

# COUNCIL MINUTES

October 6, 2005

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 October 6, 2005 at 7:30 a.m.

**COUNCIL PRESENT**

Mayor Keno Hawker  
Rex Griswold  
Kyle Jones  
Tom Rawles  
Janie Thom  
Claudia Walters  
Mike Whalen

**COUNCIL ABSENT**

None

**OFFICERS PRESENT**

Mike Hutchinson  
Debbie Spinner  
Barbara Jones

Mayor Hawker excused Councilmember Whalen from the beginning of the meeting. He arrived at 7:35 a.m. Mayor Hawker also excused Councilmember Thom from the remainder of the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

1. Review items on the agenda for the October 10, 2005 Regular Council meeting.

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

Conflicts of interest declared: 5g and h (Hawker)

Items added to the consent agenda: None

Items removed from the consent agenda: 10a

2. Hear a presentation, discuss and provide direction with regard to the proposed Photo Safety Program:

City Manager Mike Hutchinson advised that, subject to Council approval, staff would like to place this item on the October 10<sup>th</sup> Council agenda.

Police Chief Dennis Donna advised that the City of Mesa's Photo Safety Program has been in effect for a number of years, and that the recent Request for Proposals (RFP) addressed recommendations and concerns expressed by the Council and the Police Committee. He stated that the program has successfully increased safety at many intersections.

a. Design of proposed system.

Lieutenant Ben Kulina stated that the City's contract with Affiliated Computer Services (ACS) expires at the end of October 2005, and that ACS will provide service during the transition period. He advised that in August 2004, the Police Committee requested that staff initiate an RFP process for a five-year contract that expanded the number of intersections from 17 to 30, implemented "speed on green" on up to five locations, included four photo radar safety vans, and utilized a "flat fee" instead of the current "per citation" pricing structure. Lieutenant Kulina reported that the evaluation team, comprised of Police, Transportation Studies and Purchasing Division employees, reviewed and scored four responses to the RFP. He reported that an August 2005 proposal to the Police Committee that the contract be awarded to American Traffic Solutions (ATS) resulted in the Police Committee's recommendation that the proposal move forward to the full Council.

Lieutenant Kulina advised that the contract includes the following:

- An estimated build out time of 180 days instead of the anticipated two years.
- Violators identified with the new technology would receive citations within one week compared to 30 days under the existing contract.
- Vans could be located on residential streets rather than on main streets.
- Cameras inside the van are removable and could be placed on tripods for selective enforcements.
- The new digital image technology should increase the number of citations issued (presently only 35 percent of the violations captured result in citations because of the film quality).

Materials Management Director Ed Quedens stated that during the process two protests and one appeal were received, and after further review, staff determined that the information provided by ATS was accurate. He advised that the protests and the appeal were denied.

Lieutenant Kulina stated that Mesa's photo safety enforcement program has been in existence since 1996, and that a ten-year study determined that traffic volume east of Gilbert Road has increased by 79 percent, which indicates a need for increased coverage in East Mesa. He reported that monitored intersections had a 15 percent decrease in total collisions and a 30 percent decrease in injury collisions, while non-monitored intersections had a five percent reduction in total collisions. He advised that although Mesa had a high number of fatal collisions this year, no deaths occurred at photo safety equipped intersections. Lieutenant Kulina added that "speed on green" is included as part of the program in order to address the fact that 43 percent of Mesa's collisions in the past five years involved speeding.

Mr. Quedens referred to Attachments A and B (see Attachments) and advised that the recommended program's revenue projections exceeds expenses. He noted that staff considers the revenue projection to be conservative, and he explained that the "flat fee" pricing enables staff to better estimate expenses.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that a computer chip enables the "speed on green" feature to detect a vehicle traveling in excess of 11 miles per hour over the speed limit; that a "red light" and a "speed on green" violation would trigger only the "red light" violation; that staff believes selective enforcement of "speed on green" will modify driver behavior; that technology is able to generate a number of violations equal to that of nine officers working 24 hours a day

at a specific intersection; and that the technology frees police officers to address other issues such as drunk driving and seatbelt violations.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Walters, Chief Donna advised that the City has no statistical data on accidents related to cell phone usage. He explained that the issue is one that should be addressed by the State.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that manpower and maintenance costs were factored into the alternatives listed on Attachment B; that a reduction in the number of vans would reduce the revenues; and that non-sworn, City employees who are trained to testify in court would staff the vans.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Griswold, Lieutenant Kulina confirmed that the City does not pursue out-of-state photo safety violators unless a local address can be obtained.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that staff will provide information relative to the amount of revenue generated by requiring violators to attend driver safety classes in addition to paying the fine; that the City is following the national recommendation to adopt a "flat fee" schedule; that an earlier public perception that the Photo Safety Program was implemented in order to increase revenues was incorrect; that State law requires "red light" violators to pay a fine and attend driver safety classes; and that several states require that the registered owner be held responsible when the driver cannot be identified.

b. Recommend awarding the contract to American Traffic Solutions.

It was moved by Councilmember Rawles, seconded by Mayor Hawker, that the contract award for the full Photo Safety Program, as recommended by the Police Committee and proposed by staff, be placed on the Council agenda for consideration.

Councilmember Griswold recommended that staff negotiate a "no cost to the City" guarantee.

Mayor Hawker advised that he opposed Councilmember Griswold's recommendation, and he expressed support for the "flat fee" concept.

Mayor Hawker called for the vote.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Rawles-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS – None  
ABSENT – Thom

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

Mayor Hawker thanked staff for the presentation.

3. Appointments to boards and committees.

Mayor Hawker recommended the following appointment to Boards and Committees:

PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD:

David Martinez                      Expiration of Term:    June 30, 2007

It was moved by Vice Mayor Walters, seconded by Councilmember Jones, that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendation and the appointment be confirmed.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES –            Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Rawles-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS –            None  
ABSENT –        Thom

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

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

- a.      General Development Committee meetings held June 23, 2005 and September 19, 2005.
- b.      Parks and Recreation Board meeting held on September 22, 2005.

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

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES –            Hawker-Griswold-Jones-Rawles-Walters-Whalen  
NAYS –            None  
ABSENT –        Thom

Mayor Hawker declared the motion carried unanimously by those present.

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

Councilmember Jones:            East Valley Family Self-Sufficiency Graduation Ceremony.

6. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

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

Monday, October 10, 2005, 3:00 p.m. – Fire Committee

Monday, October 10, 2005, TBA – Study Session

Monday, October 10, 2005, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, October 13, 2005, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session – Cancelled

Thursday, October 20, 2005, TBA – Study Session

Thursday, October 20, 2005, 8:30 a.m. – Transportation Committee

Monday, October 24, 2005, TBA – Study Session

Monday, October 24, 2005, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

Thursday, October 27, 2005, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

7. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

8. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

9. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 8:35 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 6th day of October 2005. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

baa

Attachments: A & B

**Photo Safety Cost Comparison**

	Current Contract Affiliated Computer Systems (ACS) Pricing <small>(Based on 2004 Actuals)</small>	Current Locations Using New American Traffic Solutions (ATS) Pricing	Proposed Contract 30 Intersections 1- 5 Speed on Green 4 Radar Vans
<b><u>Red Light</u></b>			
Vendor Payments	\$ 577,297.00 *	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 1,384,620.00
<b><u>Speed on Green</u></b>			
Vendor Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$93,000.00
<b><u>Radar Vans</u></b>			
Vendor Payments	\$ 563,606.00 *	\$ 312,000.00	\$312,000.00
<b><u>General Safety Program</u></b>			
Police Personnel Costs	\$ 371,085.00	\$ 371,085.00	\$429,085.00
Process Server Costs	\$ 88,950.00	\$ 88,950.00	\$157,948.00
Court Personnel Costs	\$ 239,359.00	\$ 239,359.00	\$339,359.00
<b>Total Expenses</b>	\$ 1,840,297.00	\$1,611,394.00	\$2,716,012.00
<b>Projected Revenue</b>	\$ 1,602,203.00	\$ 1,602,203.00	\$2,845,022.00
Difference (Annual)	\$ (238,094.00)	\$ (9,191.00)	\$ 129,010.00
Difference (Monthly)	\$ (19 841.17)	\$ (765.92)	\$ 10,750.83

\* ACS vendor payments are actuals based on a per citation fee for red light and radar van violations.  
 Future contract is a flat fee.

### Photo Safety Cost Analysis Options

	30 Intersections Speed on Green 4 Vans <b>Full Program</b>	30 Intersections 4 Vans <b>DROP SPEED</b>	30 Intersections Speed on Green <b>DROP VANS</b>	30 Intersections <b>DROP SPEED</b> <b>DROP VANS</b>	20 Intersections Speed on Green 4 Vans <b>Break-Even Point</b>	20 Intersections <b>DROP SPEED</b> <b>DROP VANS</b>
<b>Red Light</b>						
Vendor Payments	\$ 1,384,620.00	\$ 1,384,620.00	\$ 1,384,620.00	\$ 1,384,620.00	\$ 923,080.00	\$ 923,080.00
<b>Speed on Green</b>						
Vendor Payments	\$ 93,000.00		\$ 93,000.00		\$ 93,000.00	
<b>Radar Vans</b>						
Vendor Payments	\$ 312,000.00	\$ 312,000.00			\$ 312,000.00	
<b>General Safety Program</b>						
Police Personnel Costs	\$ 429,085.00	\$ 429,085.00	\$ 183,000.00	\$ 183,000.00	\$ 429,085.00	\$ 183,000.00
Process Server Costs	\$ 157,947.00	\$ 147,808.00	\$ 114,007.00	\$ 103,867.00	\$ 123,326.00	\$ 69,245.00
Court Personnel Costs	\$ 339,359.00	\$ 339,359.00	\$ 339,359.00	\$ 339,359.00	\$ 339,359.00	\$ 339,359.00
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 2,716,011.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,612,872.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,113,986.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,010,846.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,219,850.00</b>	<b>\$ 1,514,684.00</b>
<b>Projected Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 2,845,021.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,662,379.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,053,541.00</b>	<b>\$ 1,870,898.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,221,389.00</b>	<b>\$1,247,266.00</b>
Difference (Annual)	\$ 129,010.00	\$ 49,507.00	\$ (60,445.00)	\$ (139,948.00)	\$ 1,539.00	\$ (267,418.00)
Difference (Monthly)	\$ 10,750.83	\$ 4,125.58	\$ (5,037.08)	\$ (11,662.33)	\$ 128.25	\$ (22,284.83)

8/15/05

**Attachment B**