

**CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING**

DATE: February 19, 2004 **TIME:** 7:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Art Jordan, Chair
Chuck Riekema, Vice-Chair
Christine Close
Wayne Pomeroy
Mark Reeb
Terry Smith

STAFF PRESENT

Katrina Bradshaw
Greg Marek
Amy Morales
Patrick Murphy

MEMBERS ABSENT

Theresa Carmichael
Jeff Jarvis
Marshall Poe

1. Call to Order

The February 19, 2004 meeting of the Downtown Development Committee was called to order at 7:35 a.m. in the City Council Chambers located at 57 E. First Street by Chair Jordan.

2. Items from Citizens Present

There were no items from citizens present.

3. Approval of Minutes of the January 15, 2004 meeting

It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Terry Smith, to approve the minutes.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

4. Discuss and consider Design Review Case No. DR03-008TC for the C. M. Berge building located at 166 W. Main Street (a.k.a. Paul Sale Building).

Applicant: Bob Saemisch, Architect
Staff Contact: Shelly Allen, Sr. Redevelopment Specialist, (480) 644-2773

Mr. Marek explained that Shelly Allen (staff contact) was not available and that he would be giving the presentation. The CM Berge Building is formerly known as the Paul L. Sale Building. Mr. Marek stated that Bob Saemisch is the architect for the building and that he will be discussing the design plans for the building.

Mr. Marek stated that staff does support the proposed design changes and displayed an overhead of the proposed design of the building, explaining that the existing Lehi Brick will be replaced with Clay Face Red Brick. Mr. Marek stated that one of the stipulations of approval is that prior to the issuance of a building permit that the applicant applies for a Comprehensive Sign Plan to be approved by the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) and the Zoning Administrator. The building will consist of storage in the basement and retail on the ground floor and offices on the second floor. Mr. Marek is expecting to have multi-tenant type issues, adding that the City of Mesa's Sign Ordinance does allow for multi-tenant signage that does require the approval of a Comprehensive Sign plan. Due to the quality of this project, the signage for this project, is an intricate part of the building's design and that is the reasoning behind the need for a Comprehensive Sign plan.

Mr. Saemisch of Saemisch DiBella Architects, who is the architect for this project, stated that this building has a large amount of history associated with it and that the intention of this project is to convert the building into a viable project while reflecting a historical content as well. Mr. Saemisch added that this project is not a restoration project, adding that the intentions of the design of the building are only to slightly echo the past, not to be an imprint of the past. In order to stabilize the building, openings have been filled in and reopened, as well as creating new openings.

Mr. Saemisch stated that the stabilization of the existing Lehi brick is sensitive and challenging. The brick easily crumbles and the mortar has now turned into sand, especially when working on a two-story structure with a basement. A veneer brick is being used that is one-half-inch thick that is being installed one piece at a time, not in sheets. The brick will have mortar in-between each joint so that it will appear as a full brick course, including the corners. It will be a fully turned brick. Mr. Saemisch stated that the balcony effect that is being done is an attempt to serve as a shade structure, not as a balcony, as well as an element that signage could be placed on. He added that this idea was obtained from reviewing old photographs. The basement is intended for other than storage uses. If an appropriate tenant can be found for that area, they will attempt to have them occupy a portion of the basement. Mr. Saemisch stated that a furniture lift will be installed in the basement, as a portion of the basement will be used for furniture & antique storage. He noted that a sewer ejector system is also being installed to allow for complete restrooms in the basement.

Mr. Reeb asked for details on the building's cornice and on the building's height and construction.

Mr. Saemisch stated that the height of the building is exactly the same as the height of the parapet of the original building. The same building height has been maintained around the sides of the building to hide the mechanical equipment that is located on the roof. The structure of the building is frame, foam and EFIS material that will overhang approximately eighteen inches over the face of the building.

Mr. Reeb questioned what the color of the mortar joints were on the brick application.

Mr. Saemisch stated that the color was grey, which is a typical mortar that is used.

Mr. Reeb stated if the color was reflective of the rendering submitted, adding that the rendering appeared to be lighter in color.

Mr. Saemisch responded that the same photograph was used attempting to achieve the same amount of lighting in the rendering, but he was unsure if the mortar in the submitted rendering appeared to be white or grey. Mr. Saemisch stated that he has designed other buildings in the area that used grey mortar, which were the Brown & Brown parking garage, and the Killians Office Building. Mr. Saemisch stated that the lintels are going to be the same color as the cornice, the wainscot that wraps around the column base, and the lintels above the beams. He added that the colors would not be that noticeable.

Mr. Pomeroy inquired how soon the construction would begin after all of the approvals are received?

Mr. Saemisch responded that they are very anxious to move forward and hope to have the working drawings finalized and submitted to the City by the second week in March.

Chair Jordan stated that there have been different occasions in the last five years where some people have tried to make a point by stating that the DDC is not developer friendly and that they do not usher these types of projects through the Development Services process as quickly as other municipalities. He then asked Mr. Saemisch to comment on how that process has been going for him.

Mr. Saemisch stated that he has seen an improvement in the process, adding that because his business does know the process that the City uses, they take the opportunity to go down and speak with the building officials prior to starting the working drawings to make sure that they do not have any hiccups on any basic issues, which is a key part of the process. He stated that the openness and willingness of the Building Safety Department to work with the applicant has always been there, only there seems to be a lot more dedication shown now to have the applications reviewed up front, instead of towards the completion of the project and trying to prevent problems from occurring instead of trying to solve them after they have already been established.

Mr. Saemisch stated that he is very appreciative of the new attitude and that he personally does not believe that the Rehabilitation Code is going to be that much help to the downtown area. As Mr. Saemisch is a member of the Mesa Town Center Board, they are constantly reviewing that process, and to date, they are not aware of anyone using the Rehabilitation Code. Adding that the Mesa Town Center Board has been in close contact with the Fire Department, as they believe that there are major issues with the fire sprinkler requirements, occupancy uses, basements, second floors, residential re-uses, etc. Mr. Saemisch stated that the Mesa Town Center Board feels that it is very important to be informed of what the policies are and how to achieve the uses that are being proposed for the downtown in the future. He also pointed out that this effort would assist the elimination of vacant upstairs and downstairs portions of existing buildings. Overall, Mr. Saemisch noted he appreciates the ability to work on an issue all the way out and be able to convert the issue into a solution.

Chair Jordan stated that when some of the different interests (Divisions) specifically the Fire Department participate in the plan review process, sometimes they do not feel that they need to stay parallel with the Building Safety Review during the process. He stated because of that lack of coordination in the review of drawings, sometimes the end result is stipulations that are placed on the drawings after they have already been completed. Chair Jordan feels that it is very important that the Fire Department reviewers should review the life safety issues during the preliminary review and be responsible to abide by their preliminary review comments at the end of the process. He stated by doing this the applicant/architect can expect the recommendations not to change at some point during the review process.

Mr. Saemisch agreed that there are key individuals in all areas, adding that he has recognized Hal Key for his efforts and knowledge of being able to solve problems with the Design Community as a member of the Fire Department.

It was moved by Mark Reeb, seconded by Wayne Pomeroy, to approve Design Review Case No. DR03-008TC, along with the following stipulations:

- 1. Full compliance with approved plans and all current Code requirements, unless modified through the appropriate review and stipulations outlined below.**
- 2. Compliance with the basic development as shown on the site plan and elevations dated December 12, 2003.**
- 3. The lighting plan shall be developed according to the City's Outdoor Lighting and Control Ordinance (Night Sky Ordinance), and shall ensure that light does not spill over into the adjacent properties.**
- 4. Mirrored window glazing and glass reflective in quality shall not be used on the buildings.**
- 5. Approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan by the DDC prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 6. Obtain an Encroachment Permit from the Development Services Department prior to constructing the proposed steel canopy.**
- 7. Obtain necessary Right-of-Way permits from the Development Services Department prior to performing any work located within the Right-of-Way.**

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed

Mr. Reeb also encouraged the applicant to look at the colors proposed for the mortar strip joints. Mr. Reeb reiterated the applicant's own comment of design being a reflection of the past, adding that a lighter shade of grey would serve better as a reflection of the past than the chosen color Portland Grey.

Chair Jordan commented that the building would be beautiful with no signage, noting that any request for signage would be reviewed in great detail as part of a Comprehensive Sign Plan for that reason.

- 5. Discuss the submittals to the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Site 17 and consider a Request For Proposals (approximately 25-acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Mesa Drive and University Drive).**

Staff Contact: Patrick Murphy, Sr. Redevelopment Specialist, (480) 644-3964

Mr. Murphy stated that item of discussion was the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Redevelopment Site 17 (Site 17) which is approximately a 25-acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Mesa Drive and University Drive. Mr. Murphy stated that on July 14, 2003 the City Council directed staff to issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Staff did so and received three submittals to the RFQ for Site 17, two of which were comprised of several development partnerships. Mr. Murphy stated that a team comprised of Ernie Bleinberger of Hunter Interests, Inc. and the Redevelopment Division staff reviewed these submittals. Based on the experience indicated in the developers' responses to the RFQ, this team believes that there are qualified developers interested in this redevelopment site. Mr. Murphy stated that since the issuance of the RFQ, numerous developers (approximately 20) have contacted staff expressing their interest in receiving an RFP. Mr. Murphy stated that a list of the interested developers was included in the DDC packets.

Mr. Murphy stated that a draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was included in the staff report for the DDC to consider recommending to the City Council to have the RFP issued. The format of the RFP is similar to the document that was issued for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), the main differences are: more detailed information is being requested as to what the developer proposes to do at the site, as well as the developer's financial capability to complete the project and information on how much the developer plans to pay for the land.

Mr. Murphy stated that in the Northeast Quadrant Analysis prepared by Hunter Interests, one of the recommendations was that the developers contact Mesa Community College (MCC) in order to explore mutually beneficial development opportunities with their team. A contact name for MCC has been included with the RFP, so that developers will be able to speak to the College, to help ensure whatever is planned for those 25 acres will coincide with MCC's plans for the future. Mr. Murphy stated once the City Council directs staff to issue the RFP, it will be advertised in the newspaper, Mesa's Channel 11, the Redevelopment Website, and the site will be posted. Mr. Murphy added that if it were possible, the RFP would be included in the listing with the International Economic Development Council. A copy of the RFP will be sent to all submitters of the RFQ, as well as all of the developers who have expressed an interest in the past months.

Mr. Murphy stated upon receipt of the RFP submittals, the staff review team would review them; the review team will include a representative from Hunter Interests. The submittals will then be presented to the DDC for a recommendation to the General Development Committee and then onto the City Council. Mr. Murphy stated, as noted in the staff report, just because an RFP is issued, it does not mean that the City Council has to select a developer. Although the goal is to have a developer selected, the City Council is in no way bound to selecting a developer. Mr. Murphy stated that both staff and Hunter Interests recommend proceeding with the RFP.

Mr. Reeb inquired as to whether Exhibit #2, the List of the Interested Developers, was the list of developers that was previously mentioned by Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy confirmed that the List was of the interested developers.

Mr. Pomeroy inquired what was the exact recommendation from staff.

Mr. Murphy responded that staff's recommendation was that the DDC forward a recommendation to the City Council to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Redevelopment Site 17.

Mr. Riekema inquired what staff is looking for in a developer, i.e., Master Developer for the whole 25-acres or Multiple Developers to develop portions of the 25 acres.

Mr. Murphy responded that staff is looking for a Master Developer to develop the entire 25-acre site, so that it does not look like a piece-meal approach when the project is completed. Mr. Murphy stated that one of the unique things about this site is that it is 25-acres of vacant land in an urban area and that is why staff feels that a Master Developer needs to be chosen for this site to ensure that the project meets the goals of what the citizens approved when they approved the Concept Plan which is a part of the General Plan. Mr. Murphy stated having the Concept Plan in mind, Hunter Interests came up with a mixed-use development concept for Site 17. The mixed-use concept development includes: retail and commercial along University and Mesa Drive, residential on the interior, and live work units along the portion between Hibbert and Pasadena. Mr. Murphy added that the Northeast Quadrant analysis suggested that the proposed live work area could be an area that the Mesa Community College may be interested in. Mr. Murphy stated that staff is looking for a Master Developer for the site to develop a mixed-use, although this proposed development is not set in stone. If a Master Developer happens to come up with a better idea, that idea will be examined as well.

Mr. Marek stated that part of the search for the Master Developer might include a proposal to develop the project in phases. Mr. Marek explained that when Hunter Interests began developing the mixed-use project proposal, they developed the proposal from a developer's perspective, and from that perspective the City does not have to offer incentives to the developer and that the developer should be willing to pay for the land.

Mr. Riekema stated his concern that the City may become overly anxious to develop this site, using the empty box buildings located in the Fiesta Crossings Strip Mall as an example. Mr. Riekema inquired as to whether it would be possible to develop a mixed-use area that would include offices, retail and recreation or if the City would rather place homes on that site.

Mr. Marek responded that the mixed-use suggested in the Hunter Report promotes the new urbanism type of design that includes some retail and some

offices; staff's intentions are not to build 8-story office buildings fronting on University Drive. Mr. Marek added that the downtown square mile currently has 3,000 residents; in order for a City the size of Mesa to have a vibrant downtown there should be about 15,000 residents in the downtown. Mr. Marek stated that downtown Mesa may never reach 15,000 residents but the new urbanism assist in bringing residential to the downtown. By moving forward with the RFP, the City will have the opportunity to review what the developers are proposing to develop and why they feel one project would work better in this area than another.

Chair Jordan stated that this whole process is a matter of timing and showing a continuity of effort. Chair Jordan believes that staff is on the right track by working to release a RFP, though he feels that this action is premature. Chair Jordan feels that it would be very important for staff to wait until approximately June 2004 in order to receive a Definitive Action Plan on some of the other items included in the Hunter Interests Report from the City Council. Chair Jordan stated that these decisions would be very important to the type of developer that staff would like to attract for the project.

Chair Jordan stated that decisions should be made on the Centennial Center, the Aquatics Center and when the revenues for operating will be available. Chair Jordan stated that the economy seems to have turned enough, that the City's financial people should have seen a turn in the revenues and that their can be a trend delivered. Chair Jordan stated that it is time for the City to take a position and follow through on construction of the Aquatics Center, as it has been on the table for approximately 6-years. Chair Jordan stated that Hunter Interests Report is extremely clear on the Centennial Center, that no action is not an option. Chair Jordan stated that a decision needs to be made as to which action the City wants to pursue, adding that the developers should be able to rely upon the actions that are chosen to pursue. Chair Jordan stated that he sat on the Mesa Community College Downtown Task Force, and he has not received any updates in over 6-months, as this issue is now a bond issue, he believes that this is very important to bring this component into the issue and evaluate how much synergy will be received from that issue.

Chair Jordan stated that RFPs will bring interest. Some developers will have misguided feelings as to how much the City is willing to contribute, and that is why that information needs to be put on the table now. That way the developer is not counting on negotiating with the City to receive more out of the deal than he/she is ultimately is going to get. Chair Jordan stated that the land would attract its ultimate use by knowledge and developers knowing what is available. Chair Jordan stated that he is in favor of the RFP, but he is also in favor of delaying it until after the election.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that he has a different point of view on the RFP. Mr. Pomeroy stated that once the RFP is issued, it takes so long to go through all of the City processes and to work with the interested developers. Mr. Pomeroy does not agree with delaying this project any longer. He suggested that the

RFP be issued and while processing the RFP, the areas of concern that have been brought up can be addressed at the same time.

Mr. Reeb stated that he was also in support of delaying the RFP; he believes that housing is important and is part of a vibrant downtown setting. However, downtowns are generically destination orientated; Mesa has a good start with the Arts and Entertainment Center. Mr. Reeb stated that there are things on the drawing board such as the Aquatics Center and decisions to be made for the Amphitheatre. Mr. Reeb stated if definition were to be added to the items on the drawing board, and if those were 'green lights' to go ahead with those projects, that would create more synergy. When you create more synergy, you create more interest; when you have more interest, it creates more value; and when you have more value ultimately you end up with a better product. Mr. Reeb stated that the residential demand is there; the question is are the other uses that go along with a mixed-use there? Mr. Reeb brought up an example of a mixed-use project located at Higley and the freeway that was built, which has been sitting stagnant. When those uses are ready there will be more value for the residential component of that project. Mr. Reeb does not feel that the City is quite there yet. Mr. Reeb added that there is not much probability in the near future that the City of Mesa will end up with a block of 25-acres in downtown Mesa, they are not going to continue with any condemnation efforts for a Redevelopment project. Mr. Reeb advised that the timing needs to be examined and that the City needs to be very specific about the direction that they are headed. At this point Mr. Reeb feels that the RFP is premature.

Ms. Smith concurred with Chair Jordan and Mr. Reeb that the RFP is premature. Ms. Smith does not believe that the residential interest in this project is going to fade. Ms. Smith suggested that the City be more cautious and wait a little longer. She is interested in seeing a developer put in an interesting mixed-use at this 25-acre site in conjunction with the residential. Ms. Smith stated that the disposition of the City Council is critical in this area, particularly in what their attitudes are on various projects that are on the drawing boards and are in motion. Ms. Smith stated that this 25-acre site has been vacant for quite a long time and a couple more months would gain the Committee information and knowledge. Ms. Smith stated that she would like to see staff wait on issuing the RFP.

Mr. Marek stated that when the decision is being made to delay the issuance of the RFP, the DDC needs to be precise on how long they would like to have this project delayed. Mr. Marek state that some of the projects that are waiting for the Council to make decisions, such as the Centennial Center, can take many, many months.

Ms. Close suggested that the submission due date be extended to the end of summer to allow the RFP's to be issued and extend only the time allowed for the submission. Ms. Close added that she is a resident of this area and would like to see something happen there. When there is talk of delaying this project, that concerns her. Ms. Close stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Pomeroy to go ahead and issue the RFP and only change the submission due date to allow for any transition with the Council or decisions that may occur. Ms. Close stated that she would like to see this project move forward.

Chair Jordan inquired that when the Hunter Interests Report was presented to the City Council and did it illicit any definitive action so far by Council.

Mr. Marek replied that Council stated that they were pleased with the report and accepted the report and the recommendations received from Hunter. Mr. Marek stated that the Council did not specifically discuss Site 17, or specific details of recommendations received from Hunter. Mr. Marek stated that Ernie Bleinberger of Hunter Interests gave a presentation to the Council and in that presentation he went through the recommendations such as having the Aquatics Center located in its original location, to move forward with Site 17 and that the developers take into consideration working with Mesa Community College, and to make a decision on the Centennial Center. Mr. Marek stated because of the fact that the Council has accepted Hunter's report and recommendations, it has been inferred that Hunter's recommendations have been accepted. Mr. Marek stated that the only way to be sure that they have been accepted would be to take the recommendations, with discussion and comments that are received from the DDC, to the General Development Committee and then on to the City Council.

Chair Jordan inquired what the next step would be if the DDC did not give a recommendation to support the issuance of the RFP, but rather postponed the issuance. Would the item still move on and be presented to the General Development Committee?

Mr. Marek stated that yes, whatever the recommendation is, the item would be forwarded to next available General Development Committee.

Mr. Riekema stated that his concern is that the direction of the Convention Center is still undetermined and he believes that will have a large impact on Mesa. Mr. Riekema would like to be able to have clear answers to the unknown issues before moving forward with the RFP, as these issues will have a huge impact on this site.

Chair Jordan stated that the location of the Aquatics Center is constantly being discussed and he would like to see the Council make the final decision and determine where the facility would be constructed.

Ms. Chris Miller, resident and representative of the Wilbur Historic District stated that she has been very excited about many of the things that are coming to pass and really enjoys living in downtown Mesa. Ms. Miller stated that Site

17 is adjacent to her neighborhood. She really appreciates all of the sensitivity and amounts of discussion that the DDC has given to this issue. Ms. Miller stated that the Wilbur Neighborhood has participated multiple times in discussions concerning Site 17, adding that the residents and property owners in this historic district want to make sure that this neighborhood is integrated into the overall concept of the downtown. The existing and new residential components are key components to the Downtown Development Plan. Ms. Miller stated that they look forward to working with the City and with any developer that is selected to work on this project. Ms. Miller agrees that they are very excited about the concept in the Hunter Report and the possibility of Mesa Community College being integrated into the overall fabric of the downtown, adding that they really appreciate the thoughtfulness and are excited to see this project move forward thoughtfully.

It was moved by Wayne Pomeroy, seconded by Mark Reeb, to continue this agenda item until the March 18, 2004 Downtown Development Committee meeting.

Mr. Riekema's proposed an amendment to continue this agenda item until the March 18, 2004 Downtown Development Committee meeting and to add some substance to the RFP and encourage the Council to make a decision regarding the Convention Center and provide absolute written guidance as to the Aquatics Center so that certainty and assurance can be provided to the developers and to the citizens of this community and to the residents in the Wilbur Historic District. Wayne Pomeroy and Mark Reeb accepted the amendment to the original motion.

Vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed of the motion as amended.

Chair Jordan requested that a DDC Study Session be scheduled prior to March 18th, so that a draft agreement can be produced to support the recommendations included in the amendment.

Chair Jordan then excused himself from the meeting and stated that Mr. Riekema would be taking the meeting over.

Mr. Riekema polled the members and March 4th was selected as the date for the Study Session.

6. Report From Mesa Town Center, Tom Verploegen – Executive Director

Infill Development Policy - MTCC Board has become more involved with infill projects, mostly located in west Mesa they feel that it is very important to be involved with projects located within 1,2, and 3 miles of the downtown.

Broadway Corridor - Meetings have been held with Chicanos Por La Causa, as well as with Dick Mulligan from the Economic Development Office. The Broadway Corridor is the southern 3rd of the Town Center Area that has a high influence on the downtown.

7-day Work Schedule – There are more people visiting the downtown on Sundays; it has helped tremendously to have the Downtown Ambassadors work on a 7-day work schedule.

Safe and Sound Program – There have been meetings with the City of Phoenix discussing their Safe and Sound Program. In the future as Mesa's night events expand, it is believed that additional Downtown Ambassadors will be needed.

Parking – There is now a parking monitor back on staff. As for parking arrangements, MTCC will be rearranging the City employee's parking spaces. Diagonal parking for 1st Avenue has been approved and diagonal parking is now being proposed for 1st Street.

Sculpture Exhibit – Sculptures have received almost 20-minutes on Channel 3 and advertising efforts have become more structured. The Sculpture Panel will be meeting in March, and Ultimate Imaginations is currently exploring some dates in 2006 to host a 1st class Sculpture Festival.

7. **Director's Report, Greg Marek**

Parking – Staff is working with MTCC to explore a parking management plan for the downtown that would also consider how primarily day time parking can be accommodated when the Aquatics Center opens and the Mesa Arts Center is also holding events. The first phase consists of a parking plan.

Southwest corner of Country Club and University Drive – The shopping center that DDC approved was a Design Review case that is now going through their final inspections; the building design has received many compliments.

Site 21 – Financing deadline for the developer is coming up and he has assured the Redevelopment Staff that he will be submitting a letter of credit. Lee & Associates has been hired as the leasing agent for the building. There is a level of interest that has been expressed in occupying the building.

Site 24 – Mesa TV & Appliance is starting to move dirt in their first phase. The bus pullout/shelter for Country Club Drive is scheduled to be constructed in April 2004.

Mera Bank Building – The building is located on Main Street just west of Center Street, which was the last remaining warehouse building on Main Street, is in the process of being sold.

Coffee Talk & The Robson Villas – The previous issues that were brought up by the Robson Villas when the Towers was being discussed ended up to be more of an issue with The Robson Villas and Coffee Talk then with the Towers. Those issues are currently being resolved.

Sheraton Hotel – Renovations are underway. Their goal is to have the renovations completed by the end of April. Some of the renovations include the ballroom and locating a Starbucks in the lobby.

Aquatics Center – The Tourism & Sports Authority has allocated \$500,000 dollars for the Aquatics Center. Mesa Community College has expressed an interest to be involved in participating with the City in the facility; currently, the College has no place to provide Aquatics Activities for their students.

Northeast Quadrant Analysis – The City is moving forward to try to develop an intergovernmental agreement between the City and Mesa Community College to further strengthen the relationship and how we will proceed.

Nuestro Neighborhood – The Neighborhood Outreach Division is working with the neighborhood that is located just south of Broadway Road to 8th Avenue and from Center Street to Country Club Drive. A small portion of this neighborhood is located in the Redevelopment Area; there is a keen interest as to what goes on in that area as it is adjacent to the Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Pomeroy inquired if the newly developed building on the southwest corner of Country Club and University Drive has tenants yet.

Mr. Marek responded that he believes that the building does have tenants, but is unsure as to who they are, adding that there will be an upcoming Design Review project for a shopping center located on the southeast corner of Country Club and University Drive.

9. Board Member Comments

None

10. Adjournment

With there being no further business, this meeting of the Downtown Development Committee adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Gregory J. Marek, Director of Redevelopment
Minutes prepared by Amy Morales