

# GENERAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 23, 2001

The General Development Committee of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on May 23, 2001 at 9:00 a.m.

## COMMITTEE PRESENT

Claudia Walters, Chairman  
Jim Davidson  
Mike Whalen

## COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson

1. Hear a presentation on site, design, and cost considerations for potential relocation of the Indoor Aquatic Center.

Parks and Recreation Director Joe Holmwood, City Engineer Keith Nath and Planning Director Frank Mizner addressed the Committee relative to this agenda item.

Mr. Holmwood acknowledged the cooperation he has received from other members of staff and noted that the project is currently at the 50% construction document phase.

Mr. Mizner referred to Exhibits A, B and C, which were distributed to the members of the Committee for their review and consideration, and provided a brief overview of each of the project alternatives. He noted that in accordance with the Committee's previous comments, effort has been expended to ensure that all of the options open up a view corridor towards the mountains.

Discussion ensued relative to staff's listing of advantages and disadvantages of relocating the indoor aquatic center (IAC) to Site 17, the fact that prior to the project being placed on hold, it was estimated that the bidding process would take place from July through December 2001, with construction beginning in the Fall of 2001, the fact that the construction phase at the existing location is estimated to be eighteen months, with the opening anticipated to occur in the Spring of 2003, the fact that approximately \$23 million has been earmarked for the IAC project and at the current time is approximately \$1.1 million out of balance; the fact that to date the City has expended \$1,189,043 on consultants' fees for the IAC project, excluding City engineering services, the fact that a City staff "land use team" was assembled with representation from Planning, Engineering, Parks & Recreation, Transportation and Redevelopment to work along with BPLW to develop a land use plan for the site and extensive efforts expended by staff to correctly identify the pros and cons

of relocating the IAC to Site 17.

Mr. Mizner stated that three important issues have to be considered, the costs involved in relocating the IAC; time delays that would occur as a result of the relocation; and the ultimate product that the Committee/Council envisions for this facility.

Additional discussion ensued relative to anticipated costs for all three alternatives, the fact that it would cost an additional \$6.7 million to relocate a facility of a similar design to Site 17 and it would cost an additional \$14.6 million for an enhanced designed building on that site; justification for the additional anticipated costs, including going back to the design process and additional design and construction management costs, additional costs associated with the larger site, 10% contingency costs, operating costs, parking spaces and costs per space, increased air conditioning costs, the potential for a future water chilling plant, and land values.

In response to a question from Committeemember Whalen, Mr. Holmwood stated that an enhanced facility on Site 17 would not be completed until May 2005 and that may not leave enough time to prepare to host the Goodwill Games in December of that year.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding the estimated \$1.2 million that has already been spent on consulting fees, Mr. Nath explained that the \$1.2 covered a wide array of services, including the preparation of several hundred detailed construction drawings.

Committeemember Davidson agreed with staff's recommendation contained in their report that public input be solicited prior to proceeding any further with the possible relocation of the IAC. He added that increased economic development revenues would be generated at the larger site and that issues such as this should be considered when balancing all of the data and pointed out that the project is being funded as a result of a sales tax being levied. He noted that the costs have already exceeded the approved amount and added that in his opinion, the approved amount should be sufficient to build a facility on either site. He said that from his perspective, the cost of the project needs to remain within the approved revenue stream. He added that he agrees that the construction of this facility on the original site would do much to change and improve that area but said he would still support soliciting public input on this issue before rendering a final decision.

Committeemember Whalen said that he concurs with many of Committeemember Davidson's comments and emphasized that synergy is an important component of the entire proposal. He said that thought should be given to pursuing a possible public-private partnership if the Council decides to move the facility to Site 17. Committeemember Whalen stressed the importance of master planning the entire site and noted that there is no park located in close vicinity to the downtown area. He requested information relative to the market value of the 1st Avenue site and added that a chilled water loop should also be further pursued. Committeemember Davidson said that he looks forward to receiving public input on this issue.

Chairman Walters expressed the opinion that future economic development activities and revenues will be generated on either site. She also voiced concerns regarding project costs and the fact that the original facility on the original site is already \$1.1 million more than anticipated. She stated the opinion that the relocation of the IAC facility to Site 17 is not feasible based on the excessive costs associated with that proposal. Chairman Walters added that although she strongly believes that the relocation is not possible, since the other two members of the Committee have indicated support for soliciting public input, she too will support presenting this issue to the citizens for their comments.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson said that staff will work on the costs associated with the project and the various options in order to clarify the issue for the benefit of the citizens at the public meeting. He expressed appreciation to staff for their efforts on this project.

## 2. Adjournment.

Without objection, the General Development Committee meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the meeting of the General Development Committee of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> 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

lgc

**Indoor Aquatic Center  
 Relocation vs. Remaining at Current Site  
 Cost Analysis - Summary**

	<u>Current Site</u>	<u>Site 17 Similar Design</u>	<u>Site 17 Enhanced Design</u>
Current Budget Appropriations	\$22,800,000	\$22,800,000	\$22,800,000
Consultant Fees Expended-to-Date	\$ 1,189,043	\$ 1,189,043	\$ 1,189,043
Other Costs	\$ 2,729,218	\$ 2,729,218	\$ 2,729,218
Current Construction Budget	<u>\$18,881,739</u>	<u>\$18,881,739</u>	<u>\$18,881,739</u>
	<u>\$22,800,000</u>	<u>\$22,800,000</u>	<u>\$22,800,000</u>
Additional Consultant Fees Required	\$ -	\$ 1,317,000	\$ 2,330,000
Additional Construction Costs - Beyond Original Appropriations*	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 3,146,400	\$ 9,482,900
Additional Contingency Required**	\$ -	\$ 2,227,682	\$ 2,861,332
Additional Appropriations Needed	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 6,691,082	\$14,674,232
Additional Time Required	1 month	12 months	24 months
Estimated Opening	Spring 2003 (May)	Spring 2004 (May)	Spring 2005 (May)

\*Current Site - Additional Construction Costs represent the estimated amount which must be added or value engineered out of the current project to remain within the current appropriations. In addition, it is staff's opinion the \$750,000 in value engineering reductions already incurred should be reinstated to ensure the facility remains a world class aquatic facility. If reinstated, the total additional construction costs are \$1,850,000.

\*\*Current Site - Contingency reserves are approximately 5% of the construction estimate, currently \$900,000. This is considered adequate, construction drawings are 50% complete.

Source: BPLW and City Engineering Division