jaffa and Councilmember Pomeroy declared conflicts of interest on agenda item 6a (Authorizing the annual assessments for the Mesa Town Center Improvement District No. 228) and said they would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

2. Hear, discuss and consider a preliminary report and draft plans for the redistricting of City Council districts.

Pat Langdon, Chairman of the Council Districting Commission, provided a brief update regarding the status of the redistricting process. He introduced Dr. Alan Heslop and Dr. Florence Adams of National Demographics Corporation (NDC) and stated that NDC was retained by the City to provide technical assistance throughout the process. Mr. Langdon reported that the Commission approved criteria to be used in the line drawing process and agreed to a schedule of meetings and deadlines that will meet the timeframe associated with

Justice Department approval of new district boundary lines and Mesa's 2001 elections. He noted that the first series of public hearings begins on May 23, 2001.

Dr. Heslop addressed the Council and provided an overview of the *Preliminary Report to the City of Mesa Council Districting Commission on the Redistricting Process*, which was provided to the Councilmembers. He stated that the report was prepared by NDC to provide citizens with a simple, easily used guidebook to the redistricting process. Dr. Heslop discussed the various topics addressed in the report including Mesa's history, growth, geography and demography; the public participation process; redistricting tasks and NDC's approach to redistricting; and data and maps (based on 2000 census data) used throughout the process.

Dr. Adams addressed the Council and reported that NDC developed a Citizen Redistricting Kit, which includes three draft redistricting concepts, to assist citizens in providing input to the line drawing process. She noted that the draft concepts were developed through input received from City Councilmembers, Commission members and staff.

Dr. Adams referred to numerous maps included in the citizen kit, including: 1) Total Population Counts; 2) Hispanic Population Counts; 3) Voting Age Population Counts; 4) Hispanic Voting Age Counts; 5) a plain blank map (for use by citizens to develop concepts); 6) various thematic maps showing the location of minorities throughout Mesa by percentages; and 7) a clear overlay map of the current Council districts.

Dr. Adams referred to the maps provided with the three draft concepts and explained that the green lines delineate proposed district boundaries and the black lines delineate existing district boundaries. She noted that emphasis was placed on drawing straight lines where possible in response to input from City Councilmembers, staff and Commission members. She added that spreadsheets (containing population data and percentages) are also provided with each of the three concepts.

Dr. Adams discussed the boundary adjustments in Concept A, which include movement of District 3 slightly east and north; considerable movement of District 1 east; movement of District 2 east; and movement of District 5 (into District 6) south to Southern Avenue. She noted that District 4 has the highest percentage of Hispanic population at 46.15%.

Dr. Adams commented on the boundary adjustments in Concept B which include movement of District 3 east and north in a different manner than Concept A in order to add population; straightening of the lines in District 4 and movement of District 4 into District 6, resulting in a reduction of the Hispanic population in District 4 to 43.96%; movement of District 1 into District 2 and also into District 4; and movement of District 5 into District 6.

Dr. Adams discussed the boundary adjustments in Concept C including movement of District 4 slightly into District 3, straightening the line between 3 and 4; movement of District 3 north; movement of District 1 significantly east; and significant configuration change of District 5. She stated that the most significant change in Concept C is the movement of District 2 to the southern border of the City and she noted that the Hispanic population of District 4 is 46.24%.

In response to concerns voiced by Councilmember Pomeroy regarding street names on the maps, Dr. Adams stated that additional street names will be added to the maps to help identify boundary lines.

In response to a question from Councilmember Walters regarding population deviations, Dr. Adams stated that although effort is made to draw boundary lines that create districts that are nearly equal in population, negative deviations are generally applied to districts that are rapidly growing and positive deviations to districts that are built out.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding the timeline for approval of the final plan, Dr. Adams advised that it is anticipated that the City's final plan will be submitted to the Justice Department for approval in mid-August and that a response will be expected approximately 60 days later.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding Council candidates that wish to collect signatures prior to final plan approval, City Attorney Neal Beets stated the opinion that candidates should wait for final approval. He added that the Clerk's Office will provide candidates with nomination petitions upon request, and explain the risks associated with gathering signatures prior to final plan approval.

Discussion ensued regarding nomination petition signature requirements.

The Council voiced appreciation to Mr. Langdon for his service to the community and commended Dr. Heslop and Dr. Adams for their expertise in this area.

3 Acknowledge receipt of minutes of various boards and committees.

- a. Board of Adjustment meeting held May 8, 2001.
- b. Council District Commission meeting held April 26, 2001.
- c. Design Review Board meeting held May 2, 2001.
- d. Historic Preservation Committee meeting held April 12, 2001.
- e. Transportation Advisory Board meeting held April 17, 2001.

It was moved by Councilmember Pomeroy, seconded by Councilmember Kavanaugh, that receipt of the above-listed minutes be acknowledged.

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

Councilmember Kavanaugh commented on the Design Review Board minutes and requested Mr. Beets to provide the Councilmembers with his response to a request from the Design Review Board regarding an applicant that failed to comply with directives of the board.

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

Councilmember Whalen reported that staff recently conducted neighborhood meetings in the Gilbert Road/Hermosa Vista Drive area regarding anticipated end-of-freeway conditions. He stated that the meetings were well attended and produced good ideas for development of traffic calming measures in the area.

Councilmember Jaffa commented on a Boy Scouts meeting he recently attended and voiced appreciation for their many contributions to the community.

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Executive Session followed by Budget Hearing immediately following today's Study Session

Friday, May 18, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – Budget Hearing

Monday, May 21, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – Budget Hearing

Monday, May 21, 2001, TBA – Study Session

Monday, May 21, 2001, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Tuesday, May 22, 2001, 3:30 p.m. – Police Committee

Wednesday, May 23, 2001, 9:00 a.m. - General Development Committee

Thursday, May 24, 2001, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, May 24, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – Finance Committee

Thursday, May 31, 2001, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Monday, June 4, 2001, TBA – Study Session

Monday, June 4, 2001, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Mr. Hutchinson also reported that a group Council photograph session is scheduled on June 4, 2001 at 3:00 p.m.

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 8:56 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 17th day of May 2001. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2001.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pjt