

**MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL WORKSESSION/ROUNDTABLE**  
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YUMA, ARIZONA  
CONFERENCE ROOM 190, YUMA CITY HALL  
ONE CITY PLAZA, YUMA, ARIZONA  
**October 20, 2009**  
**3:00 p.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Mayor Nelson** called the City Council meeting to order.

Councilmembers Present: Shoop, Mendoza, Beeson, McClendon, Nicholls, Johnson and Mayor Nelson  
Councilmembers Absent: none  
Staffmembers Present: City Administrator, Mark S. Watson  
Deputy City Administrator, Bob Stull  
Director of Engineering, Paul Brooberg  
Director of Community Development, Laurie Lineberry  
Principal Planner, Jennifer Albers  
Various Department Heads or their representative  
City Clerk, Brigitta M. Kuiper

**I. MAJOR ROADWAYS PLAN**

**Traffic Patterns:** Area bounded by 24<sup>th</sup> Street, 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, Pacific Avenue and Arizona Avenue

**Brooberg** reiterated previously stated increase in percentages of traffic flow on the four streets listed above, noting, however, that Arizona Avenue has experienced an 8% to 10% downturn in traffic and 32<sup>nd</sup> Street has experienced a 3% increase.

**Brooberg** presented the following:

Areas of concern within the specified area:

- Arizona Avenue and Palo Verde Street non-standard intersection
  - Correcting the alignment would require the purchase of right-of-way at the northwest corner
- Winsor Avenue's access onto 32<sup>nd</sup> Street
  - 32<sup>nd</sup> Street will be within the City's jurisdiction within six months
  - Fortuna Avenue's access to 32<sup>nd</sup> Street needs to be studied because it will become the gateway in and out of the airport.
    - A traffic light is needed at this spot to break up the traffic and allow drivers to make U-turns
  - Staff will undertake a mini-corridor study of the Winsor Avenue and Fortuna Avenue section of 32<sup>nd</sup> Street after the first of the year.
  - An informal survey of driver's exiting onto 32<sup>nd</sup> Street from Winsor found that they were headed west or to points farther east than Walmart.
- The Palo Verde wall
  - In 1987, the owner of the property on the south side of Palo Verde Street obtained an encroachment permit to construct the Palo Verde wall, with the intention of stopping the drifting sand and tumbleweeds.

- Since the construction of the wall, the area has fully developed.
- Several unofficial studies performed in connection with various other projects have reviewed the wall and found no justification for not allowing thru traffic onto Palo Verde Street.
- This situation will also be studied by staff in the mini-corridor study mentioned above.

#### Discussion

- How will the demolition of the old Sky Chief restaurant affect the intersection?
  - Minimal impact; the current roadway configurations are adequate to traffic needs.
- The study of Winsor and Fortuna Avenues, as well as Palo Verde Street and Pacific Avenue, will begin after the first of the year with findings becoming available in April 2010.
  - This study will be assigned to one of the City's transportation consultants.
- A Capital Improvement Program includes a project for the Palo Verde wall within the next 10 years.
  - Estimated cost of removing the wall: \$135,000

#### **10<sup>th</sup> Street from Avenue A to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

##### **Lineberry presented the following:**

- Four blocks, designated as a Collector, requires the purchase of an additional 20 feet to create an 80-foot wide roadway.
  - Impacts every home on block
- Staff recommends changing the designation to a Local street, reducing the roadway width to 58 feet with no turn lane.
  - Eliminate on-street parking
  - Would have three lanes of traffic – two lanes in each direction with a center lane for left turns – and a bicycle lane, curb, gutter and sidewalk on either side.
  - Would require very little additional right-of-way only from corners
- The current right-of-way is 62 feet.

#### Discussion

- Why make any changes given the nature of the area; it's essentially a residential street?
  - Changing the designation would remove the requirement for future development to dedicate right-of-way for an 80 foot road.
  - The street was designated as a Collector because it connects an Arterial, Avenue A, and another Collector, 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  - The recommendation is to downgrade it.
- Eliminating on-street parking would make the streets less congested, making it less necessary to perform costly widening.
- 12<sup>th</sup> Street is the main street connecting to the valley; the area has a number of high density dwellings.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> Avenue from 6<sup>th</sup> Street to 16<sup>th</sup> Street**

##### **Lineberry presented the following:**

- The majority of this section of roadway is currently designated Arterial; that section north of 8<sup>th</sup>

Street is a Collector.

- Currently, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue has an 80-foot of right-of-way, though north of 8<sup>th</sup> Street the street is not constructed to its full right-of-way width.
  - The street could be reconfigured without the need to acquire any further right-of-way and without the need for a right turn lane.
- South of 8<sup>th</sup> Street is a well-used alternative to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue jogs at 14<sup>th</sup> Place where the right-of-way then narrows to 60 feet
- Staff will probably be seeking to cul-de-sac 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 16<sup>th</sup> Street; 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue must be restricted in some way at this point.

#### Discussion

- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue north of 16<sup>th</sup> Street is functioning as a Collector or Minor Arterial and south of 16<sup>th</sup> Street as residential.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 16<sup>th</sup> Street does not align correctly
  - When 16<sup>th</sup> Street is rebuilt, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue south of 16<sup>th</sup> Street should not be made an Arterial; the dog-leg should be eliminated, creating the possibility of a one-way couplet with 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.
- 16<sup>th</sup> Street widening will take more off the north side of the street than the south.
- Providing for right turns at 6<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenues for eastbound traffic on 16<sup>th</sup> Street is being grappled with by 16<sup>th</sup> Street design consultants.
- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue is too close to the 16<sup>th</sup> Street/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection to be a continuous north/south route.
- The City has just purchased right-of-way at 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue to be the mid crossing between 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Avenue A.
- Staff is considering a number of options.
- Southbound drivers on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue are circumventing the intersection with 16<sup>th</sup> Street by cutting east at 15<sup>th</sup> Place in order to access 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue south.
  - The City is in negotiations with the owner of the old movie theater for their building at the northwest corner of 16<sup>th</sup> Street/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and related parking; once the City owns the property, 15<sup>th</sup> Place will cease to be a roadway.
  - Access to the 16<sup>th</sup> Street/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection corner must be figured out in order to allow those corners to develop and be used commercially.

**Brooberg** summarized staff's recommendation: 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue from 8<sup>th</sup> Street to 14<sup>th</sup> Street to be designated as a Collector, requiring no additional rights-of-way, with the exception of at 12<sup>th</sup> Street, where right turns may be required.

## II. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

**Albers** briefed the City Council on the schedule for updating the City of Yuma General Plan; highlights follow:

- State Statutes require the General Plan to be updated within 10 years of its last adoption, November 2002.
- The schedule leads up to approval of the plan by the City Council in late 2011 and before voters in 2012.

- The Planning and Zoning Commission are involved in reviewing the plan prior to consideration by the City Council.
- A number of public hearings and open houses before the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council are required and planned.
  - The process used to approve the 2002 General Plan was successful and will be used as a model for this revision.
- State Statutes have been revised to include two new elements:
  - Energy Element: addresses efficient use of energy and greater uses of renewable energy
  - Neighborhood Preservation and Revitalization Element: focuses on promoting home ownership and maintenance
- City staff will work with other agencies, as necessary.

#### Discussion

- The 208 Plan is a countywide wastewater management plan that was incorporated into the City's General Plan. Since 2002, the City's Public Works Department has developed the Water and Sewer Integrated Master Plan, which staff will be looking to incorporate into the upcoming revisions.
  - Yuma County is working with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to update the 208 Plan, with greater County involvement.
- The difficult area will be transportation.
- Revising the General Plan will not mean that the various elements have to be upgraded from scratch. The City has been busy over the last 10 years updating various plans that will be incorporated into the General Plan.

### III. FINANCIAL UPDATE

Stull gave a brief financial update, as follows:

- General Fund: 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter - comparison 2009 to 2010
  - Sales tax revenues
    - 2010 budgeted: \$4,686,300
    - Actual: \$3,838,211
    - 18% below budget
- Car sales taxes will be received next month
- State shared revenues are as budgeted though they are moving down
  - Current year: \$2.8 million; next year: less than \$2 million
  - State sales tax revenues have dropped 5% from last year
  - Local and state sales tax revenues will continue to be the focus of staff's concerns.
- Construction sales taxes were negative in September, which will require investigation.
- Revenues are at 92.66% of budget
- Expenditure cuts have been effective and ongoing.
- Staff will continue to look for ways to generate revenues and make sure all revenues that should be received are collected.
- Revenues fluctuate from month to month, whereas, personnel expenditures are a constant.
  - Much of the General Fund supports personnel costs.
- Yuma is faring better than other Arizona areas.

