



COUNCIL MINUTES

April 11, 2002

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 April 11, 2002 at 7:38 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

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

COUNCIL ABSENT

None

OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson
Debbie Spinner
Barbara Jones

1. Review items on the Agenda of the April 15, 2002 Regular Council Meeting.

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

Mayor Hawker declared a potential conflict of interest on agenda item 4f (Fire Station No. 206 Expansion) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

Vice Mayor Davidson declared a potential conflict of interest on agenda item 6c (Authorizing the City Manager to execute an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Pueblo Mesa Mobile Home Park Phase II Street Lighting Improvement District) and said he would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

Mayor Hawker, Councilmember Jaffa and Councilmember Pomeroy declared potential conflicts of interest on agenda item 6d (Setting May 20, 2002 as the hearing date for the annual assessments for the Mesa Town Center Improvement District No. 228) and said they would refrain from discussion/participation in this item.

Mayor Hawker stated that agenda item 7 (Consider entering into a contract with Hartsook Companies, Inc., to develop an integrated fundraising campaign for the Mesa Indoor Aquatic Center) would be removed from the agenda; and agenda item 9a (Z01-55 1010 S. Stapley Drive) would be removed from the consent agenda.

2. Hear a presentation, discuss and consider the design proposal for the public art passenger shelter at Alma School and Southern.

Public Art Coordinator Kate O'Mara addressed the Council and introduced Landscape Architect Steve Stettler, Dr. Kent Layton, Chairman of the Artist Selection Panel and Joe Tyler, Artist. Ms. O'Mara referred to a model on display in the Council Chambers and said that the model represents Mr. Tyler's prospective design for the bus shelter at the intersection of Alma School Road and Southern Avenue. She noted that Mr. Tyler collaborated with property management of the bank building at the site and Mr. Stettler in creating the design.

Ms. O'Mara stated that staff is seeking Council approval to proceed with construction of the bus shelter and noted that the Museum and Cultural Advisory Board recommends approval of the design.

Mr. Tyler addressed the Council and described and commented on his multi-sided/arched, dome-topped design. He reported that the shelter will provide seating for nine people, 100% shade canopy and full handicap accessibility including sufficient space for a wheelchair inside the shelter. He noted that a sculpted trash receptacle and bike rack will be incorporated into the shelter although they are not part of the model. He stated that brick pavers will be used as a flooring surface and noted that the existing sidewalk at the site is brick pavers. Mr. Tyler outlined the construction materials and commented on the low-maintenance design elements of the shelter.

Ms. O'Mara reported that with Council approval, the proposed shelter will be completed and installed this fall. She added that a proposed design by a different artist for a bus shelter at the intersection of Broadway and Macdonald will be presented to the Council at a future Study Session.

Mr. Layton commented on the artist selection process and on the Selection Committee's support for Mr. Tyler's work.

Discussion ensued regarding the "tree" bus shelter at Tempe High School designed by Mr. Tyler.

In response to questions from Mayor Hawker pertaining to the cost of the proposed bus shelter, Ms. O'Mara advised that the total cost of the proposed shelter is \$34,000, which includes the artist services, installation and a community participation process. She noted that the cost of a standard City bus shelter is approximately \$27,000.

Councilmember Kavanaugh voiced approval of the design and stated the opinion that the additional \$7,000 for the artist designed shelter is a worthwhile investment of public art funds. He commended Mr. Tyler for his existing works and said that his designs are memorable and help define communities.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Pomeroy, that the design proposal for the public art passenger shelter at Alma School and Southern be approved.

Vice Mayor Davidson voiced concerns regarding the potential for graffiti defacement on the proposed shelter.

In response to Vice Mayor Davidson's stated concerns, Mr. Tyler advised that the only surface on the bus shelter where graffiti might be a problem is on the screens, which are designed to bolt off and on for maintenance. He added that graffiti has not been a problem at any of the four existing bus shelters in Tempe that he designed.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that the model will remain the property of Mr. Tyler; and the fact that the bus shelter will be located on the southeast corner of the intersection, east of the fountain in front of the bank building.

Councilmember Jaffa spoke in support of Mr. Tyler's design and urged staff to arrange the purchase of the model in connection with any future commissions of Mr. Tyler's work and suggested that future models be auctioned to help raise additional public art funds.

Mayor Hawker and Councilmembers Pomeroy, Walters and Whalen also stated approval of the proposed bus shelter.

In response to a question from Councilmember Kavanaugh, Ms. O'Mara confirmed that the City, in partnership with Mesa Community College, will be working with Mr. Tyler in the future concerning the design of a bus shelter near the rose garden at Mesa Community College.

Carried unanimously.

3. Hear an update on improvements to the building permit and land development process.

Building Safety Director Crystal Pearl addressed the Council and provided an historical overview concerning this project. She stated that automation/technology improvements represents the most critical element of planned process improvements in the Building Safety and Code Compliance divisions. She said that the Council will be asked to approve a proposal for the purchase of computer hardware and software (Item 4a Building and Compliance System to Support Building Safety and Code Compliance Divisions) at the April 15, 2002 Regular Council Meeting.

Ms. Pearl discussed staff's proposed timeline for implementation of various phases of automation improvements, including: Phase I, base system on November 15, 2002; Phase IB, wireless access on December 16, 2002; Phase II, web access on March 24, 2003; and Phase III, GIS system on May 28, 2003. She noted that the proposed implementation deadlines are estimates and may require adjustments as staff begins working with the new system.

Neighborhood Services Manager Bryan Raines addressed the Council and commented on the cost of the proposed system. He stated that there are two separate cost components, the purchase price of the system (\$726,612.85) and the ongoing maintenance costs for years 2-5 (\$480,101.01). He stated that the maintenance costs are proportional in comparison to other City automation projects and he discussed the complexities of the proposed system. He said that maintenance will be provided through dial-up access with the proposed system vendor, Tidemark. He added that funds are budgeted this fiscal year and FY 2002/03 for a five-year lease purchase of the system.

In response to questions and concerns voiced by Mayor Hawker concerning the maintenance costs, Senior Project and Services Leader Wendy Saadi explained that system maintenance becomes increasingly necessary as a system ages because technology is constantly changing and the system must accommodate those changes in addition to changes within the Building Safety and Code Compliance divisions. She noted that Tidemark is a nationwide vendor for this system and would be incorporating new processes, reports, screens and functions on an on-going basis. She commented on the benefits associated with contracting for vendor support versus in-house support and added that vendor support is considered the best practice when purchasing a system that is used by many organizations.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker regarding systems used by other Valley communities, Ms. Pearl advised that Phoenix utilizes a Tidemark product and that staff reviewed Phoenix's system as part of this process.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that maintenance costs are fixed regardless of the amount of support required and paid on annual basis; that staff does not anticipate that customization of the system will be required for the City's purposes; that the zoning inspector process will be included in automation process improvements; that the Planning Division is in the process of recruiting an inspector; and the fact that the Desert Uplands area is one of the immediate focus areas that the new inspector will be assigned to.

In response to questions from Mayor Hawker concerning the ability of the proposed system to conduct the plans review process via the internet, Ms. Pearl explained that one of staff's current goals is to be able to conduct small plans review (single page size) via the internet although the ability to do large plans review is not forecast for at least several years.

Mayor Hawker thanked staff for the update.

4. Discuss and consider amendments to the Mesa Zoning Ordinance regarding citizen participation.

Planning Director Frank Mizner provided a brief overview regarding this agenda item and said that the Citizen Participation Guidelines were adopted by Resolution in November of 1998. He noted that the guidelines were modeled on similar programs in other Valley communities, particularly the City of Glendale. He referred to staff's report and a draft Zoning Code amendment (11-18-15 Citizen Participation) that were provided to the Councilmembers and stated that staff is seeking Council approval to proceed with the public review process followed by introduction of the corresponding Ordinance. He noted that the public review process will include the development community.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated support for staff's recommendations and noted that although implementation of the Citizen Participation Guidelines was intended as a one-year pilot project to precede adoption by Ordinance, the Guidelines have been a positive addition to the development process for more than three years. He added the opinion that City residents and businesses have benefited from the citizen participation process. He also stated support for requiring applicants to maintain records/summaries of neighborhood meetings as part of the process and commented on the problems encountered in connection with the development of Tri-City Pavillions.

It was moved by Councilmember Kavanaugh, seconded by Councilmember Walters, that staff's recommendations to proceed with the public review process, including neighborhood and development community input, relative to adoption of a Citizen Participation Ordinance, be approved.

Councilmember Jaffa spoke in support of soliciting developer and citizen input concerning adoption of an Ordinance. He voiced concerns relative to requiring developers to spend significant funds on the citizen participation process for all cases, including cases where there is minimal citizen response. He also stressed the importance of ensuring that the citizen participation process does not result in inappropriate negotiations/concessions between residents and developers.

Councilmember Walters stated support for the motion and stated that the Citizen Participation Guidelines have served as a "de facto" ordinance since adoption. She voiced the opinion that the Guidelines have been positive for the community and have helped to strengthen neighborhoods.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated support for incorporating the Guidelines as an Ordinance and concurred with Councilmember Walters comments. He also stated approval regarding the new zoning notice signs. He voiced concerns regarding reports of insufficient citizen notification concerning proposed planning and zoning changes.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson concerning the potential loss of flexibility with respect to an Ordinance versus guidelines, Mr. Mizner confirmed that there is a risk of losing flexibility in the process. Mr. Mizner commented on the rigorous notification requirements enforced by Planning staff and reported that the development community contends that notification requirements are excessive.

Mr. Mizner referred to the draft Zoning Code amendment provided to the Councilmembers and advised that staff has attempted to balance the requirements by providing flexibility to applicants relative to the manner in which notifications are made and meetings conducted. He noted that some projects require minimal notification and that staff intends to be sensitive and flexible concerning situations involving individual homeowners. Mr. Mizner also commented on the proposed requirement that developers provide records of meetings with neighborhoods.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Davidson concerning reports that multi-lingual outreach to citizens has been inadequate in the past, Mr. Mizner advised that staff recognizes that some cases require bilingual information and will ensure that alternative language materials are available if needed.

Councilmember Pomeroy stated support for adopting the Citizen Participation Guidelines into an ordinance.

In response to a questions from Mayor Hawker relative to penalties that could be imposed for an "after-the-fact" violation of a Citizen Participation Ordinance, Deputy City Attorney Joe Padilla reported that police powers apply to the City's zoning ordinances, a violation would represent a criminal violation and the maximum sentence that could be imposed upon an individual is six months in jail and a fine of \$2,500. He noted that a different penalty would apply to corporations

and organizations. Mr. Padilla added that the Council could designate the violation a lesser misdemeanor.

Mayor Hawker voiced concerns regarding having the same penalty structure for individual homeowners seeking variances in connection with home modifications or adding a swimming pool versus a developer proposing a significant development. He commented on the numerous requirements imposed upon all applicants and stated the opinion that they are burdensome for individual homeowners. He stated support for the manner in which staff currently enforces the Citizen Participation Guidelines and voiced opposition to adopting the Guidelines into an ordinance.

Councilmember Kavanaugh commented on the fact that the City's current Zoning Code provides for criminal violations and that the Court has the opportunity to impose the same penalty structure for other violations of the Code. He noted that the Court considers the circumstances surrounding each violation and imposes penalties accordingly.

City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised the Council that new language added to the Planning and Zoning enabling statutes (Arizona Revised Statutes Section 9-462.03) requires municipalities to adopt by ordinance a citizen review process for each rezoning application that requires a public hearing.

Mayor Hawker noted that a Citizen Participation Ordinance would encompass more than just rezoning cases.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, Mr. Mizner reported that the City receives between 100-125 applications for variances each year.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated the opinion that the citizen participation process is appropriate for individual homeowner variance cases and he stressed the importance of ensuring that all impacted residents are apprised of construction that could impact their property.

Mayor Hawker said that although he concurs with Vice Mayor Davidson's comments, in his opinion the process is too cumbersome for individual homeowners.

Mr. Mizner stated that staff would evaluate a "two-tiered" approach and differentiate cases involving relatively minor variance procedures versus full-scale zoning cases. He also commented on the fact that many homeowners in the City are also governed by Homeowners' Associations, which typically require approval for all home modifications and particularly variance situations.

Councilmember Whalen said that although he supports moving this matter forward to the public review process, he also has concerns regarding cases involving individual homeowners and urged staff to ensure that appropriate considerations are made in this regard.

Councilmember Jaffa stated support for moving this matter forward to the public review process and said that he shares concerns raised by Councilmembers.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stressed the importance of ensuring that there is no confusion concerning the fact that the citizen participation process would not apply to routine home improvement cases that only require a permit and do not require a variance.

Further discussion ensued regarding the new Growing Smarter legislation that requires municipalities to have an ordinance in place concerning citizen participation in zoning cases.

Mayor Hawker clarified that although he is opposed to adopting the City's Citizen Participation Guidelines into an ordinance, he would support actions necessary to comply with State law.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES - Davidson-Jaffa-Kavanaugh-Pomeroy-Walters-Whalen
NAYS - Hawker

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried by majority vote.

5. Discuss and consider revisions to big box retail regulations.

Mr. Mizner provided an historical overview concerning the process of developing big box retail regulations. He noted that in January 2002, the Council deferred action regarding this issue until after the March 2002 election in consideration of the WalMart zoning referendum issue. He stated that with Council direction to do so, a proposed Ordinance regulating big box retail development would be scheduled for introduction at a future Council meeting followed by a public hearing and Council action.

Mayor Hawker stated opposition to an ordinance regulating big box retail development. He voiced the opinion that most of the concerns relative to big box retail have been addressed through the updated Design Guidelines and he commented on Council's purview concerning zoning cases.

Councilmember Kavanaugh stated support for moving forward with introduction of a proposed Ordinance incorporating five of the seven recommendations from the Planning and Zoning (P & Z) Board. He indicated opposition to recommendations 4 (consider the method of measurement to be from the building wall of the large retail store rather than from the property line of the development site) and 5 (delete the one-mile spacing between similar stores, thereby allowing them to "cluster" at arterial intersections).

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that by incorporating a delayed implementation provision into the draft Ordinance, as recommended by the P & Z Board, approved projects that are noncompliant with the new Ordinance would have a specific period of time to secure a building permit.

Councilmember Pomeroy voiced opposition to adopting an ordinance regulating big box retail. He stated concurrence with the P & Z Board that an ordinance is not needed in addition to the updated Design Guidelines.

Discussion ensued concerning the fact that the P & Z Board opposed the proposed big box retail regulations; the fact that the P & Z Board indicated that big box retail concerns would be

addressed through the updated Design Guidelines and General Plan designated land uses, and further regulations would be counterproductive to economic development in the City and sales tax revenue; the fact that although the P & Z Board opposed the proposed regulations, they made seven recommendations to improve the draft Ordinance in the event the Council elects to adopt the Ordinance; and the seven recommendations made by the P & Z Board.

Councilmember Whalen said that due to the fact that the voters in essence approved the Super WalMart at Greenfield and McKellips, his concerns relative to imposing a one-mile separation requirement between big box uses, and the City's current financial condition and reliance on sales tax revenue, he has reversed his position concerning this issue and is now opposed to an ordinance regulating big box retail. He added that he does support Council purview with respect to the location of big box uses.

Discussion ensued concerning parcels in the City that currently have appropriate zoning in place for future big box uses including a site at Signal Butte and Baseline, the northeast corner of Country Club and Baseline and the recently approved K-Mart at Stapley and Southern; and the zoning process safeguards and General Plan designated land use safeguards that apply to undeveloped parcels.

In response to questions from Councilmember Walters concerning the potential redevelopment of big box uses on sites that have existing appropriate zoning, particularly the Target at the intersection of Dobson and Main, Mr. Mizner commented on hypothetical situations and stated that if a developer proposed to redevelop a site and raze a structure with an existing site plan, it is likely that the developer would require an amended site plan, which would trigger the planning and zoning and Council review processes. He added that many old zoning cases did not include an approved site plan, which could result in redevelopment in absence of the planning and zoning and Council review processes.

Councilmember Walters stated that although she is generally opposed to adopting a big box ordinance, she has concerns regarding the potential for future development of big box retail uses without Council review and approval.

Discussion ensued concerning the purview of the Design Review Board and the fact that they accept the zoning and General Plan land use designations in place and do not deny a project based on the use of the project.

Councilmember Walters suggested that further consideration of this issue be continued to a future Study Session and that staff be instructed to compile a list of properties where the possibility exists for future development of a big box retail store outside the planning and zoning, Council and neighborhood review processes.

Mayor Hawker stated support for Councilmember Walters' suggestion.

Vice Mayor Davidson stated that although he supports Councilmember Walters' request for additional information, he is in favor of proceeding with the Ordinance. He voiced the opinion that appropriate development of big box retail stores involves more than the consideration of design issues and noted that traffic, neighborhood and economic issues should also be considered. He also voiced concerns regarding the potential for an excess of large vacant retail space in the City.

Councilmember Pomeroy clarified his position by explaining that he supports Council review of proposed big box retail on an individual case basis.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, Mr. Mizner explained that the Council Use Permit process would be guided by the criteria established in the Ordinance and he commented on the various proposed criteria and P & Z Board recommendations.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of incorporating an "end-of-life" provision in the draft Ordinance that would address remedies for unsightly big box stores.

Councilmember Jaffa voiced concerns regarding confusion that exists between the zoning and ordinance aspects of this issue. He also voiced concerns regarding traffic issues associated with big box retail uses and stated that if traffic issues can be addressed through updated Design Guidelines he would not support moving forward with the Ordinance. He also stated converse concerns relative to additional development restrictions that might suppress redevelopment of stagnant building uses.

Mayor Hawker directed staff to outline potential future sites of big box retail development/redevelopment that would not require Council review and reschedule this item on a Study Session agenda in approximately two weeks.

6. Hear an update on Mesa's participation in the Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail Transit Project.

City Manager Mike Hutchinson addressed the Council and provided an historical overview concerning this item and transit operations in the City. He commented on the steady growth of the Valley, the constantly increasing transportation demands and the varying opinions relative to preferred transportation methods. He reported that the City is a partner with Phoenix and Tempe in the initial minimum light rail operating system, which is a 20 mile system including the Mesa segment of 1.14 miles along Main Street from the City's western border to approximately Dobson Road.

He reported that staff will provide additional information to the Council within the next few months relative to the City's costs of the initial system, recommended financing and governance of the system. He added that Council will be asked at that time to consider making a firm commitment to participate in the initial system. He commented on the numerous, complicated governance issues that are being discussed between the three cities and noted that Scottsdale, Chandler and Glendale have expressed interest in participating in an extended system in the future. He discussed cost issues and noted that a federal match of the local participation is expected and he reported that staff is in the process of quantifying the City's projected share of costs. He stated the opinion that the Federal contribution is likely to occur but added that there is staff consensus that the project will not go forward if the Federal share is not awarded.

Mr. Hutchinson reported that the Federal Transit Authority is expected to review the project in the next few months and he stressed the importance of having a Council decision relative to proceeding forward at that time.

Mr. Hutchinson voiced the opinion that the initial light rail system will provide long-term redevelopment benefits to west Mesa in addition to providing transportation benefits to the City. He voiced appreciation to Assistant Development Services Manager Jeff Martin, Transit Administrator Jim Wright, and Wulf Grote and John Ferry of Valley Connections for their ongoing efforts with this project.

Mayor Hawker commented on the fact that although the project is ready to move forward to the final design phase, he voted in opposition to hiring the design engineer for the final design phase because he has not received formal council direction to proceed forward. He stressed the importance of ensuring that the Council is apprised of all available information concerning the project and the public has an opportunity to comment on the project prior to Council action. He urged staff to develop a progression timeline concerning this issue and also provide the Council with information relative to how the City's participation or non-participation in the project will impact other Valley communities.

(Mayor Hawker excused Councilmember Kavanaugh from the remainder of the meeting at approximately 9:55 a.m.)

Councilmember Jaffa stated concerns relative to the cost of the project and indicated that his support for the project is contingent on securing matching Federal funding. He commented on the importance of the public comment process and educating residents in east and central Mesa regarding the overall benefits this project would provide to the City and concurred with comments relative to the long-term redevelopment benefits this projects would provide to west Mesa.

City Attorney Debbie Spinner stated that Councilmember Kavanaugh requested that she advise the Council concerning research she conducted at his request relative to the Council's legal ability to voluntarily place an issue on the ballot for voter direction. She advised that her research concluded that the Council cannot voluntarily ask the voters to decide whether or not to proceed with a project.

Vice Mayor Davidson spoke in support of moving forward with the Light Rail Transit Project and voiced the opinion that the Federal participation in the project to date adds validity to the project. He urged staff to provide the Council with updated information concerning the project as soon as possible.

In response to questions from Councilmember Whalen relative to the planned alignment of the project along Main Street to the East Valley Institute of Technology (EVIT), Wulf Grote, Valley Connections Project Manager, advised that the Environmental Impact Statement is based on the alignment through the center of Main Street to the EVIT, including a station located in the center of Main Street at EVIT. He noted that maintaining the project timeline is reliant upon this alignment and that other routes were considered in the early stages of the project. He added that a park-and-ride facility is also planned at the EVIT.

Councilmember Walters urged staff to provide the Council with frequent updates concerning this issue.

7. Hear an update and consider issues associated with the proposed site for the Multipurpose Facility.

a. Financing Issues.

Mr. Hutchinson provided a status overview of this issue and commented on recent meetings with the Tourism and Sports Authority (TSA) concerning options to bridge the City's funding gap. He reported that the City team would make recommendations to the TSA the following day concerning this issue and staff anticipates providing the Council with final recommendations concerning funding within a week. He noted that with Council approval to proceed, the next step would be to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mayor Hawker directed staff to provide the Council with a status update at the April 15, 2002 Study Session.

Councilmember Whalen commended staff for their efforts concerning funding issues and also spoke in support of the TSA's recent efforts to assist the City.

b. Neighborhood Involvement Plan.

Mr. Hutchinson reported that Neighborhood Services was asked to develop a strategy concerning outreach to impacted residents and referred to a handout provided to the Councilmembers outlining staff's proposed neighborhood involvement process.

Neighborhood Outreach Director Tanya Collins and Neighborhood Outreach Coordinator Debbie Driscoll addressed the Council concerning this agenda item. Ms. Collins discussed the approach planned by staff, including: 1) utilize both internal City partners and external community partners to assist in providing residents with accurate information about the Mesa Multi-purpose Facility plan; 2) create a Steering Committee consisting of at least one resident representative from each of the affected neighborhoods; 3) schedule ongoing neighborhood meetings in accordance with the Steering Committee's direction; 4) continue to have dialogue with neighborhoods until action plans have been created for each area that desires a plan; 5) take action plans to City management and Council for review and consideration; and 6) continue working with the Steering Committee through the design, construction, facility startup and initial operation phases, taking neighbors' concerns into account throughout the process. Ms. Collins stated that the Mesa Grande Community Alliance has agreed to assist staff in this process.

In response to questions from Councilmember Pomeroy concerning when the process would begin, Ms. Collins advised that because of the fluid nature of developments concerning this issue, staff recommends that the process begin when the City is certain that the facility will be constructed in Mesa.

Councilmember Walters stated support for staff's strategy to work with neighborhoods and stressed the importance of providing accurate information to residents.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker relative to accurately projecting the funds needed to provide neighborhood mitigation measures, Mr. Hutchinson advised that staff has endeavored to maintain a flexibility margin in connection with project cost estimates, which would provide the means for neighborhood mitigation.

8. Acknowledge receipt of minutes of boards and committees.

- a. Economic Development Advisory Board meeting held March 5, 2002.
- b. Fire Committee meeting held March 28, 2002
- c. Transportation Committee meeting held March 13, 2002.

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

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

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

Councilmember Whalen discussed the Council's recent visit to the State Legislature, which included himself, Mayor Hawker, Vice Mayor Davidson and Councilmembers Kavanaugh and Walters, and reported that meetings with Mesa's legislators were productive, particularly with respect to communicating the City's concerns regarding the State budget.

10. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Monday, April 15, 2002, TBA – Study Session

Monday, April 15, 2002, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Wednesday, April 17, 2002 – Joint Dinner Meeting with Tempe City Council

Thursday, April 18, 2002, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, April 18, 2002 – Transportation Committee Meeting immediately following Study Session

Thursday, April 25, 2002 – Study Session CANCELLED

Mr. Hutchinson reported on the status of a Mesa police officer who was injured in a motorcycle accident the previous night.

11. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

12. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

(Although John Simmons, Becky Finger and Lori Place submitted requests to speak at the beginning of the meeting, none were present at this time.)

13. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 10:30 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 11th day of April 2002. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pjt