



## COUNCIL MINUTES

October 13, 2016

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 13, 2016 at 7:31 a.m.

### COUNCIL PRESENT

John Giles  
Alex Finter  
Christopher Glover  
Dennis Kavanaugh  
David Luna  
Dave Richins  
Kevin Thompson

### COUNCIL ABSENT

None

### OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady  
Jim Smith  
Dee Ann Mickelsen

Items on the agenda were discussed out of order, but for purposes of clarity will remain as listed on the agenda.

#### 1. Review items on the agenda for the October 17, 2016 Regular Council meeting.

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

Conflict of interest: None.

Items removed from the consent agenda: None.

Planning Director John Wesley reported on items 7-a and 7-b (**Adopting the Heritage Neighborhood Program and establishing the Washington-Escobedo Neighborhood as a Mesa Heritage Neighborhood**) on the Regular Council Meeting agenda, and he displayed mock signs created by the Transportation Department that will be used in the Heritage neighborhoods.

Transit Services Director Jodi Sorrell displayed a PowerPoint presentation related to the Regular Council Meeting agenda item 5.m. (**Ten-Year Term Contract for a Transit Stop and Transit Advertising Program**) She reported that the goal of the Transit Advertising Program is to find ways to add additional shelters and shade for bus riders. (**See Attachment 1**)

Ms. Sorrell illustrated the key elements between the two proposals. (See Page 4 of Attachment 1) She stated that Outfront Media proposed the addition of 50 kiosks, which are three-sided free-standing units to sit beside the City's existing shelters. She noted that Outfront Media's proposal

includes no furniture, whereas Creative Outdoor Advertising's proposal includes 300 benches with advertising. She pointed out that the main difference between vendors is the lifespan of the project and Creative Outdoor's products have a 10-year lifespan. She clarified that Outfront Media provides shelters and kiosks with a 20-year life span and they become city assets at the end of the term of the contract.

Ms. Sorrell provided examples of the furniture and products being recommended by both vendors. She explained that the shelters proposed by Outfront Media were sturdier than those we currently have and the advertising panels are larger and more consistent with those that currently exist around the valley. (See Pages 5 and 6 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Sorrell advised that the projected value of the contract is \$1.6 - 1.9 million over ten years, which includes projected revenue over the contract term and ten years of cleaning and maintenance. She provided an example of adding a shelter wrap in order to generate revenue and advertise special events, which is not included in the proposals. (See Pages 7 and 8 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Sorrell displayed detailed maps of the ad shelter and kiosk locations. (See Pages 9 and 10 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Sorrell reported that 33% of the bus stops in Mesa currently have shelters, which is 244 out of 750 total bus stops. She stated that the proposal adds 50 shelters and has the potential for build-out to approximately 400 shelters, which is 53% of all bus stops. She noted that the largest obstacle to adding more shelters is obtaining access to the right-of-way. (See Page 11 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Sorrell explained that it is staff's recommendation to approve the transit advertising contract with Outfront Media.

Vice Mayor Kavanaugh thanked Ms. Sorrell and staff. He stated that he served on the Metro Board and learned of the constant demand for Mesa transit users to have shade and believes this project has been in the works for approximately five years.

Councilmember Luna also thanked Ms. Sorrell for her presentation and inquired if any other communities are facing challenges with advertising standards.

Ms. Sorrell listed the advertising standards (See Page 14 of Attachment 1) and affirmed that they are consistent with those of the City of Phoenix and Valley Metro.

In response to a question from Councilmember Richins related to political advertising on shelters, City Attorney Jim Smith reported that the City of Phoenix has been sued twice for such challenges and won. He added that the City Code has also been modified to avoid these same types of issues.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Kavanaugh, Ms. Sorrell confirmed that the contract does include a provision that allows 10% of advertising space to be provided to the City of Mesa in order to promote City events.

Mayor Giles received clarification from Ms. Sorrell regarding the exact number of shelters, kiosks and advertising opportunities. He commented that he generally supports the contract and is

excited at the opportunity to advertise City events, but dislikes commercialization in the right-of-way due to the beautification aspect.

Assistant Police Chief Michael Dvorak displayed a PowerPoint presentation related to Item 6-j **(Cooperative Agreement with the United States Department of Justice, Office of Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics)** on the Regular Council Meeting agenda. **(See Attachment 2)**

2-a. Hear a presentation and discuss an update of the City's Multi-Use Path Projects.

Transportation Department Director Lenny Hulme displayed a PowerPoint presentation related to three items on the Regular Council Meeting agenda, two Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) and one construction contract for multi-use path projects. **(See Attachment 3)**

Mr. Hulme reported that Porter Park Pathway, along Mesa Drive and 8<sup>th</sup> Street, was completed over the summer and explained that it ties into the Eisenhower Elementary School and Kino Swimming Pool area and continues to the Consolidated Canal Pathway. He noted that the traffic counters confirm that on average of 70+ people per day are already using that new pathway. (See Page 2 of Attachment 3)

Mr. Hulme announced that another newly named project is the Stadium Connector, which is a contract on the Regular Council Meeting agenda. He indicated that the project has an IGA with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) in order to tie into the Rio Salado Pathway. He explained that the project ties in at Dobson Road and follows the canal bank up to Alma School Road. He stated that another Job Order Contract (JOC) will come before Council for the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Calming Project, which takes the pathway down Alma School Road to 10<sup>th</sup> Street, around 8<sup>th</sup> Street and ties together Sloan Park and Hohokam Stadium. He reported that these projects should be completed by early summer of 2017. (See Pages 3 and 4 of Attachment 3)

Mr. Hulme explained that Mesa has an IGA with ADOT to take over some of the right-of-way in the Southeast Pathway, which is the Baseline Road/Loop 202 area. He informed the Council that the project design is 90% complete and expected to be completed by Fall 2017. He noted that this pathway is intended to tie into the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport and the powerline section near Elliott Road, linking to an existing path that ends near Signal Butte Road and the Eastmark area. (See Page 5 of Attachment 3)

Mr. Hulme concluded his presentation by saying that traffic counters and systems are in place on the pathways and reported that the highest activity is shown along the consolidated canal, near Main Street just east of Gilbert Road, with over 200 hits per day. He added that the multi-use paths are becoming the new golf courses with a lot of activity and said that staff receives a lot of positive feedback from the residents.

Vice Mayor Kavanaugh commented that he appreciates seeing the long-standing plans come together and anticipates the same plans for connectivity by use of canals along our southern border to Chandler and western border with Tempe, as promised in the past.

Mr. Hulme replied that staff is focusing the next Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on many projects meant to bring connectivity throughout Mesa and neighboring cities.

Mayor Giles indicated that the canals are a unique feature in the community that have turned into a blessing, allowing an opportunity for linear parks to connect neighborhoods and cities. He thanked staff for the great progress and Mr. Hulme for the presentation.

2-b. Hear a presentation, discuss, and provide direction on the following unsolicited proposals for the development of approximately two acres of City-owned property on the southeast corner of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Macdonald:

Downtown Transformation Manager Jeff McVay displayed a PowerPoint presentation related to the City-owned property on the southeast corner of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Macdonald. **(See Attachment 4)**

Mr. McVay recalled that Mesa Housing Associates II, LLC had previously been selected by the Council to develop a senior housing facility and 24-unit market rate development on the property. He clarified that the development agreement was contingent on the developer being awarded the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), which they were unsuccessful in receiving.

In response to a question from Councilmember Richins, Mr. McVay stated that the dates were built into the development agreement and the required delivery date for both projects is October 2018. He confirmed that the City has the right to terminate the development agreement made with Mesa Housing Associates due to their inability to receive the tax credit.

City Attorney Jim Smith explained that the property is currently tied in escrow, but the terms of the agreement also tie it to LIHTC funds that were not awarded. He confirmed that Mesa would either need to amend or terminate the agreement.

1. Mesa Housing Associates II, LLC

Mr. McVay announced that Mesa Housing has returned with a revised proposal that includes developing the market-rate portion first on the immediate corner of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Macdonald, to begin immediately if the revised agreement is approved. (See Page 2 of Attachment 4)

In response to a question from Councilmember Richins, Mr. McVay explained that under the current agreement, the developer was to begin with the senior housing project and all projects were reliant on receipt of the LIHTC award. He continued by saying the second amendment request was to allow the developer to apply for an extension of the tax credit cycle of 2017 for the 71-unit senior housing project.

In response to a question from Councilmember Finter, Mr. McVay stated that from the last agreement, \$130K was deposited into escrow and will remain unless the Council chooses to terminate the agreement. He explained that an appraisal was completed that valued the 1.9-acre site at \$510K, and \$130K in escrow reflects the half-acre portion.

In response to questions from Mayor Giles, Mr. McVay confirmed that a second appraisal has not been ordered. He indicated that some recent property sales downtown may justify another property appraisal and provide new comparables.

Mr. McVay continued by reporting that the first phase of the revised proposal would be the 24-unit market-rate apartment development for a total investment of \$2.8 million. He added that Phase Two would follow with a 71-unit five-story development of affordable senior housing, if awarded the LIHTC in the next cycle. (See Pages 3 and 4 of Attachment 4)

2. artHAUS Projects, LLC

Mr. McVay announced that the second proposal is from artHAUS Projects, who had previously submitted an RFP that was one day late and could not be considered. He said they have resubmitted for consideration a proposal for the 1.9-acre site to develop 170 market-rate residential units, in addition to 10,000 sq. ft. of first-floor retail space along Macdonald. (See Pages 5 and 6 of Attachment 4)

3. Artisan Development

Mr. McVay stated that Artisan Development is a Connecticut company who submitted a proposal for a larger site area of 3.5 acres, which is the entire area included in the original RFP, as well as the adjacent vacant land. He indicated that the proposal is for market-rate, mixed-use, residential apartments at a proposed purchase price of \$510K for the entire site. He noted that Artisan did not yet have the opportunity to put together conceptual site plans or renderings, but did provide photos of other architectural developments. (See Pages 7 and 8 of Attachment 4)

In response to questions from Councilmember Luna, Mr. McVay explained that there is a possibility that Mesa Housing Associates would not be awarded the LIHTC funds during the next cycle. He explained that staff received unsolicited proposals and did not want to make a decision without the direction from Council. He stated that the Council has the option to re-release the project to an RFP.

Councilmember Finter expressed the opinion that the purchase price of \$130,000 for a corner lot in downtown Mesa seems very low, especially considering that it is next to an amazing development.

In response to a question from Councilmember Luna, Mr. McVay clarified the process that Mesa Housing Associates must follow in order to reapply for the LIHTC by March 2017. He expects that the application is 90% complete due to the fact that most of the project remains the same.

Mike Wright, a Mesa resident, spoke on behalf of Action Neighborhood Alliance (ANA). He stated that ANA opposes the proposed project from Mesa Housing Associates and is concerned with adding more LIHTC projects to the area. He added that ANA believes there is now more market-rate interest in the property.

Dea Montague, a Mesa resident, recalled that in the past, the Council voted against a LIHTC proposal near the Sycamore Station and a market-rate project is now being proposed. He suggested that the neighborhood goal is to raise household income and education, and indicated that he supports ballot Question One. He added that several nice market-rate projects have developed in West Mesa and there is no rush to give away land or grant approval for LIHTC projects in West Mesa in the future.

Mayor Giles thanked Mr. Wright and Mr. Montague for their comments.

Councilmember Richins commented that it seems questionable why so many unsolicited proposals are being received for this particular parcel of land, which is a block away from Main Street.

Mr. McVay suggested the optimistic viewpoint that downtown Mesa is the next hot market that attracts many developers. He pointed out that the parcel is in close proximity to the Light Rail

station and such properties are limited in Mesa. He also suggested that the developers find security and certainty in the ability to partner with the City.

Councilmember Finter concurred with the concerns of Councilmember Richins. He recalled that the Council experienced the same situation in the past and he suggested that staff establish a more efficient process for last minute proposals.

Mr. Brady explained that staff only recently learned that the first proposal was not awarded the LIHTC and then the interest of other developers followed unexpectedly. He indicated that staff would welcome the opportunity, if it is Council's interest, to open the RFP process to solicit other proposals. He pointed out that staff was working on a Master Plan concept with one developer and once the LIHTC funding was not awarded, then other developers began showing interest. He noted that staff requests the Council's direction on the current development agreement before moving forward with the proposal process.

In response to a question from Councilmember Richins, Charles Huellmantel, a principal with Mesa Housing Associates, said his company believes in downtown Mesa and has built two projects that have brought more residents than any others in decades. He recalled that their first project was considered risky by others, yet turned out to be successful, proving that downtown Mesa is a great place to live.

Mr. Huellmantel advised that the standards governing the Qualified Allocation Points (QAP) Process this year have not yet been solidified and may change in their favor. He stated that Mesa Housing is ready to develop the market-rate piece now and have it started by the time the LIHTC application process starts next year. He predicted that building the 24 market-rate units first would start to improve the market for future market-rate projects, offering a better chance for LIHTC funding next year. He requested that Council consider moving forward on the development agreement.

Mr. Huellmantel suggested that the reason the parcel is suddenly so interesting to others is due to the quality of the first project Mesa Housing Associates provided, and has created a desirable place to live. He added that since the LIHTC was not awarded, then the plan is to proceed with market-rate housing that is unique and desirable, in order to improve the area. He requested that the Council structure the deal to allow them to build either project.

Councilmember Luna thanked Mr. Huellmantel for attending the meeting and applauded the great project that Mesa Housing Associates brought to Mesa. He inquired as to why the plan is dependent on the LIHTC, rather than building an entirely market-rate project.

Mr. Huellmantel explained that some people dislike market-rate housing, but he believes it makes Mesa a better place by offering affordable living to retirees. He indicated that their first project is at 100% capacity and the second phase has every unit pre-leased before completion, proving the demand for the product. He added that including tax credit pieces encourages other market-rate developers downtown and expressed the opinion that building 24 really unique units is better than building 100's of units at a time.

In response to a question from Councilmember Luna related to postponing the process until after the November election, Mr. Huellmantel confirmed that delaying the process would risk pushing the project out another year. He emphasized that residents are needed now in downtown and Mesa Housing is ready to move forward, otherwise they may not be ready for the tax credit application.

Mayor Giles thanked Mr. Huellmantel and said that Encore was a great project that set the standard in downtown Mesa.

Mayor Giles stated that the debate over LIHTC versus market-rate is money. He suggested that LIHTC is a lucrative business and guarantees success so he can appreciate that with developers. He indicated that the upcoming election will set the stage for the future of downtown Mesa and he suggested waiting until after the November election to go through a proper RFP process.

Councilmember Thompson commented that the Council has been reluctant to sell City-owned property in the past. He said that the Council trusted Mesa Housing Associates to do a good job and they proved that with their other projects. He explained that the master plan is a known quality project and he recommended moving forward with the agreement.

Councilmember Glover concurred with Councilmembers Thompson and Richins. He reported that he met with two developers and agreed with moving forward with Mesa Housing Associates who are willing to proceed with the market-rate piece. He said that although there is no guarantee that the tax credit will be awarded, the market-rate piece is guaranteed and will set that standard for future development. He recommended moving forward with Mesa Housing Associates, but also directed staff to work with arHAUS Projects and Artisan Development to explore other suitable locations in downtown Mesa.

Vice Mayor Kavanaugh emphasized that modifying an existing agreement is not a bad thing. He stated that he recently attended a national conference on rail and transit-oriented development and the key theme was to ensure that both market-rate and affordable housing were accommodated along transit lines. He expanded by saying that a large part of that concept is due to seniors downsizing and their inability to use their own vehicles. He noted that another known trend is affordable senior housing becoming a key component associated with universities and colleges. He stated that he sees a good synergy and supports moving forward with the current agreement with Mesa Housing Associates. He pointed out that arHAUS Projects is requesting significant government participation/subsidy with their project, as well as a substantially reduced price for the land, reduced utility rates for the life of the project, and significant City infrastructure improvements, which are all factors to be considered.

Councilmember Richins thanked Vice Mayor Kavanaugh for pointing out the details of the various concessions being requested by the other developers, proving that there is more involved than just the value of the dirt. He stated that he is comfortable moving forward due to the positive reputation of Mesa Housing Associates' projects.

Councilmember Finter stated that this is the second time staff has brought Council a broken process and asked them to make a tough decision. He expressed his support of proceeding with Mesa Housing Associates who has performed successfully for years. He further requested that staff correct the process for the new Council going forward.

Mr. Brady thanked Councilmember Finter for bringing up the point and explained that the reason for the broken process is that the developer has not met the requirements of the existing agreement. He requested direction from the Council as to how to proceed after the first round of scores, whether staff can terminate the existing agreement to allow time to proceed with a proper RFP process. He explained that when other developers hear that a project may not be approved for LIHTC, then they come directly to the City with other options and staff is compelled to present those options to the Council. He noted that the longer this agreement lingers the closer we are

to the next round of LIHTC proposals, so a hard stop needs to be established at some point in the cycle.

Councilmember Finter remembered that staff has amended the process a few times in the past and looks forward to establishing a hard stopping point.

Councilmember Luna thanked Mr. Brady for clarifying the reasoning and agreed that the development agreement needs to be modified in order to move forward. He expressed his support for proceeding with the market-rate project from Mesa Housing Associates. He emphasized that the process needs to be more transparent in the future to ensure that all parties have the same opportunity to submit applications.

Mayor Giles declared that the consensus of the Council was to move forward with amending the agreement with Mesa Housing Associates II, LLC.

Mr. McVay requested that staff be given the latitude to reopen the agreements again in order to verify that nothing was missed in the rush when originally written, and would return to the Council with the amended agreement before the end of the year.

3. Information pertaining to the current Job Order Contracting projects.

(This item was not discussed by the Council.)

4. Approval of minutes from an Executive Session held on September 22, 2016.

It was moved by Councilmember Luna, seconded by Vice Mayor Kavanaugh, that the minutes from an Executive Session held on September 22, 2016 be approved.

Carried unanimously.

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

5-a. Human Relations Advisory Board meeting held on August 24, 2016.

5-b. Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes held September 6, 2016.

5-c. Judicial Advisory Board meeting held June 29, 2016.

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

Carried unanimously.

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

Councilmember Luna: New York City Pre-Kindergarten Conference

7. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

City Manager Christopher Brady stated that the schedule of meetings is as follows:

Friday, October 14, 2016 – Councilmember Luna has Mobile Office Hours at 7550 E. Adobe  
Saturday, October 15, 2016, 8:00 a.m. – Household Hazardous Waste event  
Saturday, October 15, 2016, 1:00 p.m. – 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Pumpkin Splash  
Saturday, October 15, 2016, 5:00 p.m. – Celebrate Mesa at Red Mountain Soccer Complex  
Saturday, October 15, 2016, 8:00 p.m. – MACtoberfest at Mesa Arts Center  
Monday, October 17, 2016, 5:15 p.m. – Council Study Session  
Monday, October 17, 2016, 5:45 p.m. – Council Regular Meeting  
Thursday, October 20, 2016 – Council Study Session cancelled

8. Convene an Executive Session.

It was moved by Councilmember Glover, seconded by Councilmember Luna, that the Study Session adjourn at 9:14 a.m. and the Council enter into an Executive Session.

Carried Unanimously.

8-a. Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the City Attorney. (A.R.S. §38-431.03A (3)) Discussion or consultation with the City Attorney in order to consider the City's position and instruct the City Attorney regarding the City's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation. (A.R.S. §38-431.03A (4)):

1. *Boruch I and II v. State of Arizona and City of Mesa*, Nos. CV2014-014115 and CV2015-007341.

Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the City Attorney. (A.R.S. §38-431.03A (3)) Discussion or consideration of employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, salaries, discipline, dismissal, or resignation of a public officer, appointee or employee of the City. (A.R.S. §38-431.03A (1)):

2. City Clerk Review
3. City Attorney Review

9. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

---

JOHN GILES, MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

DEE ANN MICKELSEN, 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 13<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

hm  
(Attachments – 4)

# Transit Advertising

# Program Goal

Enhance the transit experience for fixed-route bus riders by increasing the number of transit shelters to provide shade.

# Procurement

50 potential prime and sub contractors downloaded the RFP

2 vendors submitted proposals

Creative Outdoor Advertising

Outfront Media

Proposal evaluation team : Transit Services, City Attorney's Office, City Manager's Office, Engineering, Procurement, City of Phoenix Public Transit Department and Outside third party


# Key Proposal Elements

	Creative Outdoor Advertising	Outfront Media
Contract Term	10 years with 2 one year options	10 years with 2 one year options
Number of new shelters	60	50
Number of kiosks	None	50
Number of benches	300	None
Compensation	Minimum annual guarantee \$50/unit (\$180,000 over 10 years) or revenue sharing of 5%	Minimum annual guarantee over 10 years \$250,000 or revenue sharing of 8 percent for years 1-7 and 15% for years 8-10
Other	Shelters and benches have 10 year lifespan	Shelters and kiosks become city assets after the term of the contract

# Creative Outdoor Proposed Shelters



# Outfront Proposed Shelter



# Projected Contract Value


Projected Revenue over 10 years	\$250,000 - 585,000
50 Shelters	\$600,500*
50 Kiosks	\$313,500*
Estimated cleaning and maintenance	\$450,000
<b>Total Projected Value</b>	<b>\$1.614 - 1.985 Million</b>

\*includes shelters, seating, trash cans, concrete pad and solar lighting


# Example of Shelter Wrap



# Mesa, AZ: Ad Shelter Units - Bus Stops



# Mesa, AZ: Ad Kiosk Units - Mesa Bus Stops



Source: Proprietary Data | Copyright 2016, The Nielsen Company | Prepared by OUTFRONT Media



# Bus Shelters in Mesa

Existing inventory is:

750 bus stops in Mesa

244 bus stops have a shelter

33% of bus stops have shelters

Proposal adds 50 new shelters

Increases number bus shelters by 20 percent

Increases percentage of bus stops with shelters to 39 percent

Potential build out is approximately 400 shelters or 53% of all bus stops

# Growing the System

Add kiosks to the LINK stations

Evaluate advertising potential for shelter installations that occur through

- lifecycle replacements
- property damage
- street improvement projects

# Recommendation

Approve transit advertising contract with Outfront Media

# Advertising Standards

1. The Advertisement shall contain a commercial transaction as defined by an interaction between two or more parties in which goods, services or something of value is exchanged for some type of remuneration.
2. The advertising shall not:
  - a. Be false, misleading, or deceptive.
  - b. Relate to an illegal activity.
  - c. Advertise or depict the use of tobacco or smoking products as that term is defined in Section 36-798, Arizona Revised Statutes, Definitions.
  - d. Advertise or depict the use of spirituous liquor as that term is defined in Section 4-101, Arizona Revised Statutes, Definitions, on transit shelters and stops that are located less than 600 feet from a church or similar structure of worship, or school building.
  - e. Represent, by language or graphics, violence or antisocial behavior.
  - f. Advertise or depict language, gestures, conduct, or graphical representations that are obscene, pornographic, vulgar, profane, or scatological.
  - g. Represent, by language or graphics, a nude or seminude person, as those terms are defined in Section 11-821, Arizona Revised Statutes, or the exposed buttocks of any person.
  - h. Depict, relate to, or reference a website or other medium that relates to specified sexual activities or specified anatomical areas as those terms are defined in Section 11-821, Arizona Revised Statutes.

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS GRANT

Funding towards the replacement of Records  
Management System (RMS)

# RMS REPLACEMENT NEEDED

- ▶ Current RMS system installed in 2005 (Updated in 2013)
  - ▶ Current system runs on discontinued technology
  - ▶ Current vendor has been unable to fix existing issues and will not be upgrading this product to run on a supported database
  - ▶ Current system does not allow for future security updates
  - ▶ Police Department has plan for replacement of existing RMS System to address stability concerns

# RMS REPLACEMENT NEEDED

- ▶ FBI Uniform Crime Reports Program will be transitioning to National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
- ▶ FBI will transition to NIBRS-only data collection by January 1, 2021
- ▶ Current RMS system will be ineffective for NIBRS reporting
  - ▶ System Instability
  - ▶ Not user friendly for more detailed NIBRS Reporting

# GRANT/PROJECT FUNDING

- ▶ Bureau of Justice Statistics Grant provides an opportunity for partial funding on a project that is needed for the Police Department
- ▶ Grant will provide \$608,680 in funding to assist with implementation of new RMS System
  - ▶ \$418,680 in personnel costs
  - ▶ \$190,000 for software/equipment
- ▶ Cost of replacement RMS system will be greater than the amount of the grant
  - ▶ Estimated cost \$3.5-4 million distributed over FY17-18 and FY18-19
  - ▶ Public Safety sales tax initiative is possible source of project funding

# Questions

# City of Mesa Multi-Use Path Projects Update

City of Mesa


Council Study Session

October 13, 2016



mesa·az

# Porter Park Pathway



**Length:** 1 mile

**Phase:** Open



**Estimated Completion:** July 2016

**Cost:** \$1.8 Million

**Project Details:** Pathway from Mesa Drive/8<sup>th</sup> Street to existing Consolidated Canal Pathway.



# Salado Pathway



**Length:** 1.5 Miles

**Phase:** Construction

**Estimated Completion:** Jan-Feb 2017


**Cost:** \$4.2 Million

**Project Details:** Pathway from Tempe under the SR101/SR202 Red Mountain to Dobson Road with a tunnel connection to Riverview Park.



**mesa**·az

# Stadium Connector



**Length: 2.5 miles**

**Phase: Securing Construction Contracts**


**Estimated Completion: May 2017**

**Cost: \$3.2 Million**

**Project Details:** Connect Hohokam Stadium to Sloan Park via canal pathways, on-street cycle track and pathway on north side of Riverview.



# Southwest Pathway



**Length:** 1 mile

**Phase:** Design

**Estimated Completion:** Early Fall of 2017

**Cost:** \$1.3 Million

**Project Details:** First phase of pathway along SR202 Santan right of way. From Guadalupe Road to Elliot Road.



mesa·az

# 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE AND MACDONALD

## SUMMARY OF UNSOLICITED PROPOSALS


City Council Study  
Session – 10/13/2016

Jeffrey McVay AICP  
Manager of Downtown  
Transformation

# MESA HOUSING ASSOCIATES II, LLC

## Overview


- 1.9± acre site
- 95 total residential units
- 86,100± gross square feet between two buildings
- 86 parking spaces
- \$18,374,180 total investment



# MESA HOUSING ASSOCIATES II, LLC

## *Residences on First*

- Development not contingent upon LIHTC
- 0.5± acre site
- 24 market rate residential units
- 20 one bedroom and 4 two bedroom
- 3 story, 16,600 square foot building
- 32 parking spaces
- \$2,800,000 total investment



VIEW LOOKING SOUTHEAST



VIEW LOOKING SOUTHWEST



VIEW LOOKING NORTHWEST



VIEW LOOKING NORTH

RESIDENCES  
ON FIRST

PERSPECTIVES

© 2016 MHA & IMA

Architectural Partner



# MESA HOUSING ASSOCIATES II, LLC

## *Encore on Macdonald*

- 1.5± acre site
- 71 affordable senior residential units
- 47 one bedroom and 24 two bedroom
- 5 story, 69,400± square feet building
- 54 parking spaces
- \$15,574,180 total investment
- Requests land at no cost
- LIHTC request due March 1, 2017



VIEW LOOKING NORTHEAST



VIEW LOOKING WEST



VIEW LOOKING SOUTHEAST



VIEW LOOKING SOUTH

# ARTHAUS PROJECTS, LLC

## Overview

- 1.9± acre site
- 170 total residential units
- 185,900± gross square feet between four buildings
- 147 parking spaces
- \$32,145,000 total investment




birds eye perspective view from 1st Ave and Macdonald

# ARTHAUS PROJECTS, LLC

## *Development Details*

- 1.9± acre site
- 170 market rate residential units
- 34 studio, 18 one bedroom, 118 two bedroom
- One 5-story and three 4-story buildings totaling 185,900± square feet
- Up to 10,000± square feet ground level retail along 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue



street level perspective view from 1st Ave and Macdonald

# ARTISAN DEVELOPMENT, LLC

## *Development Details*

- 3.5± acre site
- Mixed-use, market-rate multi-family
- 40+ dwelling units/acre
- \$510,000 purchase price (1.9 acres appraised value \$510,000)



# ARTISAN DEVELOPMENT, LLC



Representative Projects from Design Partner

