

## Minutes City Council Retreat October 2, 2015

Minutes of the Tempe City Council Retreat held on Friday, October 2, 2015, 8:00 a.m., at the Tempe History Museum, 809 East Southern Avenue, Tempe, Arizona.

### **COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mayor Mark W. Mitchell  
Councilmember Robin Arredondo-Savage  
Councilmember Lauren Kuby  
Councilmember David Schapira

Vice Mayor Corey D. Woods  
Councilmember Kolby Granville  
Councilmember Joel Navarro

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Andrew Ching, City Manager  
Steven Methvin, Dep. City Mgr. – Chief Operating Officer  
Kay Savard, Deputy City Clerk  
Tony Cani, Mayoral Aide  
Parrish Spisz, City Council Aide  
Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director  
Alex Smith, Real Estate Development Supervisor  
Rosa Inchausti, Diversity Director  
Julie Hietter, Public Works Administration Manager  
Dave Heck, Deputy Internal Services Director – IT  
Marge Zylla, Government Relations Officer  
Greg Ruiz, Fire Medical Rescue Department Chief  
MaryAnne Majestic, Presiding City Judge  
Cecilia Velasco-Robles, Financial Services Manager/Budget  
Dion Loureiro, Information Technology Services Consultant

Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager – Chief Financial Officer  
Judi Baumann, City Attorney  
Elizabeth Higgins, Mayor/City Council Chief of Staff  
Kristin Gwinn, City Council Aide  
Donna Kennedy, Economic Development Director  
Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Dev. Dir. – Planning  
Rob Cox, ASU Economic Development Liaison  
Don Bessler, Public Works Director  
Renie Broderick, Internal Services Director  
Nikki Ripley, Communication and Media Relations Manager  
Naomi Farrell, Human Services Director  
Don Jongewaard, Fire Captain Medic  
Barbara Blue, City Auditor  
Kris Baxter, Public Information Officer

***Mayor Mitchell called the meeting to order at 8:12 a.m. and welcomed meeting attendees.***

Mayor Mitchell announced that some agenda items will be taken out of order.

### **Process for Introducing New Development Projects**

Mayor Mitchell discussed the current process and timing of how potential developers, or their representatives, meet with City staff and Councilmembers. He requested consideration to modify the process so that once a project has been introduced to the City Council, the developer works directly with staff on all project negotiations. Staff can then brief the City Council on those negotiations in executive session. A developer should not be able to count City Council votes; this could potentially violate the Open Meeting Law. This process will empower staff to design projects with developers that fit the City's design guidelines, and to negotiate on the City's behalf. He stated that staff is proposing the creation of an Economic Development/Community Development Team (Team), to serve as a liaison between the developer and the City Council. He then acknowledged the presence of members of the Development Review Commission (DRC) at the meeting.

Steven Methvin, Deputy City Manager – Chief Operating Officer, stated that the Team will consist of representatives from various Departments. The process will provide consistency in the way that development agreements are presented to the City Council and to the public.

Councilmembers voiced concern that executive session discussions can be divided on what Councilmembers want to see in a project. Councilmembers are also contacted by developers and asked for their feedback on projects. In response to Councilmembers' comments and concerns, Mayor Mitchell clarified that the purpose of this proposal is to authorize staff to negotiate with developers and for staff to provide project updates for City Council consideration. Negotiations with developers should not be done by Councilmembers. He emphasized that Councilmembers would continue to have the ability to meet with developers.

Councilmembers discussed having differing priorities and the importance of being able to express their concerns about a project to the developer. It is important that Councilmembers be involved with projects at the beginning of the process. Staff would coordinate projects and keep the City Council and department heads informed on the project status.

Mr. Methvin added that the proposal adds structure to the existing process. The Team will combine economic development and community development components. It is important that developers know how Councilmembers feel about a project, before a project is submitted to the City. Once a preliminary site plan has been submitted to the City, the Team will be activated. The Team will select a lead staff contact who would act as a conduit between the City Council, the DRC, and the developer. Councilmembers have the option on whether or not to include staff in meetings with developers.

Councilmembers and Mr. Methvin discussed how this process informs the development community that project negotiations are administered by staff, with input from the City Council. It is important for developers to meet with neighborhood residents in the conceptual stages of the process; it is the role of staff to ensure that the developer follows through on engaging the public. Additional discussion could occur regarding how the Public Involvement Plan is being implemented. DRC involvement and feedback are also an important part of the process.

Councilmembers voiced concern about receiving notification of changes to a project on the same day as a Regular Council Meeting. Last minute information has an impact on the ability of the public to provide input and attend a meeting. Councilmembers noted that there are times when last minutes changes to projects are in favor of the neighborhood.

Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director, stated that this process allows for staff to take a holistic view of a project. Mayor Mitchell stated that if developers are aware that there is a process in place and a timeline, it may impact last minute changes, which benefits everybody. Decisions are made on the available information, and should not be rushed at the last minute.

Councilmembers requested feedback from meeting attendees.

Darlene Justus, Tempe, North Tempe Neighborhood Association, stated the appropriate time to engage neighborhood residents is before, or at the time of activation of the Team, and before the developer has spent an excessive amount of money.

Linda Spears, DRC member, stated that developers do approach the community ahead of time, but the public does not always participate. Neighborhoods cannot be forced to participate in the process. There are valid reasons why staff and the DRC make changes to a project; however, it is unfair to the process when a project is renegotiated based on the wishes of one individual. The DRC does not like last minute project changes and does not have an opportunity to review the changes. If the proposed process eliminates this activity, she supports this change. Bringing project concerns to the DRC earlier in the process gives the DRC an opportunity to work on the issues.

Councilmembers discussed how this process would relay the City Council's vision to developers, including taking into consideration the General Plan. Ms. Kennedy stated that the Team will work with the developer to ensure that issues of concern can be addressed. Andrew Ching, City Manager, stated that a consequence to a developer could be to postpone the project to the next Regular Council Meeting. Mr. Methvin stated that staff will provide clarity regarding when the public gets involved in the process.

Based on the discussion, the City Council approved a process for introducing new projects; staff will coordinate neighborhood involvement earlier in the process; and agenda revisions should be limited to no less than 48 hours prior to the meeting date. It was also suggested that the process be revisited in six months to determine if any adjustments need to be made.

## Development Incentives

At the request of Mayor Mitchell, this agenda item was taken out of order.

Alex Smith, Real Estate Development Supervisor, provided a PowerPoint presentation and detailed various development incentives that have been offered to the following projects over the past 30 years: Chase building at Centerpoint on Mill Avenue, America West Airlines building, Tempe Marketplace, and Hayden Ferry Lakeside (Phase II). Mr. Smith reviewed the impacts of the project incentives and noted that one of the reasons for offering incentives is to build an environment that positively impacts the community. Once development incentives are in place and the project has been built, City staff has follow up responsibilities on the project. He stated that he will provide an overview of what the incentives are, how incentives are managed now, and seek City Council direction on how incentives should be managed in the future.

Councilmembers discussed the benefits of providing development incentives; impacts to current and future generations, schools, bonding capacity, and infrastructure; and, return on investment. It would be helpful to include economic impact data regarding project incentives on the City's website, including how schools are impacted by these types of projects. There is a perception of inequality and incentivizing competitors to compete against each other; it is important to know what is going to be built and what that project will be competing with when considering incentives. Mr. Smith noted that there is a level of risk developers are willing to tolerate; incentives play a role. Donna Kennedy, Economic Development Director, stated that she will provide an economic analysis of projects to Councilmembers. Councilmembers then discussed how development agreements impact the types and sizes of businesses for a project; this can have an impact on small, local businesses.

Mr. Smith reviewed the current incentives policy, which is to review projects on a case-by-case basis. He stated that staff is seeking feedback on City Council priorities moving forward. He presented three options as follows: 1) continue to use the informal guidelines; 2) continue to use the informal guidelines with the nuance that clear priorities are established for what is being incentivized; or, 3) establish formal guidelines. Mr. Smith noted that it would be helpful for staff and the community to include these guidelines on the City's webpage.

Councilmembers discussed that it is critical to ensure that small businesses in the downtown are not left out of the process; downtown lease rates are too high for some small businesses. Developers could be asked to consider smaller tenant spaces. Discussion continued regarding the time and resources needed to perform case studies; the use of volunteers to assist with case studies would be beneficial.

Councilmembers encouraged staff to consider a redevelopment package to retool existing buildings, versus tearing down buildings; Government Property Lease Excise Tax (GPLET) and incentives could potentially be used for these purposes. Mr. Smith stated that staff will research what the State allows regarding GPLET-based redevelopment areas; there are strict requirements for tax rebates.

Councilmembers discussed the Adaptive Reuse Policy (Policy) that was approved by the City Council in 2014. The Policy encourages the reuse of buildings that are more than 20 years old, as opposed to tearing buildings down. Mr. Smith stated that this Policy reduces the overall cost for these types of projects. Councilmembers discussed the need to improve communications with the public regarding the long-term benefits and return on investment for projects that have received incentives, including how City services are impacted. Information could also include data relating to potential sites for incentives. Councilmembers suggested that a form be developed that would provide information regarding the short term and long term value for providing incentives, including impacts to schools; the information could include pre and post build data.

Councilmembers discussed how the economic downturn impacted the City's revenue stream. Since 2012, there has been an emphasis placed on economic development. Incentives impact how the City Council votes on projects. The City works in partnership with its residents and the business community. Quality of life is the primary goal.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the media is not always accurate when reporting on such complex issues. She then noted that staff is working with Vice Mayor Woods on distressed retail centers, including potential incentives.

Councilmember's asked the City Attorney to discuss the Gift Clause Law and what is allowed by the courts. Judi Baumann, City Attorney, explained that the Gift Clause Law does not specifically apply to the statutorily authorized GPLET projects, but historically, Tempe has always prepared that type of analysis to ensure that the City receives a public benefit. Under the Gift Clause analysis, the courts look for a tangible economic benefit. The courts do not agree that a project being added to future tax rolls is considered a tangible economic benefit; the courts want to see an economic benefit that is not grossly disproportionate. In the case of whether or not public parking is considered an economic benefit, the court's view is that only having public parking is not considered enough of a public benefit; the court considers this in the context of the other economic benefits that go along with a particular project. Mr. Smith added that the statute focuses on financial and economic impacts. Increased density and quality of construction are also taken into consideration.

Councilmembers discussed how the courts view job creation, as a result of a project. Ms. Baumann stated that job creation has historically not been considered a tangible benefit. The economic analysis assesses specific revenues that the City can raise and receive in exchange for the incentive offered. Councilmembers asked the City Attorney to provide a list of case law Gift Clause items that have gone before the courts and have been found to be defensible. Andrew Ching, City Manager, added that he thinks of this process in terms of direct vs. indirect value. For example, an increase in jobs being created as a result of a project would be considered indirect value.

Mr. Smith stated that staff will work on incentives for small businesses. Staff will also work with the City Attorney's office on developing criteria for this process. Under consideration is continuing with the informal guidelines and establishing the priorities as follows:

- Continue informal guidelines; establish clear priorities for incentives for:
  - Redevelopment of underperforming strip centers
  - Encouraging condominium and townhome projects
  - Grocery store in downtown
  - Hotel and conference center in downtown

Councilmembers voiced a preference for the above process because projects are reviewed on a case-by-case basis; the informal guidelines allow for flexibility and inform developers and the public of what the City is looking for. Councilmembers also discussed the importance of locating a grocery store in north Tempe and suggested that affordable, rental and workforce housing be included with the condominium and townhome housing options. There should be a balance of homeownership opportunities. Councilmembers then discussed the quality of materials used for housing, sustainability of housing products, and the importance of design.

Councilmembers discussed how incentives must be legally defensible; consideration should be given to what the Goldwater Institute looks at. Councilmembers asked about recent examples of GPLETs that fit within the priorities noted above. Mr. Smith stated that the white paper on incentives will include an analysis of strip centers.

Based on the discussion, the City Council agreed to continue with the current policy (informal guidelines and priorities as noted above), with the addition of affordable housing to the list of priorities; include return on investment data on the City's website, including impacts to City services; develop a form that outlines short term and long term value of projects, including impacts to schools; staff will provide Councilmembers with a list of case law gift clause items; staff will prepare a white paper on incentives and conduct an analysis of strip center incentives; and, staff will provide a list of legally defensible incentives to residents and developers.

*The meeting was recessed at 9:44 a.m. for a break and reconvened at 9:55 a.m. with all Councilmembers present.*

## Development Agreement Language Elements

Councilmember Granville discussed recent legislative actions that preempted the City from regulating plastic bags and recycling at apartment complexes. Following those legislative actions, he introduced a Committee of the Whole item for Councilmembers to consider formulating standard language elements that could be included in development agreements; the language would align with the City's goals and culture. Staff could work with developers to negotiate a series of items, or the City Council could develop a list of required items.

Councilmembers discussed how development agreements are created on a case-by-case basis. Concerns raised include how the City could become a target for the Legislature, which could have negative repercussions; legislative preemptions impact all cities and towns; and, that legislation could preempt development agreement language. This could make the process cumbersome for developers; the emphasis should be on compliance versus mandating. An alternative to this proposal could be for the City Council to advise staff in executive session about what they would like to see in development agreements.

In support of this proposal, Councilmembers noted that development agreement language would advise developers on things that the City wishes to improve upon and it would decrease the number of deals made with developers during City Council meetings. The national trend is to challenge preemptions.

Based on the discussion, a majority of Councilmembers agreed not to pursue including standardized language in development agreements.

## Economic Development Department Update

Ms. Kennedy, Economic Development Director, introduced co-presenter, Rob Cox, ASU Economic Development Liaison. Mr. Cox provided an update about the *INTEMPE* Program. This entrepreneurship program is in need of a platform for sharing information and also needs meeting space for a small business network. The Lucid Agency is providing marketing services to promote this program. A website is being developed; mentoring, business plan assistance, applying for business loans, and various workshops will be available. The business center would be located at the Tempe Public Library. The Rotary Club will donate \$23,000 for tenant improvements. Mr. Cox displayed illustrations of the proposed business center.

Councilmembers suggested that groups such as the Green Chamber of Commerce, the Arizona State University (ASU) Walton School of Sustainability, and Green Light Solutions be contacted to assist with this program. The TEN Program is interested in repurposing the Tempe Performing Arts Center (TPAC) building to use as space for networking and workforce development; program participants will volunteer and participate in events such as Geeks' Night Out and educating youth.

Ms. Kennedy introduced Chase Norlin, Transmosis founder. Mr. Norlin explained that Transmosis is a business externship program with start-up companies. He discussed how Transmosis has impacted companies, careers, and economic development, and expressed an interest in partnering opportunities with the City at the TPAC site. Councilmembers discussed information technology infrastructure challenges at the Tempe Public Library and the TPAC building.

Ms. Kennedy reviewed statistics on employment growth and trends and where Tempe stands in the rankings. She discussed regional efforts for business attraction, including foreign direct investments and opportunities and strategies to partner with Mexico. Ms. Kennedy stated that the National League of Cities and Towns Hispanic Elected Local Officials and the Arizona Commerce Authority are assisting with this collaborative effort. She noted that she will provide additional information at an upcoming executive session.

Rosa Inchausti, Diversity Director, provided an update on a recent business trip to Mexico; the goal is to establish a long term partnership. Councilmembers thanked staff for working strategically with Mexico and with the business community, and for reaching out to ASU.

## **Increasing Demand for Homeownership**

Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director, discussed whether or not the tools used for homeownership opportunities in the City are effective or if change is needed. He reviewed maps illustrating the distribution of various housing stock in Tempe, based on the 2010 census. He discussed infill opportunities, revitalization of commercial centers, negotiations on development agreements requiring conversation or condominium platting, layers of requirements and incentives, and housing trends.

Councilmembers and Mr. Nakagawara discussed the status of Tempe's Home Improvement Planning Program (HIPP). Currently, there is limited data on the HIPP program because the program is too restrictive. The program is being restructured and will be brought back to the City Council for feedback. Councilmembers suggested that the HIPP program be promoted to the Southeast Valley Regional Association of Realtors. The City should also be promoting its diversity of housing options as well as the Service Line Protection Program (SLiPP), to the business community. Funding should be allocated to marketing programs that the City offers.

Councilmembers discussed the possibility of waiving City fees for home improvements; offering rebates; and, incentivizing infill projects. Mr. Nakagawara stated that staff is working on these issues. Councilmembers discussed the positive impacts of home improvements. Concerns have been raised about copyright issues for allowing the public to access building plans. Councilmembers discussed the possibility of proactively seeking certain types of builders or developers; providing incentives for building single family homes; exploring alternative programs; and, partnering with the Newtown Program. Councilmembers requested additional information on the Down Payment Assistance Program and potentially expanding the program.

A member of the audience spoke about the amount of rental properties north of the U.S. 60 freeway and that the housing stock consists of small homes.

Based on the discussion, staff will improve marketing of existing City programs such as HIPP, SLiPP, and diversity of housing options; staff will provide Councilmembers with Down Payment Assistance Program data; consider incentivizing single family construction and waiving HIPP fees.

*The meeting was recessed at 11:07 a.m. for a break and reconvened at 11:41 a.m. with all Councilmembers present.*

## **Development Discussion – Downtown Tempe**

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director – Planning, provided a slide presentation illustrating the historic character of the downtown and the Mill Avenue corridor. He discussed building height, massing, and streetscape treatments and elements. He then discussed various downtown visioning documents.

Councilmembers, Mr. Levesque, and Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director, discussed how the City is collaborating with Downtown Tempe Authority (DTA) consultants to ensure that the Council's vision for the downtown is integrated with the DTA's plan. Density and traffic congestion are a couple reasons why staff is conducting this comprehensive review of development. The visioning documents provide guidance when projects are submitted to the City; the General Plan provides the overall framework. The City Council has the flexibility to change its vision. General Plan voting requirements have been implemented, at the request of the City Council. Staff is also working with ASU on the streetcar project.

Councilmembers discussed public safety calls for service and response times. Staff will be presenting a public safety agenda item at the City Council meeting on October 22, 2015, to account for growth.

Mayor Mitchell asked Councilmembers to provide feedback on their vision for the City. Councilmembers discussed how the vision will evolve over time. The City should work with ASU officials on the Stadium District, as well as on new development projects in the downtown. The City should explore ways to address traffic congestion, provide taxi parking, and offer multi-modes of transit. The streetcar could move parking away from the downtown. Concern was raised about potentially having projects downtown that are too small.

Mr. Levesque concluded by stating that staff is continuing to explore how much funding will be needed for the streetcar. He then discussed character area plans for the Apache/Alameda areas and noted that staff would like to pursue the downtown/Mill Avenue area for the next character area plan process.

Based on the discussion, Councilmembers voiced approval of the downtown vision documents as presented.

## **Development Discussion – Town Lake Vision**

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director – Planning, provided a slide presentation of illustrations of residential, mixed-use, office, and hotel developments around the Town Lake. The Rio Salado Project (Tempe Town Lake) was established by ASU in 1966. Staff is seeking City Council direction on the vision for the Town Lake and future projects at the Pier 202/Southbank site. Councilmembers discussed the ASU Stadium District Master Plan, the Request for Proposals (RFP) Town Lake Design Document, Community Design Principles for the Town Lake, recreational lake activities, linear park around the lake, public spaces on the ground floor of buildings, views of the lake, and pedestrian and retail linkages to downtown.

Councilmembers, Mr. Levesque, and Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director, discussed building height restrictions and the importance of architectural elements that create visual interest; a variation in building height and the use of quality building materials is important. Staff looks for unique architecture and how buildings relate to a site; design principles dictate decisions.

Councilmembers voiced a preference for a mixed-use atmosphere such as retail and restaurant venues along the lake, and smaller in size; the City should be selective with projects. Development should be iconic and consistent along the Town Lake and Rio Salado Parkway, accessible, pedestrian experience, open spaces, and a variation of height and sight lines. Because of climate change impacts, tree and shade programs, cooling centers, and efforts towards conservation should also be areas of consideration during the development process; and, to include LEED construction in the RFP. A mixture of heights along the lake, quality architecture and construction, and sustainability, are important. Councilmembers discussed what are considered quality building materials and pros and cons of the use of certain building materials.

Councilmembers discussed the importance of creating a citizen venue versus an event venue; programming the area is important; and, potential legal issues with serving alcohol outdoors. Councilmembers asked that barricades not be placed up to the waterline during events, to provide the public with a walking corridor during special events. The Tempe Arts Master Plan visioning should be incorporated into the Town Lake vision.

Based on the discussion, Councilmembers approved the town lake vision documents as presented; a focus should be placed on quality construction.

## **Parks Asset Management Program**

Don Bessler, Public Works Director, introduced Julie Hietter, Public Works Supervisor, who developed the Parks Asset Management Program. Mr. Bessler reviewed the four park program priorities: 1) public health and safety, 2) existing assets; 3) customer enhancements, and 4) system expansion and new amenities. The priorities provide a framework to achieve equity among neighborhoods. The next level of improvements are based on “play value”. Ms. Hietter stated that the hierarchy of play value will assist in prioritizing parks and will move the process from addressing base amenities to system expansion.

Councilmembers and Mr. Bessler discussed various park amenities that they would like to see in City parks such as porta-potties, restrooms, dog runs, and playground equipment. Traffic impacts should also be taken into consideration. A menu of ideas would be helpful to staff. Expenditures will be driven by the budget and neighborhood involvement.

Darlene Justus, Tempe resident, voiced concern that Indian Bend Park is not included in the list of park priorities; the park is 54 years old. She asked that park repairs be done in parallel to all parks, not just the parks with amenities.

Mr. Bessler stated the next step is for the City Council to provide direction to staff. Councilmembers agreed with the play value approach. Additional park amenities discussed include lighting, aesthetics, parking, and adaptive equipment; there is also a balance between risk management issues and aesthetics and design. Staff will seek feedback from neighborhoods regarding park lighting impacts. Councilmembers discussed that accessibility is not adequately addressed in the plan and should be included in the list of priorities.

Councilmembers discussed the importance of equity among neighborhood parks and requested that additional information be provided regarding a list of parks that have not been scheduled for improvements, including the goal of when improvements will be accomplished and funding needed to reach the goal.

Councilmembers and Mr. Bessler discussed that there is not enough funding to get caught up on deferred park maintenance. Exploring new revenue sources is an option to address the lack of funding. Consideration of dedicating lease payments made to the City as a new revenue source for parks was discussed. A pilot park enhancement program could be developed to show citizens how revenue will be used. Mr. Bessler indicated that staff will prepare a 10-year long range forecast of park needs and wants, including funding data. Councilmembers discussed the impact that the recession had on streets and parks. Mayor Mitchell stated that consideration of parks funding should occur during the upcoming budget discussions.

Andrew Ching, City Manager, stated that the Parks Plan will be updated based on feedback from Councilmembers; an updated version of the document will include the status of all City parks. Councilmembers requested that accessibility data be included in the updated Parks Plan. Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager - Chief Financial Officer, stated that staff will return with a long range forecast for consideration during upcoming budget discussions.

Based on the discussion, staff will revise the Parks Plan to include parks not scheduled for Capital Improvements Program funding and park accessibility data.

## **Total Compensation for Tempe Employees**

Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager - Chief Financial Officer, stated this agenda item is for Councilmembers to discuss disparity between employee groups and comparable compensation. Mr. Jones provided a slide presentation outlining personnel cost trends and comparisons data, including impacts to the General Fund.

Councilmember Granville discussed the revenue stream, the cost of employees, and how new developments generate the need for new employees. He noted that employee costs continue to increase. Pension reform is needed at the State level; however, the chart indicates that it is the City's responsibility to address pension problem(s).

Councilmembers discussed how there are multiple organizations and groups working with the State legislature on this issue. This is an issue of statewide concern, versus one of local control. Public safety personnel, including Tempe firefighters, are involved in the discussions.

Mr. Jones discussed a lawsuit that has impacted the cost of public safety personnel compensation. The situation will not improve in the near future due to unfunded liabilities. The problem will improve as new public safety personnel are hired.

Councilmembers discussed that public safety personnel are needed and are different than other employee classifications in terms of job risk and how these employee groups are compensated. The chart provided does not reflect the entire picture. Revenue growth rates are unpredictable. The trends since 2009 are more positive.

Mr. Jones stated that the ideal scenario would be to pay employee growth rates based on revenues. Councilmember Granville stated that he would like to see employee growth rates tied to the revenue stream and inflation.

Based on the discussion, Councilmembers agreed that this matter should be addressed at the State level.

*There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.*

I, Kay Savard, the duly-appointed Deputy City Clerk of the City of Tempe, Maricopa County, Arizona, do hereby certify the above to be the minutes of the City Council Retreat of October 2, 2015, by the Tempe City Council, Tempe, Arizona.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark W. Mitchell, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kay Savard, Deputy City Clerk