Minutes
Regular City Council Meeting
May 12, 2016

Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of Thursday, May 12, 2016, held at 6:00 p.m. in the Harry E. Mitchell Government Center, Tempe City Hall, City Council Chambers, 31 E. Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona.

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT:

Mayor Mark W. Mitchell
Vice Mayor Corey D. Woods
Councilmember Robin Arredondo-Savage
Councilmember Kolby Granville
Councilmember Lauren Kuby
Councilmember Joel Navarro
Councilmember David Schapira *(joined telephonically at 7:28 p.m.)*

STAFF PRESENT:

Andrew Ching, City Manager
Judi Baumann, City Attorney
Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager – Chief Financial Officer
Brigitta M. Kuiper, City Clerk
Steven Methvin, Deputy City Manager – Chief Operating Officer
Don Bessler, Public Works Director
Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Dir. – Planning
MaryAnne Majestic, Presiding Judge
Various Department Heads or their representatives

Mayor Mitchell called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

1. Councilmember Arredondo-Savage gave the invocation.

2. Mayor Mitchell led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. MINUTES

A. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes
Motion by Councilmember Navarro to approve agenda items 3A1 – 3A3; second by Councilmember Arredondo-Savage. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote 6-0.

1. Executive Session - April 14, 2016
2. City Council Special Calendar Meeting - April 14, 2016
3. City Council Work Study Session - March 17, 2016

B. Acceptance of Board, Commission and Committee Meeting Minutes
Motion by Councilmember Navarro to accept agenda items 3B1 – 3B12; second by Vice Mayor Woods. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote 6-0.

1. Board of Adjustment - February 24, 2016
2. Hearing Officer - April 5, 2016 and April 19, 2016
3. History Museum and Library Advisory Board - April 6, 2016
4. Human Relations Commission - March 8, 2016
5. Mayor's Commission on Disability Concerns - September 14, 2015, October 5, 2015, January 4, 2016, February 1, 2016, March 7, 2016, and April 4, 2016
6. Mayor's Youth Advisory Commission - April 5, 2016 and April 19, 2016

7. Municipal Arts Commission - March 9, 2016
8. Neighborhood Advisory Commission - October 7, 2015, November 4, 2015, December 2, 2015, February 3, 2016, and March 7, 2016
9. Parks, Recreation, Golf and Double Butte Cemetery Advisory Board - March 16, 2016
10. Technical Code Advisory Board of Appeals - March 6, 2015
11. Tempe Family Justice Commission - October 12, 2015, November 17, 2015, January 19, 2016, February 16, 2016, and March 22, 2016
12. Tempe Sustainability Commission - February 20, 2016

4. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Mayor's Announcements

1. Public Works Week Proclamation
Mayor Mitchell read a proclamation declaring May 15 – 21, 2016 as Public Works Week in Tempe, Arizona. Mayor Mitchell invited Don Bessler, Public Works Director, to accept the proclamation and acknowledged various Public Works' employees of the month.

2. Tree City USA Award
Mayor Mitchell announced that Tempe has received the Arbor Day Foundation's "Tree City USA" certification, for the 20th year. He invited Shawn Thomason, Landscape Coordinator, to the podium to thank him for applying for this certification, on behalf of the City of Tempe.

B. City Manager's Announcements – None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed on the Consent Agenda will be considered as a group and will be enacted with one motion by the City Council unless an item is removed for separate consideration. Members of the public may remove public hearing items for separate consideration. Public hearing items are designated by an asterisk (*). Councilmembers may remove any item for separate consideration.

Motion by Councilmember Kuby to approve the consent agenda; second by Councilmember Arredondo-Savage. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote 6-0.

A. Miscellaneous Items

5A1. Set a public Hearing date for June 9, 2016, for the Downtown Tempe Enhanced Services Improvement District Assessments for Fiscal Year 2016/2017.

Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact to the City.

5A2. Approved a budget transfer of $900,000 from the Water Enterprise CIP Fund Project No. 3204969 – Rehab and Replacement of Aging Infrastructure, to the Capital Improvement Project No. 3299989 – Water System Upgrade Repairs and Replacement, to fund a Development Agreement between Jefferson Town Lake Apartments, LLC and the City of Tempe for a 30-inch transmission waterline relocation at the Jefferson Town Lake Development project.

Fiscal Impact: Approval of this budget transfer funding request would ensure adequate funding of $1.9 million is available for the project per the development agreement.

5A3. Approved a Final Subdivision Plat for TEMPE REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS, located at 1900 East 5th Street. The applicant is Tempe Real Estate Holdings, LLC.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact on City funds.

*5A4. Held a public hearing and recommended the approval of a series 11 hotel/motel liquor license for Solana Beverage Concessions, LLC, dba AC Hotel Tempe, 100 East Rio Salado Parkway.

Fiscal Impact: N/A

B. Award of Bids/Contracts

5B1. Approved the utilization of a one-year National Intergovernmental Purchasing Alliance/The Cooperative Purchasing Network contract with PSC Mobile for the purchase of ruggedized portable computers, accessories, equipment, related services, and microwave communications equipment for the Fire Medical Rescue Department, Police Department, and other City departments on an as-needed basis.

Fiscal Impact: Total cost of this contract will not exceed $450,000 during the one-year contract period. Sufficient funds have been appropriated in General Fund – cost center 1991 (IT Administration) and various Citywide operating and capital improvement cost centers for the anticipated expenditures.

5B2. Approved two-year contract renewals with Primus Electronics Corporation and United Fire Equipment Company for the supply of Mine Safety Appliances repair and replacement equipment.

Fiscal Impact: Total cost of these contracts will not exceed $135,000 during the two-year renewal period. Sufficient funds have been appropriated in General Fund cost centers 2340 (Fire – Emergency Services) and 2380 (Fire – Special Operations) for the anticipated expenditures in the current and upcoming fiscal year.

5B3. Approved a one-year contract renewal with ECMS, Inc. for cleaning, inspection, and repair of turnout clothing worn by the Fire Medical Rescue Department personnel.

Fiscal Impact: Total cost of this contract will not exceed $60,000 during the one-year renewal period. Sufficient funds have been appropriated in General Fund cost center 2340 (Fire – Emergency Services) for the anticipated expenditures in the current fiscal year.

5B4. Approved a one-year contract renewal with Redburn Tire Company to provide tire retreading services.

Fiscal Impact: Total cost of this one year contract renewal will not exceed $195,000. Sufficient funds have been appropriated in the General Fund – cost center 3262 (Fleet Maintenance) – for the anticipated expenditures.

5B5. Awarded a one-year contract with four, one-year renewal options to Leotek Electronics USA LLC for the purchase of LED traffic signal and pedestrian modules. (Contract #2016-100)

Fiscal Impact: Total cost of this one-year contract will not exceed $100,000. Sufficient funds have been budgeted in the Highway User Revenue Fund – cost center 3825 (Signal Systems) – for the anticipated expenditures.

5B6. Awarded a professional services contract to CivTech Inc. for design of new bus pullouts at various locations throughout Tempe. (Contract #2016-101)

Fiscal Impact: The professional services design contract amount is $440,163.80. Funds to cover this contract were approved and are appropriated for fiscal year 2015/16 in Capital Improvement Project No. 6006764, Bus Pullout Project.

5B7. Awarded job order no. 8 to CSW Contractors, Inc. for replacement of the water line along South Dorsey Lane from East 8th Street to East University Drive.

Fiscal Impact: The total job order amount is $539,907.34 and the project contingency amount is $53,000. Funds to cover this job order contract and related costs are appropriated for fiscal year 2015/16 in Capital Improvement Project No. 3204969, Water System Rehabilitation or Replacement of Aging Infrastructure.

5B8. Awarded a one-year contract with four, one-year renewal options to Conduit Language Specialists, Inc., for the provision of language monitoring and transcription services to be used by the Police Department. (Contract #2016-102)

Fiscal Impact: Total amount shall not exceed $500,000 over the one-year contract term. Sufficient funds have been appropriated in the Police Department Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) and Grants Fund, cost center 2222 (RICO – State Pass Through Costs) for the anticipated expenditures in the current and subsequent fiscal years.

C. Resolutions

5C1. Adopted RESOLUTION NO. R2016.48 authorizing the Chief of Police or designee(s), to accept funds from State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company to create traffic, pedestrian and home safety public service announcements. (Contract #2016-108)

Fiscal Impact: The amount of the total award is $10,000. This award will supplement the Police Department's existing General Fund budget appropriation. Sufficient budget appropriation for expenditure of this award was authorized in the Police Grants and Restricted Revenue Fund (Fund 45) as part of the fiscal year 2015-16 adopted budget.

5C2. Adopted RESOLUTION NO. R2016.49 to approve a one-year Intergovernmental Agreement establishing the enrollment of 18 Tempe Elementary School District schools in the Tempe Grease Cooperative and allowing for a City study to determine appropriate grease trap and interceptor cleaning schedules for school cafeterias. (Contract #2016-103)

Fiscal Impact: Total cost to the City for cleaning and maintenance activities associated with the frequency study shall not exceed $1,606.50. Sufficient funds are appropriated in the Water and Wastewater Fund – cost centers 3026 (Environmental Administration) and 3028 (Environmental Compliance).

5C3. Adopted RESOLUTION NO. R2016.50 to accept donations from Gannett Fleming, Inc. and PCL Construction, Inc. and authorize the use of such funds for the Tempe Town Lake Day Celebration.

Fiscal Impact: The total amount of the donations is $1,000 ($500 from Gannet Fleming, Inc. and $500 from PCL Construction, Inc.). Sufficient budget appropriations for the expenditure of the donations is authorized in the Restricted Revenue and Donations Fund (Fund 44, cost center 44107) as part of the fiscal year 2015-16 adopted budget.

6. NON-CONSENT AGENDA

A. Miscellaneous Items/Bids/Contracts/Resolutions

6A1. Contract with Express Scripts to provide pharmacy benefits management services for eligible City employees and dependents.

Councilmember Kuby requested to continue agenda item 6A1 to the May 26, 2016, Regular Council Meeting, to allow time to receive additional information about this agenda item, in response to concerns raised by a resident.

Motion by Councilmember Kuby to continue agenda item 6A1 to the May 26, 2016, Regular Council Meeting; second by Vice Mayor Woods. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote 6-0.

6A1. *Continued to the May 26, 2016, Regular Council meeting,* to approve a one-year contract renewal with Express Scripts to provide pharmacy benefits management services for eligible City employees and dependents.

Fiscal Impact: The total cost of this one-year contract renewal will not exceed $3,400,000. Sufficient funds will be appropriated in the Health Fund – cost center 4167 (Employees) and 4169 (Cobra Participants) – for the anticipated expenditures in the upcoming fiscal year. Effective date of the renewal is July 1, 2016.

B. Ordinances and Items for Introduction and First Hearing

*6B1. Ordinance for an Amended Planned Area Development and a Development Plan Review for FAIRFIELD INN & SUITES, 2222 South Priest Drive.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6B1. Mayor Mitchell closed the public hearing.

*6B1. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance for an Amended Planned Area Development and a Development Plan Review for a new five-story hotel in the GID Zoning District in Fountainhead Corporate Park for FAIRFIELD INN & SUITES, located at 2222 South Priest Drive. The applicant is Les Partch of Functional Formation Architecture. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.26)

Fiscal Impact: While this ordinance change does not directly impact revenue, the planned development will result in collection of the standard development fees, calculated according to the approved fee structure at the time of permit issuance.

---

*6B2. Ordinance approving the lease of City-owned property at Rio Salado Parkway and Mill Avenue, a development and disposition agreement, and leases and related documents.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6B2. Mayor Mitchell closed the public hearing.

*6B2. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance approving the lease of City-owned real property located at the intersection of Rio Salado Parkway and Mill Avenue, and authorizing the Mayor to execute a development and disposition agreement, one or more leases and related documents necessary to effect such leases and other transactions. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.27)

Fiscal Impact: The City will lease the "Mill Tract", "Hotel Tract" and the "Multipurpose Tract" for a period of ninety-nine (99) years. The rent for each of the Mill and Hotel Tracts will be an amount equal to $10,000 annually plus percentage rents that will commence on the 4th anniversary of the lease and range from 0.5% - 3.0% of specified revenue sources. The rent for the Multipurpose Tract will commence on the 4th anniversary of the lease and will range from 0.5% - 1.0%, of specified revenue sources.

---

*6B3. Ordinance granting a Utility Easement to Arizona Public Service Company on City-owned land, Tempe (Hayden) Butte.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6B3. Mayor Mitchell closed the public hearing.

*6B3. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance authorizing the granting of a Utility Easement to Arizona Public Service Company on certain City-owned land known as Tempe (Hayden) Butte. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.28)

Fiscal Impact: N/A

---

*6B4. Ordinance for a Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review for NEWMAN CENTER / THE MAXWELL ON COLLEGE, 712 South College Avenue.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing.

Trevor Barger, applicant representative, stated that staff will introduce agenda item 6B4.

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director – Planning, provided an overview of the proposed project. Mr. Levesque stated that the project consists of an 18 and a 20 story tower; student housing, office, and commercial space. The Development Review Commission (DRC) voted to approve the project with the deletion of the following three staff conditions: 1) provide the minimum number of residential parking spaces, as required by the Zoning and Development Code; 2) require an updated letter from Arizona State University (ASU) to confirm adequate parking for the church use; and, 3) provide a south bound right-turn lane on College Avenue. Staff recommends denial of the request based on the three conditions that the DRC eliminated. Staff would support the project, if those conditions were restored. The applicant has agreed to provide the southbound right-turn lane on College Avenue. Further discussion is needed regarding the reduction in parking spaces and the off-site parking agreement with the ASU Foundation Center. At the request of Vice Mayor Woods, Mr. Levesque clarified that the staff recommendation was to provide 444 parking spaces.

Councilmember Granville discussed the possibility of offering a month to month lease option that would allow tenants to remain operating, until construction begins. There have been instances in which long-time businesses close due to pending construction. Mr. Levesque stated that staff has drafted a Planned Area Development (PAD) stipulation stating that a demolition permit may not be issued unless the applicant/developer provides the City with a performance surety for

the construction of structures on the site. Alternatively, the applicant/developer may provide the City with verification of financial capacity for completion of the new construction. Most of the former tenants have vacated the premises; the City does not have control over that activity. Councilmember Granville requested additional information on ways to minimize the risk to long-time businesses, without infringing on property rights. Mr. Levesque stated that staff can address this in a holistic manner.

Mr. Barger displayed a map of the proposed project area and discussed the Newman Center's partnership with ASU as it relates to offering religious-based classes, building a dormitory, parking, density, and height of the project. A previously proposed dormitory project on the site was not built due to the impacts of the recent recession. Mr. Barger then provided a slide presentation regarding various aspects of the proposed project and outlined the various partners that are involved with the project.

Councilmember Kuby asked about the height of the existing and proposed dormitories. Mr. Barger stated Palo Verde Main is seven stories; Manzanita is fourteen stories of residential, including two levels of amenities.

Mr. Barger reviewed the three staff conditions of approval that were eliminated by the DRC and outlined the current bicycle and vehicle parking options for Newman Center visitors. Mayor Mitchell noted that ASU has submitted a letter to the City, objecting to the proposed project. Mr. Barger stated that ASU has specified that the parking at the ASU Foundation building could not be used for residential or commercial parking associated with The Maxwell project. There is an existing agreement for Newman Center visitors to use the ASU Foundation parking on weekends.

Mr. Barger introduced Father Robert Clements, Director, All Saints Catholic Newman Center, who spoke in support of the project. Father Clements discussed how the Newman Center's mission and identity has developed over the years. The commercial development partnership will extend the mission of the Newman Center to students and to the community.

Joseph Schimpp, Tempe, spoke in support of the project. The project will benefit the students and the University.

Wayne Rich, Tempe, spoke in support of the project. He discussed the benefits that students receive from faith-based student housing, including the positive influence it has on emotional and social development.

Mr. Barger asked audience members in support of the project to stand.

In response to questions from Mayor Mitchell, Mr. Barger stated that the applicant is not seeking any incentives for the project. However, there is a separate proposal for the creation of an art alley. The art alley project funding would not impact the 4% art fund for College Avenue and 7th Street, undergrounding powerlines, or paving the alley for The Newman Center/The Maxwell project. He discussed various activities that could occur in the proposed art alley. The funding request for the art alley is $1.1 million and would not impact The Newman Center/Maxwell project, if not funded.

Councilmember Kuby voiced concern about the project height of 20 stories; student lifestyles can lead to public safety issues in dense developments. She discussed the parking and traffic issues in the area and suggested waiting for the parking study to be completed before moving forward with this project.

Mr. Barger discussed research done on successful student housing projects such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) housing, which is similar in height to the proposed project. The applicant consulted with ASU on the Manzanita student housing project; a student survey was conducted, resulting in positive feedback. Concerns raised were regarding private balconies, the speed and size of elevators, and the need to have more than one community activity level. The proposed project incorporates retail amenities on the ground level, as well as amenities on levels four and eight, including a swimming pool. Elevators will automatically stop on levels four and eight. The Newman Center will provide programming and activities for students.

Mr. Barger stated that the parking study is a joint effort of the City and ASU. The parking study consultant, CivTech, has indicated that the study is not likely to be finished within the next few months. Various uses in the area have intensified the activity in this corridor. The Palo Verde Main student housing project has a higher density rate per acre with twice as many students, than the proposed project. The parking code does not take into account student housing parking

requirements. Transportation staff supports the College Avenue right-turn lane to improve traffic circulation. Mayor Mitchell acknowledged the intense traffic volume at College Avenue and University Drive.

Don Bessler, Public Works Director, noted that CivTech is conducting a master transportation and multi-modal study along this corridor. CivTech is in the data collection stage; it will take 60-90 days to a draft plan. Once completed, the plan will serve as a guideline for area planning.

Councilmember Granville discussed operational problems with the elevators in Manzanita. He voiced appreciation for the applicant addressing elevator and trash and recycling receptacles in the proposed project. The setback behind the church helps to compensate for concerns he has about the project height and density.

Councilmember Navarro stated that the project has been thoughtfully laid out in relation to the area, the use, the street front activity, and activating 7th Street. The project height is lower than what is allowed. He voiced support for the art alley proposal, and for the creative use of alleys, in general. He would also support a grocery store in the area. This is a congested area; various uses encourage the utilization of alternative modes of transit.

Vice Mayor Woods voiced appreciation for the quality building materials and for the applicant working with staff on the College Avenue right-turn lane. Due to parking concerns raised by staff and ASU, he suggested that the applicant work with staff and ASU officials to address the issue. The initial condition of approval was to require 444 parking spots; he would like to see more parking added back into the project. He suggested that the applicant meet with ASU officials prior to the second public hearing regarding public safety issues and the proposed property management company.

Councilmember Arredondo-Savage voiced appreciation for the quality and design of the proposed project. She thanked Father Clements for his comments and noted that the faith-based facility concept is new and of value. She stated that she also supports the art alley concept. She voiced concerns about inadequate parking, the project density and height, and the proposed property management company. She suggested collaborating with ASU officials on developing a property management plan.

Mayor Mitchell discussed his family's experiences with the Newman Center. He voiced support for the quality of the proposed project. His concerns are with the height, density, zero building setback on College Avenue, and parking. He stated that he does not believe it is a good practice for the City to incentivize student housing. In response to a question from Mayor Mitchell, Mr. Barger stated that the room rates would not be comparable to the ASU student housing rates. Financing for the project is in place. The plan is to begin construction this summer. Mayor Mitchell reiterated that ASU does not support the proposed project. He stated that he would be willing to meet with the applicant to discuss height and building setback issues.

Councilmember Schapira joined the meeting telephonically.

Councilmember Granville asked about the status of the Police Department approving a security plan for this project. Mr. Barger stated that the applicant is in the process of acquiring zoning. The Police Department has reviewed the project and has given permission to move the leasing office to the third floor. Mr. Levesque further clarified that the Police Department was involved in the initial review comments to the applicant; upon preparation of the building permits and construction plan, the Police Department will complete a second review and draft a security plan.

Councilmember Kuby asked if the project includes solar features. She noted that the traffic study should be completed in August, 2016, and may contain valuable information for this development. To put things in context, she clarified that the Palo Verde building is five to six stories for freshman student housing, whereas the proposed project will have mixed ages; MIT housing consists of graduate student housing, which decreases public safety issues; and, the reason Manzanita's height stayed the same is because it is a historic structure. She stated that she would like to see plans formulated with ASU to ensure continuity and sustainability as it relates to the management company's underlying philosophies.

Councilmember Schapira stated that this is a busy location and suggested waiting for the results of the traffic study before moving forward with the project.

Vice Mayor Woods asked staff to report back to the City Council regarding when the traffic study is expected to be completed.

The public hearing was closed.

*6B4. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance for a Planned Area Development Overlay and approve a Development Plan Review for a new mixed-use development containing 295 dwelling units, restaurant, retail, office, classroom, and church uses for NEWMAN CENTER / THE MAXWELL ON COLLEGE (PL150419), located at 712 South College Avenue. The applicant is Maxwell Tempe, LLC. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.29)

Fiscal Impact: While this ordinance change does not directly impact revenue, the planned development will result in collection of the standard development fees, calculated according to the approved fee structure at the time of permit issuance.

---

*6B5. Ordinance authorizing the abandonment of waterline easements located near 500 and 508 West First Street.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6B5. The public hearing was closed.

*6B5. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance authorizing the abandonment of waterline easements located near 500 and 508 West First Street. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.30)

Fiscal Impact: N/A

---

*6B6. Ordinance amending Chapter 2, Article II, Division 2, Tempe City Code, relating to the appointment and qualifications of judges and commissioners.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance and opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6B6. The public hearing was closed.

*6B6. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 2, Article II, Division 2, Tempe City Code, Section 2-26 relating to the appointment and qualifications of judges, and Section 2-34 relating to the appointment and qualifications of commissioners. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.31)

Fiscal Impact: There is no direct cost to the City from the proposed amendments.

---

*6B7. Ordinance for a Planned Area Development and a Development Plan Review for 9TH AND WILSON, 431 W. 9th Street.

Mayor Mitchell introduced the ordinance, opened the public hearing, and invited the applicant to provide a presentation.

Joe Risi, applicant representative, provided an overview of the proposed project, staff recommendations, neighborhood outreach, and neighborhood feedback. During the outreach process, the 1998 to 2002 Northwest Tempe Neighborhood Strategic Plan was reviewed; the plan was never adopted. The applicant worked with neighborhood liaison, Sarah Capawana, who provided neighborhood feedback to the applicant. Based on that feedback, a new plan was developed.

Mr. Risi stated that the proposed residential project consists of a 2-story building with 6 units on 15,000 square feet of property. No changes to zoning or density are being requested. He outlined various project elements including the quality of the project design and materials. The project was approved by the Development Review Commission (DRC) on April 12, 2016, subject to certain conditions regarding the landscape plan and the windows facing 9th Street; City staff supports the project. He displayed photographs of several properties in the area and noted that Ms. Capawana has recanted her initial support of the project. He stated that Tempe is landlocked; the proposed project is needed.

In response to a comment from Councilmember Kuby, Mr. Risi stated that his intent in displaying pictures of the neighborhood is in response to letters sent to the City Council stating that the project does not fit the character of the neighborhood. One resident described trash in the neighborhood, poor quality construction, and termite infested homes. He stated that this project will increase the quality of housing in the neighborhood. A concern with any development project is that property values will decline; area residents have expressed concern that this project would increase property values, and in turn increase rental rates. He noted that the City has the option to waive the renter's tax or not charge sales tax on the sale of new homes to aid in the affordability of housing. He believes that this project fits the character, and is compatible, with the neighborhood.

Jerry Palmer, Palmer Architects, provided a slide presentation on the proposed project. He discussed the site, building design and materials, parking, and the landscape plan. He outlined various project elements of this single family project. Neighborhood resident feedback has been incorporated into the current plan.

In response to questions from Vice Mayor Woods, Mr. Palmer explained that the Planned Area Development (PAD) request is to: 1) reduce the front yard setback from 20' to 13'; and, 2) reduce the side yard setback to so that the building height can be lowered. The applicant has collaborated with neighbors and has been responsive to their feedback. As a result, additional landscaping and windows have been added to the plan and the roof height has been lowered. Vice Mayor Woods stated that there are neighborhood residents that still have concerns about the project.

In response to Councilmember Kuby, Mr. Palmer stated that he did not have a picture of the proposed project in the context of the surrounding buildings, given the time spent on the initial design and the subsequent effort to develop the current design. Councilmember Kuby noted that the character of the area includes setbacks and the sense of green and trees, which provides a cooling effect; the tree canopy will be impacted by the project. Mr. Palmer referenced the creative landscaping design in the proposed plan.

In response to questions from Vice Mayor Woods, Mr. Palmer stated that R-3 zoning allows for 6.4 units to be built; no change or increase to the zoning is being requested. The requested PAD will result in a better product. The original project had a PAD request for additional building height and tandem garages.

Councilmember Kuby discussed the possibility of reducing the project to four houses with an increase in setbacks to alleviate some of the neighborhood opposition. Mr. Palmer stated that the project fits the character of the neighborhood and is within the allowable zoning density; there are several contemporary projects in the neighborhood that are higher density. Community Development staff have requested more single-family products.

Mayor Mitchell asked for clarification of the PAD amendment. Mr. Palmer restated the setbacks being requested. If granted, bay windows will be incorporated into the project. In order to reduce the height, keep the quality of development, and provide private yards, the requested PAD amendment is needed for the setbacks.

In response to Councilmember Kuby's comment on the cooling effect of trees, Mr. Risi stated that the proposal includes a lush landscaping plan; there should not be a greater standard imposed on this project than what is in the neighborhood. Many of the surrounding areas have desert landscaping and asphalt. Councilmember Kuby stated that to replace the existing landscaping with a structure would increase the urban heat island effect in the area by reducing the tree canopy.

Mr. Risi noted that neighborhood growth should not be set aside due to the temperature impacts. The plans call for more trees than what currently exist on the property. He emphasized that the zoning allows up to 6.4 units for the lot, and the applicant is proposing to build six units.

In response to Vice Mayor Woods, Mr. Risi stated that it would not make economic sense to build four units versus six units on this lot. He outlined the project fees and costs involved. The houses would need to cost approximately $525,000 each, in order for the project to break even.

Councilmember Arredondo-Savage voiced support of homeownership products and discussed the importance of creating a balance of homeownership opportunities in Tempe. She asked if it would be possible to move forward with this project, without the requested setbacks. Mr. Risi stated the project provides 50% more parking than what is needed, with a total of 16 spaces, to address the neighborhood concerns about on-street parking. If two of the guest parking spaces were eliminated along Wilson Street, it would decrease the setback request and allow for increased landscaping. Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director – Planning, clarified that each single family unit is required to have two spaces; there is no guest parking requirement. Mr. Risi discussed project design alternatives if the PAD is not granted.

Mayor Mitchell opened the public hearing.

Phil Amorosi, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. He compared the Hudson Manor neighborhood to the 9th and Wilson neighborhood, both of which consist of small homes on large, flood-irrigated lots. It is important to preserve the green, open space. The plans shown do not reflect how close the setback is to the adjacent property. It is unfortunate that the underlying zoning was changed to allow for more density; this is not the right time or location for this project.

Philip Yates, Tempe, President of the Riverside Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to the project. He stated that six units are too dense for the area; four units, flood irrigation to the lot, and additional trees, would be more acceptable. Residents do not support this type of development. He believes that this project will turn into rental properties.

Sally Wittlinger, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that the project is too large for the location; it will severely impact the character of the neighborhood and set a precedent for the neighborhood. She described the neighborhood and stated that she lives two blocks south of the proposed project. The desire to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood will emerge during the Character Area 3 planning process. According to the General Plan 2040, this property is located in a Cultural Resource Area, which is culturally significant to the character of Tempe. She requested that the City Council oppose the PAD overlay.

In response to questions from Councilmembers, Ms. Wittlinger stated that while the current plan is an improvement from the original plan, the project is still too large. She feels that half of the plan, placed towards the back of the lot to maintain a large green front yard, would be more acceptable. This neighborhood is made up of small, single-family homes with large front yards and trees. She stated that she is unsure if the craftsman design fits in a neighborhood that consists mostly of block homes. The project would still be too large even if the parking spaces in the front were removed; the farther the project is away from the street, the better the project will be. She is also opposed to a project that is similar to the apartment building across the street from this location.

Councilmember Navarro noted that a 22-unit apartment complex was recently approved in the area, but did not require City Council approval. This property is zoned R-3; property rights could be impacted. If the project is denied, the applicant could return with a project that could be worse for the neighborhood; the proposed project has the potential to be owner occupied, versus rental properties. Ms. Wittlinger stated that she fears that a precedent will be set in this area, if approved. There is a difference between development on University Drive and development within the interior of neighborhoods.

Councilmember Granville stated that he is concerned that if this project is denied, the next proposal for this property may be less desirable, and may not require City Council review or approval. Proposition 207 prevents the City Council from downzoning neighborhood properties, which would devalue the land. He suggested exploring a new requirement that the City Council begin reviewing all R-3 zoning projects.

Councilmember Kuby discussed the importance of developers engaging the neighborhood at the beginning of the process. In this case, at the first neighborhood meeting, a number of residents indicated that they had received a letter from Mr. Risi, offering to buy their homes, which shows the intent to continue this type of development throughout the neighborhood.

Linda Knutson, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that she is a neighborhood resident and has worked on various issues concerning the neighborhood, such as installing public art. She outlined the challenges the neighborhood has and stated that she would like to see development that enhances the character of the neighborhood, versus destroying it.

Councilmember Navarro corrected his earlier comment on the 22-unit apartment complex, which has not yet been approved. At Councilmember Navarro's request, Mr. Levesque clarified that the setback reduction requests under consideration are on the south side of the property, from 10' to 5'; west side, from 20' to 13'; and, north side parking area from 20' to 3'. Councilmember Navarro stated that without going through this process, the applicant could maximize this project, similar to the apartment complex across the street, which might not be a better project or representative of the neighborhood. Councilmember Kuby stated that if that were the case, the applicant would not get his selling price or be proud of his legacy. She stated that this proposal is a threat; she does not support a project this large in a neighborhood of older, single family homes.

Karyn Gitlis, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She discussed her contributions and preservation efforts regarding the Maple-Ash historic neighborhood over the past 30 years and outlined various elements of the neighborhood that have been areas of focus. Over the years, boards and commissions and the City Council have approved multi-family projects that included requested entitlements, variances, PAD's, and Use Permits, in spite of the residents' requests to not do so. She noted that she is a constituent, and asked the City to develop a plan to preserve the eldest, historic neighborhoods. She stated that she supports Councilmember Kuby's comments and agrees that R-3 zoning projects should be reviewed by the City Council.

Joan Bahamonde, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that she owns property across the street from the proposed project; the current proposal will negatively impact the quality of life in the neighborhood. She requested that the City Council deny the applicant's request for a PAD overlay and suggested a moratorium on these types of developments until the Character Area Plan guidelines are developed. The neighbors that she has spoken with agree that this is not the best project for the neighborhood. The density of the project needs to be addressed and should be respectful of the surrounding single family homes, which are on large lots.

Therese Lucier, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that she lives one block south of the proposed development and thinks that the project is too dense for the neighborhood. This project will raise the temperature in the neighborhood and it will turn into student housing, which is not conducive to the neighborhood character.

Sarah Capawana, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that she owns a home across the street from the proposed project. She has worked with Mr. Risi and the Wilson neighborhood residents to modify the original plans. At the April Development Review Commission (DRC) meeting, she hesitantly supported the project. Since that time, she has decided that the project is not in the best interest of the neighborhood; it is too dense. In this evening's presentation, Mr. Risi failed to provide photographs of the historic homes on Wilson Street. She would support the project with four houses. Three of the units face the next door neighbor's driveway and front door. She asked the City Council to protect the neighborhood and vote no on this request.

Remo Paul, Phoenix, spoke in support of the project. He stated that he is a real estate agent and that millennials comprise 30% of home buyers. There is a lack of new, single family homes in Tempe. Higher density is in demand. He disagreed with the earlier comments regarding the heat island effect. Mr. Risi has legal rights to his land use and he does good work.

Nick Adamakis, Tempe, spoke in support of the project. He described the difficult time he had finding a new, single family home that was close to Arizona State University, public transportation, and amenities, until he found Mr. Risi's Tempe Newport project. Tempe Newport is an infill project that improved the neighborhood. Mr. Risi has acted in good faith and

has taken the neighbors' concerns into consideration. The City's goal and vision is to provide a vibrant and diverse urban community.

Ben Funke, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. He stated that the PAD request is important to Mr. Risi; however, the project does not benefit neighborhood residents. Mr. Risi can build the six units, without the PAD overlay. The project has obtained DRC approval, and at that meeting Mr. Risi provided several variances from 2002 that apply to the property. Mr. Levesque has confirmed that those variances are no longer valid. Even though the existing R-3 zoning allows up to 20 dwelling units per acre, Mr. Risi has not produced a plan that conforms to the existing zoning. Many of the existing R-3 parcels in the neighborhood are far below the maximum level of density.

Dustin Short, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. He voiced support for requiring a City Council review for all R-3 zoned projects located in cultural neighborhoods. This developer builds high quality products such as the Newport project; however, the proposed stick and stucco construction is a decrease in building quality, compared to surrounding homes. The Newport project was approved for approximately 38 building units, but only eight units have been built, which shows that there is not a market demand for $500,000 homes. The property is zoned R-3 which allows for six dwelling units per acre. He requested clarification on whether the PAD includes a designation for single family or multi-family housing. The requested PAD is for attached single family homes with zero setbacks for the property lines between the units, which make the units multi-family.

In response to questions from Councilmembers, Mr. Levesque stated that as a detached product, the developer could possibly build three units on individual lots, with setbacks. The property is zoned R-3, which allows for up to 20 dwellings per acre. The applicant is proposing six units on individual lots, with the common wall serving as the property line between the units. The request is to release the boundary around the sides of the property adjacent to the street and property lines.

Catherine Mancini, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She noted that the Newport project is appropriate for its location; however, that type of project is not appropriate for the proposed location. She noted the misconception that if the PAD is not granted, the developer can build six, single family homes. She clarified that the developer can build six units, but the development would be townhomes, condominiums, or apartments, which is appropriate for a neighborhood that is comprised of 80% renters. She disagreed with earlier comments regarding the millennial generation's housing preferences. She fears a domino effect will occur, if this project is approved.

Briannin Gross, Phoenix, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that she is a millennial who likes big yards. Developments like the proposed project are the reason it is difficult to find affordable housing in Tempe.

Justin Stewart, Tempe, Chair of the Mitchell Park Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to the project. He discussed the history in the Maple-Ash, Wilson Arts District, and the Mitchell Park neighborhoods. Historically, there has been opposition to high density projects in the Mitchell Park neighborhood, in order to preserve the post-war historic homes and green spaces. He urged the City Council to listen to the neighbors and preserve the character of the historic neighborhood.

Laura Stewart, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She stated that the project does not fit the character of this historic neighborhood, including the price point of existing homes. The project consists of high density, expensive homes, on a lot which currently has one small, single family home. The purchase price of the proposed units will be well above the value of most of the surrounding residences. At approximately $475,000 each, the units will be unaffordable to employees working in the area. The developer should have to make a concession to reduce the number of units or the price of some of the units; if the PAD is denied, the developer will have to make some concessions. Approval of this project would set a precedent.

Bryan Choate, Scottsdale, spoke in support of the project. He stated that he is a real estate broker. This single family project is appropriate and will increase the value of the neighborhood; it is unique and aesthetically pleasing. There is a demand for this type of development and price point in the $400,000 to $500,000 range. The only other location in Tempe that offers this type of housing is in south Tempe.

Councilmember Granville discussed the lack of affordable housing available in Tempe for young people and families. The neighbors are concerned that the project is too expensive for young families, and for single people. While the City has an obligation to select the highest and best use of the property, it also has an obligation to have a place where existing residents can afford to live. This development will change Tempe.

Mario Martinez, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. He noted that primarily real estate brokers and an out of state developer have voiced their support for the project; whereas the neighbors are opposed to the project. He questioned why Mr. Risi displayed photographs showing poor conditions within the neighborhood and urged the City Council to reject the proposal.

Sandra (last name not provided), spoke in support of the project. She stated that she is a millennial and lives at the Newport project. There is a market for this project, as all of the units at the Newport project have been sold, with three units yet to be developed. She stated that she agrees with the number of units being proposed; change is inevitable. She stated that Mr. Risi is the best developer for this project. The Newport development took over a year to complete because it is a quality product.

Darlene Justus, Tempe, spoke in opposition to the project. She voiced concern about the developer's unfavorable comments and photographs of the neighborhood. The variances that were needed resulted in three setback requests. The fact that the developer needs this PAD overlay to connect the homes was not brought up until the City was asked to define the zoning. If approved, she is concerned about the type of future projects that may be located in these neighborhoods.

Mayor Mitchell clarified that the PAD request relates only to the property setbacks.

Drew Sullivan, Tempe, business owner, spoke in opposition to the project. He referenced various historic properties in Tempe and urged the City Council to listen to the neighbors.

Bonnie Gerepka, Tempe, discussed a news article regarding millennials' habits, living area preferences, the median home price paid by millennials, and student debt. She discussed the importance of preserving green spaces and credited Councilmember Arredondo-Savage for stating that neighborhoods are the foundation of this community.

Mayor Mitchell closed the public hearing and invited the applicant to make closing remarks.

Mr. Risi emphasized that he has a vested interest in the community. He is requesting a PAD overlay to allow three variances for property setbacks. The project is within the current zoning, density, and height requirements. Regarding his comments at a previous DRC meeting about variances from 2002 granted to this property, he was told by City staff that those variances are attached to the land. His intent in displaying the photographs was not to criticize the neighborhood, but instead to illustrate what is actually in the neighborhood; the neighborhood is not all lush landscaping, flood irrigation, and large setbacks. There are a mixture people and properties in the neighborhood, including historic homes, apartment buildings, and homes in disrepair. Affordable housing is a much larger problem and needs to be addressed in every community. The technology industry is looking for nice properties and neighborhoods to attract the quality of employees that they desire; if that is not available in Tempe, they will choose another community. He stated that he owns the property and that it has to be developed. The neighbors do not want him to build the density that was allowed at the time the property was purchased. He is requesting to build quality homes with lush landscaping that will enhance and be compatible with the neighborhood. There will be people that will be able to afford to live in this development. Change is inevitable. He requested support of this project.

Councilmember Kuby stated that being opposed to the size of the project does not mean that the neighbors are afraid of change. Some of the neighbors have indicated that they would support four houses that fit the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Risi stated that the proposed project is somewhat expensive; it is his responsibility to sell the units.

Mayor Mitchell stated that no action will be taken at this time; the second public hearing is scheduled for May 26, 2016. In the interim, he stated that he would like to meet with various community members concerning the project.

Jerry Palmer, Palmer Architects, discussed the difference between PAD's and R-3 zoning districts. He noted that R-3 zoning is outdated; the City Council loses a lot of control, rights are relinquished and the applicant also has very little say. The City Council has more control with PAD zoning. Mayor Mitchell cautioned Mr. Palmer regarding the nature of his comments. Mr. Palmer clarified that his intent was to point out that there is more control under a PAD process. He stated that he did not hear any constructive criticisms from neighbors tonight. He has worked with the neighbors to integrate a historical product within the neighborhood.

Councilmember Granville stated that he has struggled to determine what it is that the neighbors want in their neighborhood. In this case, he thinks that the neighbors want three or four units at a cost of $200,000 or less per unit to maintain the character of the neighborhood, making it affordable to live in the area. However, the applicant has indicated that he cannot build the project for that price.

Councilmember Arredondo-Savage thanked everyone for their participation in this process. She discussed the changes over time to the neighborhood; change happens. Her responsibility is to ensure that the proposed change is the best thing for that neighborhood. She respects property rights and understands why the neighbors value projects that fit the character of their neighborhood. She fears the possibility of ending up with a project that the City and neighbors do not want. She and the Mayor would like the opportunity to meet with the residents to try to reach a compromise. R-3 zoning allows for the ability to build six units, which will happen, in some form. She supports projects that offer home ownership. Infill projects are challenging and are not inexpensive.

Councilmember Navarro voiced support of the Mayor meeting with the neighbors and the developer in an attempt to reach a compromise. It is a passion of Tempe and its neighborhoods to protect these special areas. It is difficult to view the situation as having some control versus having no control. This project presents housing options for individuals that want to downsize and live in a transit-oriented area. He voiced his willingness to participate in a neighborhood meeting.

Mayor Mitchell thanked residents for providing input.

*6B7. Introduced and held the first public hearing to adopt an ordinance for a Planned Area Development and approve a Development Plan Review for six single-family homes, for 9TH AND WILSON, located at 431 W. 9th Street. The applicant is Jerry Palmer of Palmer Architects. The second and final public hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2016. (Ordinance No. O2016.32)

Fiscal Impact: While this ordinance change does not directly impact revenue, the planned development will result in collection of the standard development fees, calculated according to the approved fee structure at the time of permit issuance.

C. Ordinances and Items for Second Hearing and Final Adoption

*6C1. Ordinance granting a power distribution easement to Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District over City-owned land near Desert Cross Lutheran Church, 8600 South McClintock Drive, and an easement agreement and related documents.

Mayor Mitchell opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6C1. The public hearing was closed.

Motion by Vice Mayor Woods to approve agenda item 6C1; second by Councilmember Granville. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote 7-0.

*6C1. Held the second and final public hearing and adopted ORDINANCE NO. O2016.23 authorizing the granting of a power distribution easement to Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District over certain City-owned land near Desert Cross Lutheran Church, 8600 South McClintock Drive, and authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute an easement agreement and related documents. (Contract #2016-104)

Fiscal Impact: No impact on City funds.

---

*6C2. Ordinance amending Chapter 2, Article VIII, of the Tempe City Code relating to human relations.

Mayor Mitchell opened the public hearing. There was no discussion or public comment on agenda item 6C2. Mayor Mitchell closed the public hearing.

Motion by Councilmember Granville to approve agenda item 6C2; second by Vice Mayor Woods. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote 7-0.

*6C2. Held the second and final public hearing and adopted ORDINANCE NO. O2016.25 amending Chapter 2, Article VIII, of the Tempe City Code relating to human relations.

Fiscal Impact: There is no direct cost to the City from the proposed amendments.

---

*6C3. *This agenda item has been withdrawn at the request of the Applicant. No further action will be taken on this item.* ~~Hold the second and final public hearing to adopt an ordinance for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and approve a Development Plan Review for a 13-story mixed-use development, containing 281 dwelling units and 1,641 square feet of retail for LOT 1@ FARMER ARTS DISTRICT – PARCEL 1, located at 707 South Farmer Avenue. The applicant is Charles Huellmantel, Huellmantel & Affiliates. *(This item was continued from the March 17, 2016 and April 14, 2016 Regular Council Meetings)* (Ordinance No. O2016.17)~~

---

7. CURRENT EVENTS/COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Councilmember Schapira
- Friday, May 13, 2016 – Tempe Community Council's Commitment to Schools annual breakfast.

Councilmember Kuby
- Wednesday, May 11, 2016 – Tempe Community Action Agency (TCAA) celebrated its 50th anniversary.
- Congratulations to Vice Mayor Woods on receiving the Barbara R. Norton Service Award from TCAA.

Councilmember Arredondo-Savage
- Congratulations to Vice Mayor Woods on receiving the Barbara R. Norton Service Award from TCAA.
- Wished her son happy birthday.
- Congratulations to school graduates, including her son.

Councilmember Navarro

- Congratulations to Vice Mayor Woods on receiving the Barbara R. Norton Service Award from TCAA.

Vice Mayor Woods

- Thanked his colleagues for their support on homeless and human services' needs.
- June 23, 2016 will be the last Regular City Council for him, participating as a Councilmember.

Mayor Mitchell

- Tempe Town Lake is open for boating and water activities.
- Saturday, May 14, 2016 – Tempe Town Lake Day event at Tempe Center for the Arts.
- Congratulations to Vice Mayor Woods on receiving the Barbara R. Norton Service Award from TCAA.
- Happy 50th anniversary to TCAA.
- Congratulations to Tempe High School graduates.
- Wished his daughter happy birthday.

8. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

A. Scheduled – None.

B. Unscheduled

Alfredo Lopez Fabian, Tempe, (Rosa Inchausti, Office of Strategic Management and Diversity Director, translated from Spanish). Mr. Fabian discussed an incident with a police officer; unjust treatment of Hispanic community members; and, that the Hispanic community fears this particular police officer.

Abelino Lopez, Tempe, (Rosa Inchausti, Office of Strategic Management and Diversity Director, translated from Spanish). Mr. Lopez stated that he represents the Chaparral community. He reiterated the previous speaker's comments. He believes that Police Officer, David Lewis, is profiling. He has discussed concerns raised in the community with the officer. He requested an opportunity to speak with the new Police Chief regarding this issue.

Karin Lopez, Tempe, discussed an incident where an innocent man was detained by a corrupt police officer. The system should be fair; people should not be treated differently based on their skin color. She fears this police officer.

Dr. Sylvia Herrera, Phoenix, spoke on behalf Chaparral Mobile Village residents, as well as the Spanish speaking Tempe residents. She stated that she contacted the Tempe Professional Standards Bureau (Bureau) about the appeal process relating to Mr. Fabian's case. She discussed the information provided to her regarding the Civilian Review Panel members, the Panel member appointment process, and meeting frequency. She questioned the panel's accountability to the public. She stated that the Panel protects the police, who racially profile. The Bureau should be transparent about the number of complaints and appeals. The Spanish speaking community is concerned about racial profiling, and specifically this police officer.

Salvador Reza, Phoenix, spoke on behalf of the residents of the Chaparral Mobile Village residents. This police officer has deported more people than any other officer according to the Professional Standards Bureau (Bureau) report. The Bureau, the Review Panel, and the County Attorney have indicated that the police officer did nothing wrong. This police officer racially profiles. This problem will attract the attention of the community and the United States Department of Justice. The situation can be addressed, with the assistance of the new Police Chief.

Mayor Mitchell stated that Tempe Police Chief, Sylvia Moir, will meet with the speakers after the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

I, Brigitta M. Kuiper, the duly-appointed City Clerk of the City of Tempe, Maricopa County, Arizona, do hereby certify the above to be the minutes of the Regular City Council meeting of May 12, 2016, by the Tempe City Council, Tempe, Arizona.

_____
Mark W. Mitchell, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Brigitta M. Kuiper, City Clerk