***PLEASE NOTE: Since the Glendale City Council does not take formal action at the Workshops, Workshop minutes are not approved by the City Council.**

MINUTES
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP
April 12, 2005
1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Elaine M. Scruggs, Vice Mayor Thomas R. Eggleston, and Councilmembers Joyce V. Clark, Steven E. Frate, David M. Goulet, H. Phillip Lieberman, and Manuel D. Martinez

ALSO PRESENT: Ed Beasley, City Manager; Pam Kavanaugh, Assistant City Manager; Craig Tindall, City Attorney; and Pamela Hanna, City Clerk

1. FISCAL YEAR 2005-06 BUDGET: 5TH WORKSHOP

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM:

This is a request for the Council to review the budget requests for the Glendale Onboard (GO) Program. Specifically, the following will be presented to Council regarding the GO Program:

- FY2006-2015 Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (CIP);
- the recommended FY05-06 supplemental requests for operating and maintenance (O&M) costs related to capital projects coming on line in FY05-06; and
- the operating budget and operating budget supplemental requests.

This is also a request for the City Council to review the supplemental requests for the Stadium/Westgate projects and events related to the sports and entertainment center, where the arena and the stadium are located.

In addition, material not covered at the April 5, 2005 budget workshop, because of time constraints, will be presented at this workshop. Therefore, the Council will be presented with:

- the proposed pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) program as shown in the Preliminary CIP document;
- the supplemental requests for the O&M costs related to capital projects coming on line in FY05-06 for the Civic Center, the Field Operations Department, and the Economic Development Department;

- an update on Glendale's water resources, current and historical water demand, current treatment capacity, and the need for new treatment facilities;

- the Utilities Department's proposed capital improvement program, including supplemental requests for O&M costs related to capital projects coming on line in FY05-06; and

- the Parks and Recreation Department's operating budget, operating budget supplemental requests, and supplemental requests for O&M costs related to capital projects coming on line in FY05-06.

The material to be covered was provided to the Council prior to the meeting. The information provided is the same as that found in the FY2006-15 Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan, which was distributed to Council on February 15, 2005, and the CIP tab of the City Council budget workbook.

The Council's review of the FY2005-06 budget is consistent with the Council's goal of ensuring the city's financial stability.

During FY2003-04, the budget process was modified per the Council's request. Some of the more significant modifications include the following:

- The Council now receives quarterly presentations on General Fund (GF) revenues and expenditures;

- The Council now receives periodic presentations throughout the year on enterprise fund issues, such as sanitation collection and the landfill tipping fees;

- The Council now reviews the proposed capital improvement program (CIP) budget at the same time as the operating budgets for next fiscal year, as evidenced by the inclusion of CIP operating and maintenance supplementals as part of the operating budget process; and

- The Council now reviews all supplemental spending requests as part of the operating budget process.

Future budget workshops are scheduled as follows:

- April 19, 1:30 PM – 5:00 PM.

The 1st budget workshop with the Council occurred on March 15, 2005. This workshop covered an overview of the FY2005-06 general fund proposed budget and the recommended City Manager priority supplemental requests related to total compensation and risk management, as well as the supplemental requests for the Human Resources (HR) Department.

The 2nd budget workshop with the Council occurred on March 22, 2005. This workshop covered the Fire Department, the Police Department, Homeland Security/Special Projects, the Appointed Officials Group, the Elected Officials, and the Internal Services Group.

The 3rd budget workshop with the Council occurred on March 29, 2005. This workshop covered the departments that comprise the Public Works Group, the Community Information & Services Group (with the exception of the Parks and Recreation Department), and the Community Development Group.

The 4th budget workshop with the Council occurred on April 5, 2005. This workshop covered the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). However, because of time constraints, all of the material was not covered. Today's budget workshop (April 12, 2005) will be used to cover the CIP material not covered at the April 5, 2005, budget workshop.

Council was given the preliminary CIP written report on February 15, 2005. This material was discussed at the workshop held on April 5, 2005.

Council reviewed the FY05-06 GF revenue projection at the February 15, 2005 workshop.

Council was given the FY2005-06 budget workbook on February 28, 2005 for review prior to the scheduled budget workshop discussions. This workbook contains the following information:

- the City Manager's memo on the FY06 recommended operating budget (p.1-11);
- the FY05-06 GF budget balancing summary (p. 12); and
- the ongoing and one-time supplemental requests, including those related to new capital projects coming online in FY05-06 that are being recommended for funding from the General Fund, the enterprise funds, and all other funds.

The City of Glendale's budget is an important financial, planning and public communication tool. It gives residents and businesses a clear and concrete view of the city's direction for public services and operations and a better understanding of the city's ongoing needs for stable revenue sources to fund public services and ongoing operations.

The budget provides the Council and residents with a means to evaluate the city's financial stability.

All budget workshops are open to the public and are posted publicly per state requirements.

No decisions are required at today's workshop. Decisions on the proposed budget are not needed until the Final Balancing Budget Workshop to be held on April 19, 2005.

Ed Beasley, City Manager, opened the budget workshop by saying that today's budget workshop would cover the CIP issues not addressed at the last budget workshop, which occurred on April 5, 2005. Therefore, today's topics will include

- the pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) program;

- operations and maintenance supplemental requests related to capital projects expected to come on line in FY2005-06;

- an update on Glendale's water resources, as well as the Utilities Department's supplemental requests related to utilities capital projects expected to come on line in FY2005-06;

- an update on the Glendale Onboard (GO) Transportation Program, its operating and capital budgets, and FY2005-06 supplemental requests related to the GO Program; and

- supplemental requests related to the sports and entertainment district, which includes Westgate, the Super Bowl, and the National Hockey League's All-Star game.

Mr. Beasley reiterated that no decisions were required at today's budget workshop.

PAYGO Program & CIP O&M Supplemental Requests (Except Parks & Recreation, Utilities, and GO Program, Which Were Addressed Separately in Today's Workshop)

Sherry Schurhammer, Management and Budget Director, began the day's presentation by introducing the PAYGO program's budget requests for FY2005-06. She stated PAYGO capital projects for FY 2005-06 total $4.9 million and noted that these projects are funded with one-time GF operating dollars. She said the projects typically represent capital projects related to the maintenance or repair of city facilities and street related equipment not already included in the Vehicle Replacement Fund. She referenced the summary report of PAYGO projects listed on page 304 of the Council budget workbook.

Ms. Schurhammer then moved on to the slide summarizing the operating and maintenance (O&M) supplemental requests for capital projects expected to come on line in FY2005-06. She noted the difference between the summary figures presented in the preliminary CIP document given to Council on February 15, 2005, and the figures presented in the Council budget workbook. Essentially, the overall totals declined as a result of staff's due diligence to refine operating costs and project delays.

Ms. Schurhammer then moved on to the CIP O&M supplemental requests for the Civic Center, the Economic Development Department, and the Field Operations Department. She explained the Civic Center supplemental requests include $25,000 in ongoing funds for professional landscape services and $112,000 in ongoing funds for custodial staffing, supplies, electricity and other utilities, and sanitation collection services for the downtown campus.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked about the $252,860 PAYGO project for the Civic Center. Ms. Schurhammer said the supplemental is for unique landscape and design improvements to the outdoor fountain/terrace courtyard.

Mayor Scruggs asked for confirmation that the funds are for the fountain courtyard on the west side, not the garden courtyard on the east side of the Civic Center. John Moses, Civic Center General Manager, said the landscape design is completed and staff is ready to proceed. He said the landscape design was for both the garden and fountain courtyards, but the focus will be primarily on the fountain courtyard.

Councilmember Frate asked about the kinds of improvements that will be made. Mr. Moses said the design improvements are intended to create a more lush, warm, intimate courtyard space. Councilmember Frate asked if a shade structure of some type would be constructed. Mr. Moses said a shade structure is included in the design for the fountain courtyard on the west side, but not the garden courtyard on the east side. Councilmember Frate expressed his opinion that shade structures should be constructed in both courtyards. Mr. Moses explained that staff's intent is to purchase a tent for the garden courtyard on the east side.

Mayor Scruggs said the landscape plan was designed in 2002. She stated that the city has lost a lot of business because of the inadequacies of both gardens. She said the project is now planned for 2005, but in 2002 dollars. She stated there were problems at last week's budget hearing because Park's projects were priced at previous prices, resulting in amenities having to be eliminated. She asked staff to update the pricing figures to ensure all planned improvements can be made. Ms. Schurhammer noted that the department submitting the request was directed to work closely with the Engineering Department to update capital cost requests. Mayor Scruggs asked if the improvements for the fountain courtyard reflect 2005 prices. Ms. Schurhammer said staff in the departments was directed to provide updated cost figures for their FY05-06 requests. Mayor Scruggs asked Mr. Moses to provide Council with copies of the drawings for the planned improvements.

Vice Mayor Eggleston noted the Civic Center maintenance reserve funding for next year totals $25,000, but $100,000 for the next few years after FY05-06. Mr. Moses explained the original request for the Civic center maintenance reserve was $100,000.

Councilmember Frate suggested Council consider returning the Civic Center maintenance reserve funding to the $100,000 level, stating the grounds need more attention.

Mayor Scruggs pointed out that the building has been open since 1999. She asked if there is any funding to replace furniture or carpeting. Mr. Moses said the Civic Center has spent approximately $15,000 of the $25,000 maintenance reserve funding budgeted for the current fiscal year [FY04-05], noting this was the first year the Civic Center had any maintenance reserve funding.

Councilmember Clark said she remembers previously discussing allocating $100,000 per year for Civic Center maintenance reserve funding. She asked for additional information about Civic Center maintenance reserve funding, the initial allocation, the yearly allocation, and the current balance of funds available.

Mayor Scruggs said it was stressed to Council how important it would be to hold money in reserve to replace the carpeting and furniture and such when Council first discussed the Civic Center. Mayor Scruggs said the account was to be set up like the Vehicle Replacement Fund and Technology Replacement Fund to ensure the building would be maintained in a manner that warrants the rates being charged for its use.

Councilmember Clark asked if the reserve was established as an ongoing account. Ms. Schurhammer offered to provide the requested information. She reiterated that the Civic Center maintenance reserve funding is included in the PAYGO program, which is funded with one-time dollars each fiscal year.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked for more details on the downtown campus O&M supplemental request for $112,000. Jennifer Reichelt, Senior Management Assistant, explained the downtown campus capital project includes the Bead Museum, the Civic Center annex, and pedestrian enhancements to the plaza areas between the buildings. She said the O&M supplemental request covers the cost of utilities, custodial supplies, custodial services, and sanitation collection expenses. Mayor Scruggs asked when construction on the downtown campus would be completed. Ms. Reichelt said construction is scheduled to commence this summer with completion of the outside improvements expected by November. She said the interior improvements should be completed in January or February 2006.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked if the $112,000 represents the costs associated with the complex for the few months it will actually be open this year. Ms. Reichelt said she expects the $112,000 to cover a full year of expenses. Mayor Scruggs asked if staff expects the O&M amount to grow in the following fiscal year. Ms. Reichelt said she does not expect the amount to increase.

Ms. Schurhammer proceeded to the slide that summarized the CIP O&M supplemental requests for the GF from the Field Operations Department. She said the Field Operations requests include $8,500 in ongoing GF dollars for replacement of a water truck; $11,375 in ongoing GF dollars for the vehicle replacement charges for a dump truck; and $91,820 in one time funding for property maintenance expenses related to the former Larry Miller property on Glendale Avenue.

Mayor Scruggs asked about the security services at the former Larry Miller property. Scott Westley, Assistant Field Operations Department Director, explained the $61,320 for security costs associated with the former Larry Miller property provides for 12 hour-a-day on-site coverage of the property. He said the city evaluated the property and decided to maintain the existing level of security services because of past vandalism problems. Mayor Scruggs asked if someone would be physically located on the property the entire 12 hours each day; Mr. Westley responded yes.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked why two-thirds of the $61,200 goes to the Police Department budget. Ms. Schurhammer explained that one supplemental was submitted to encompass the request from two different departments. She said security services have transitioned from the Field Operations Department to the Police Department; therefore two-thirds of the funding for the supplemental will go to the Police Department, which will pay for the contracted security services. She said the remaining one third of the funding would go to the Field Operations Department to cover utilities expenses.

Ms. Schurhammer stated the Field Operations supplemental requests also include $12,000 in ongoing funds from the internal General Services fund for the maintenance of shop equipment and $67,500 in ongoing sanitation funds for a new FTE needed to accommodate route growth in the residential curbside collection program.

Councilmember Clark asked about the city's criteria are for adding a new truck in sanitation. Mr. Westley said an additional truck is added when an additional 1,600 homes are added to the collection program. Councilmember Clark asked if a new truck needs to be added along with the new FTE. Mr. Reedy stated the R.W. Beck study found the city needed another FTE to meet program needs on the recycling collection side of the residential sanitation collection program. He said the issues to be addressed by the new FTE are related to both growth and efficient operation, explaining the city was using too many part-time employees to be efficient.

Councilmember Frate asked if the increase in fuel costs is reflected in the budget. Mr. Reedy said the budget includes a supplemental request from the shop for additional appropriation authority to purchase fuel for the city as a whole. However, no supplemental requests were submitted by the individual departments to purchase the fuel from the equipment management division (i.e., the shop) at the higher prices. Ms. Schurhammer said staff decided not to have the departments submit supplemental requests to account for rising gas prices because of the experience of the past few years, which showed the tendency of fuel prices to fluctuate widely, with price spikes in the spring and lower prices thereafter. She said that if prices continue to rise or remain at a high level for several months, staff will return to Council to discuss the impact of continued high fuel prices on operating departments.

Mayor Scruggs asked about the cost of fuel assumed for the shop's supplemental request. Mr. Reedy said $1.85 per gallon, a figure he later corrected to $1.72 per gallon. Ms. Schurhammer said the city receives volume discounts so the cost is less than we experience at the pump.

Councilmember Clark suggested staff readdress this issue at the April 19 budget workshop, stating that she believes it is very optimistic to think fuel prices will decline, as has occurred in prior years. Mr. Reedy said the city does not pay sales tax on fuel. Nevertheless, he agreed that staff should rethink the fuel supplemental request. Councilmember Clark said it would be foolish for the city not to include sustained higher fuel prices as a new, dedicated supplement when Council resumes the budget workshops on April 19.

Mayor Scruggs agreed.

Mr. Reedy said staff would revisit the issue and try to have a more accurate number.

Ms. Schurhammer agreed the situation is different now than it has been in the past and the issue needs to be revisited.

Parks and Recreation Department (Operating Budget, Operating Budget Supplementals, and CIP O&M Supplementals)

Ms. Schurhammer reported a base budget of $11.3 million, with no carryover requests and supplemental requests totaling $126,204. She said there are also CIP O&M supplemental requests totaling just under $650,000. She then showed slides that summarized the department's supplemental requests.

Councilmember Clark asked about the $63,520 supplemental request for part-time park rangers and equipment. She questioned why staff is recommending a reduction in the number of part-time park rangers from those funded with $93,000 in the FY04-

05 budget. Gloria Santiago-Espino, Deputy City Manager for the Community Information and Services Group, said staff would rearrange the rangers' schedules to provide seven-day-a-week coverage.

Councilmember Clark said the addition of part-time park rangers has resulted in a reduction in the amount of vandalism in the city's parks, stating the money saved far exceeds the amount spent for the program. She asked for specific figures in terms of the reduction in vandalism and dollars saved since the addition of part-time park rangers was instituted with the FY04-05 budget. Ms. Santiago-Espino said staff saw a 25% reduction in vandalism, totaling approximately $4,000, for the period of September 2004 through December 2004.

Mayor Scruggs asked about the number of parks all of the park rangers serve citywide. Ms. Santiago-Espino said the rangers service all city parks. Mayor Scruggs questioned the wisdom of reducing the number of part-time park rangers while the number of parks increases, stating that the remaining park rangers will be forced to spend less time at each park.

Councilmember Goulet asked if the department is prioritizing the parks with the greatest need. Ms. Santiago-Espino responded yes, stating that staff's efforts are focused on those parks with the highest usage and highest demand for services. Councilmember Goulet asked why Sahuaro Ranch Park has been slated for only part-time coverage on the weekends. Ms. Santiago-Espino said staff would evaluate how schedules can be adjusted to increase coverage at Sahuaro Ranch Park.

Councilmember Frate said he is also concerned about coverage at the city's linear parks. He recommended that Council authorize FY2005-06 funding at the same level as that approved for FY05-06 ($93,000) to allow the program to be more proactive.

Mayor Scruggs asked why staff is requesting one-time rather than ongoing funds for the part-time park rangers. Ms. Schurhammer said that Council approved one-time funding for FY2004-05 because of questions about how the money would be allocated and what would be accomplished. Mayor Scruggs asked Parks and Recreation staff to return to Council with a comparison of the park ranger coverage levels achieved at $63,000 versus $93,000.

Councilmember Frate stated he would like to see the additional park rangers funded with ongoing dollars because the program has had a positive impact.

Councilmember Lieberman agreed.

Ms. Santiago-Espino offered to provide the requested information to Council prior to next week's budget hearing.

Ms. Schurhammer proceeded to the next slide, explaining the first item on the slide refers to the CIP related supplemental request for the Foothills Recreation and Aquatic Center, with $71,420 in ongoing funds and $419,084 in one-time funds being requested.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the $71,420 represents the city's permanent ongoing GF expense. Ms. Schurhammer explained that the ongoing cost covers only the Recreation Supervisor and ongoing costs related to the position, such as technology replacement charges for the computer equipment assigned to the position. She said the remaining ongoing expenses will be presented to Council sometime during FY05-06 as a GF contingency request, as was done in FY04-05 for the staffing for the new fire station in north Glendale. She said the Preliminary CIP report states that the total ongoing operating impact to the GF is estimated to be $1.8 million. Mayor Scruggs asked when the full amount would be appropriated. Ms. Santiago-Espino said the ground breaking for the facility is scheduled for April 28 and she expects 12 to 14 months of construction to complete the facility. Ms. Schurhammer said Parks staff would bring forward a GF contingency request if the facility opens will open before the end of FY05-06 or a supplemental request for FY06-07 if the facility opens in FY06-07. Mayor Scruggs asked if any GF operating funds were budgeted for the Foothills Recreation and Aquatic Center when the FY04-05 budget was created, and Ms. Schurhammer responded no.

Councilmember Clark said the earliest the new facility would open is April 28, 2006. Ms. Santiago-Espino agreed. Councilmember Clark pointed out a 14 month construction schedule would delay the opening until June 28, 2006, which is only a few days before the city starts its next fiscal year. She asked why the city is spending $71,420 to hire a Recreation Supervisor for FY 2005-06 when the facility will not open until two months before the end of the fiscal year, at the earliest. Ms. Santiago-Espino explained the supervisor would also work with the construction contractor on setting up the facility, purchasing equipment, program planning, etc. Councilmember Clark said she thought the Engineering Department was responsible for overseeing city construction projects. She asked how the Recreation Supervisor would function as a liaison between the contractor and the city. Ms. Santiago-Espino said the Recreation Supervisor would work with Engineering and begin looking at programming. Councilmember Clark asked if it would make more sense to hire the person three to six months prior to the opening of the facility, rather than one year ahead of time. She noted that Parks staff has already completed significant program planning for the facility. Shirley Medler, Deputy Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, said she believes it will take a couple months to fill the position. She also explained that the Recreation Supervisor would assist the city in making purchasing decisions and in marketing the facility. Councilmember Clark expressed her opinion that filling the Recreation Supervisor position a year in advance of the opening is overkill. She asked if the $71,420 reflects the anticipated delay for the hiring process. Ms. Schurhammer said no, stating that the $71,420 reflects a full year's salary.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked if any unused funds would be carried over to next year. Ms. Schurhammer explained the amount of ongoing funds will be built into the following fiscal year's budget and that any savings realized will revert to the General Fund balance.

Mayor Scruggs said the FY04-05 budget book showed an operating impact of $1,454,868 for the Foothills Recreation and Aquatic Center; thereby proving the facility was intended to be open and operating in the current fiscal year. She noted that staff now is saying that the facility will not open until FY06-07.

Councilmember Martinez expressed his opinion that it makes sense to hire the Recreation Supervisor as soon as possible to work with the contractor.

Ms. Schurhammer explained the second item on the slide refers to the CIP supplemental related to the ongoing operating and maintenance costs for three new park sites: 63rd and Butler, 87th and Missouri and 63rd and Northern, Phase I.

Councilmember Clark asked if the $59,194 was prorated to reflect when the park facilities would come online. Mr. Cardin said the figures were put into the 12-month operating budget so staff would not have to return next fiscal year with a supplemental to cover the remaining two to four months of operating expenses. Councilmember Clark said she understands the rationale but believes this approach essentially places a hold on ongoing funds that could be used for other projects.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if any contracts have been approved. He pointed out the equipment they intend to pre-purchase will have to be warehoused until the facility opens. He suggested they delay the purchase of at least some of the equipment to allow the funds to be used for the Emergency Operations Center.

Councilmember Martinez disagreed, stating the funds have already been earmarked and the cost of the equipment will only increase over the next year.

Mayor Scruggs said Council was originally told the Foothills Recreation and Aquatic Center would open this fiscal year, but now Council is being told it will not open until July 2006. She stated it is now being suggested that the money intended to buy the furnishings for the center be delayed as well.

Councilmember Clark said she does not have a problem with the aquatic center, explaining her concerns are in regard to the practice of budgeting for a full-year's expense when the expense will not come online until later into the year.

Mayor Scruggs agreed, stating they are budgeting for carryover funds. Ms. Schurhammer said they could change their practice. She explained the current practice is very conservative and ensures there will be no surprises in the upcoming year. She pointed out departments are not allowed to carryover salary savings and can carryover only non-salary savings if the department has a contract showing items have been ordered but will not be delivered until the following fiscal year.

Councilmember Clark said staff could still ensure there will be no surprises simply by indicating the requests are for partial funding for the upcoming fiscal year and that the anticipated cost for the following fiscal year will be higher.

Ms. Santiago-Espino said they have heard the Council's concerns and will be prepared to discuss them next week.

Mayor Scruggs asked if there is a budget item for supervision at the Foothills Skate Park and concession. Ms. Santiago-Espino responded no. She explained that staff currently is in the process of negotiating with the concession company. Mayor Scruggs asked if the discussions with the company have included the fact that one particular skate park is open and is having continual problems. R.J. Cardin, Deputy Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, said the RFP was for both skate facilities and the company has agreed to run both facilities. He said staff has

discussed giving the concession company a temporary building so it can begin operating at the Foothills Skate Park as soon as a contract is finalized. He said the vendor has requested 60 days for marketing before transitioning from a non-paying to a paying facility.

Mr. Cardin also stated the concession company would like to see a guarantee in case it does not attain the desired revenue. He said staff is trying to negotiate that issue out of the process, explaining that staff believes the anticipated revenues will be more than adequate and that the concession company should not expect the city to provide a safety net. Mayor Scruggs pointed out there is no money for anything in the FY05-06 budget. She stated the Foothills Skate Park has had continual problems and has been shut down numerous times by the Police Department. Mr. Cardin explained the city would pay for a temporary building for the Foothills facility out of parks capital funds as the new building is being constructed. Ms. Santiago-Espino said parks has funds budgeted for the Foothills Skate Park and the plan is to tap into those funds to pay for the temporary building.

Councilmember Martinez asked what staff means when it says the skate park will become a "paying facility." Mr. Cardin explained that there would be options for memberships or daily use of the facility as well as a charge for the items sold at the concession. Councilmember Martinez asked how Peoria operates its skate park. Mr. Cardin said the Peoria facility is unsupervised and no fees are charged. He said two privately owned skate parks charge fees and have concession services. Councilmember Martinez asked when the decision was made to move to a pay-to-use facility. Ms. Santiago-Espino said staff is currently in preliminary discussions and will return to Council for a discussion on the skate park.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the RFP gave the impression that the vendor could assess a fee. She explained the intention of the skate park was to give young people a place to go to get them off the streets and out of the shopping center parking lots. She expressed concern about a requirement for users to pay to use the skate park will put them back out onto the streets. She asked if any analysis has been done to determine the impact a fee will have on the kids and their use of the facility. Ms. Santiago said staff is still in a preliminary stage of discussions and therefore, an analysis has not yet been completed. She clarified that the RFP did not mention facility user fees. She noted there are a limited number of vendors who oversee the management of skate parks. Mayor Scruggs said the city has a good record of what can be expected when there is no supervision, food or beverages.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if consideration has been given to fencing the area to control access. Ms. Santiago-Espino stated the skate park is already fenced.

Councilmember Clark asked if the concession company understands that the issue of charging kids to use the park has not been brought to Council. She also asked if the concession company knows it will also act as a security guard for the facility. Mr. Cardin said the RFP did not include facility user fees, explaining that the idea of charging a user fee was included in one of the responses received to the RFP. Mr. Cardin noted that the RFP has been issued three times. The first time brought no responses, the second time brought only one response, and the third time brought only one response in which the vendor proposed a facility user fee.

Councilmember Clark asked if the vendor would still be interested in the facility if the city decides not to charge a facility user fee. Mr. Cardin said that is the purpose of the current negotiations. Based on the vendor's proforma regarding the revenue to be earned on concession sales alone, Mr. Cardin stated that the city believes the company can make an adequate return on its investment. Councilmember Clark asked if staff has considered partially offsetting or subsidizing the vendor until the company reaches specific goals. Mr. Cardin said that is another option to discuss during the negotiations. He stated the city also has to look at the return it gets by having the concessionaire onsite on a daily basis.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the vendor's proforma took into consideration the revenue from entrance fees. Mr. Cardin said staff looked at both options. Mayor Scruggs said the users of the skate park have been troubled by the situation for a long time. She said the city provides the Sahuaro Ranch Foundation $90,000 a year and takes care of all of the maintenance, receiving nothing in return. She asked why the city is taking such a tightfisted stance with regard to the skate park.

Councilmember Clark agreed, stating the city accepted certain responsibilities and obligations when it decided to take on the skate park. She said the city should be responsible for the costs involved in providing the facility. Mr. Cardin said staff would be happy to take Council's direction in its negotiations with the vendor.

Mayor Scruggs asked if Manistee Ranch falls under the Parks and Recreation Department or the Field Operations Department. Ms. Schurhammer said she believes it falls under the Parks Department, but she would need to double-check the budget to be certain.

Utilities Department (Needs Assessment, CIP, and CIP O&M Supplementals)

Roger Bailey, Utilities Department Director, reviewed the results of the 2003 Utilities Needs Assessment, which addressed the issues of the city's water resources; current and historical water demand, current treatment capacity, the need for new treatment facilities, and the cost of proposed improvements. It also identified growth, water resources, water quality, drought, emergencies, and construction costs as the key challenges facing the city.

He stated that Glendale is in a strategic position, able to meet current and projected build-out demand within the city's current service area up to 115th Avenue. He explained the city uses a combination of Salt River Project (SRP), Central Arizona Project (CAP) and groundwater to meet demand and projected demand. Mr. Bailey said the city's maximum demand in 2004 was 61 million gallons per day (mgd) whereas total available capacity is 71.6 mgd. During the month of January, when the SRP canals are not in use because of the annual dry-up, total available capacity is 42.6 mgd, with 13.6 mgd coming from wells. Peak demand in January was 36.3 mgd.

Mr. Bailey said staff presented a series of projects in 2003 that it felt was necessary to continue to serve the city's customers. He stated the first treatment facility, which is currently under design, should come online in 2007. He said the first groundwater treatment facility would come online the following year and a second groundwater treatment facility will come online in 2013.

In response to Councilmember Clark's question, Mr. Bailey explained they are able to bring excess water through the Pyramid Peak Plant, but they cannot rely on that water in the extended future.

Councilmember Frate asked about the location of Zone 4. Mr. Bailey explained the Zone 4 Water Treatment Facility is the site closest to the SRP power plant at Grand Avenue and 71st Avenue.

Councilmember Frate asked if groundwater is a reliable source, but more expensive to treat. Mr. Bailey responded yes. Councilmember Frate asked if there has been a time when the city did not have CAP water. Mr. Reedy explained that the CAP opened in 1986. The following year, the Hassayampa River Crossing failed and the CAP canal was shut down for about five months while repairs to the crossing were made. He said that the city's resources would be significantly impacted should that type of situation occur again. While availability of the resource is one component, the ability to treat the water and to provide potable water under the most stringent of circumstances is another part of the equation. He said constructing groundwater treatment plants is one way to ensure the city can provide potable water 24-hours a day, 365 days a year. He noted there were times this winter when the city's ability to meet demand was close to being at capacity, stating that staff discovered the city needs to make changes in the way the city's water resources are balanced.

Mr. Bailey said the city has lost the use of nine wells over the past ten years due to water quality concerns. He stated construction costs have risen significantly since this issue was first brought before the Council. The construction market is very busy, with an increased demand from overseas for raw material demands. These factors have caused a steep increase in construction costs. For example, concrete costs are up 50% and steel costs are up 100% over last year. Given these conditions, staff had to take a second look at the estimated costs of the proposed capital projects for the Utilities Department. He said the estimated cost for the short-term projects has risen from $126 million in 2003 to $157.7 million today (2005). He stated the estimated cost of long-term projects has also risen, increasing from $77.5 million in 2003 to almost $98 million in 2005.

Mr. Bailey concluded his presentation, stating that Glendale's water system is continuing to experience rapid growth. He said phased improvements are being implemented to meet projected demands and comply with water quality regulations. He said Glendale has sufficient water resources to meet current and future demands, but drought issues are being monitored and drought plans have been developed.

Ms. Schurhammer introduced a discussion about the capital plan for the Utilities Department by stating that the proposed plan is based on the previous year's plan. She said departments were directed to revise their cost estimates based on current market conditions. She reported that the FY05-06 capital plan for the Utilities Department totals almost $39.2 million. She reviewed a list of the significant capital projects scheduled for FY05-06, which includes approximately $2.1 million for a 30-inch water transmission line for the proposed Zone 4 Water Treatment Plant; over $3.6 million for Cholla Water Treatment Plant process improvements; almost $874,000 for the rehabilitation of a sewer line on Camelback Road; and almost $1.2 million for the 99th Avenue interceptor line, the main sewer line to the Sub Regional Operating Group's (SROG) sewer treatment facility.

Councilmember Lieberman asked how Maricopa is able to assure a 100-year water supply. Mr. Reedy explained cities in active management areas of Arizona are required to have a 100-year assured water supply. However, Maricopa is not in an active management area and therefore is not required to assure a 100-year water supply. He said problems like this are arising throughout the state because growth is outpacing resources. Councilmember Lieberman noted the city was penalized years ago because it exceeded its gallon-per-capita ratio; he asked if the city's ratio has since been increased. Mr. Reedy responded no, stating that the city likely will be deemed out of compliance with the gallon-per-capita per day consumption rate because of drought conditions. He said he is confident the city will transition out of the gallon-per-day consumption process into another process that will require the city to do more active water conservation.

Ms. Schurhammer reviewed the Utilities Department's CIP O&M supplemental requests shown on the slide. In response to Councilmember Lieberman's comments about the supplemental request related to filter media replacement, Ken Reedy, Deputy City Manager for the Public Works Group, noted that the change in the granular activated carbon filter media will have a positive influence on the taste of the water that comes from the plant, in addition to providing the ability to meet regulatory requirements.

Councilmember Martinez asked if Project 9240, the installation of sewers in areas currently on septic systems, is part of the sewer extension program. Mr. Bailey said the funds are available for residents in the Hidden Manor area who request conversion from septic to the city's wastewater treatment facilities. He said the city has not had any new requests for the extension of the city's sewer in areas that are currently on septic. Councilmember Martinez asked about the operating impact. Mr. Bailey said staff will keep looking at the numbers and if additional requests are not received the additional operating funds will not be requested.

Councilmember Clark asked about the benchmark used when deciding if a new FTE is needed for additional sewer lines being added to the overall system. Mr. Bailey explained they try to clean the sewer lines at least once or twice per year, noting the city currently has 700 miles of sewer lines. He said staff has determined that one additional FTE is necessary in order to maintain the annual cleaning schedule. Mr. Reedy also noted that older parts of the city have older sewer lines that require more frequent maintenance, so the analysis is not solely related to the total number of sewer line miles.

Mayor Scruggs said the number of new FTE's needed to clean the sewers seems to be tied to a program that may not have any users. She suggested staff recategorize the FTE under Sewer Maintenance rather than tie it to the septic conversion program. Mr. Bailey agreed.

Glendale Onboard (GO) Transportation Program (Operating Budget, Supplemental Requests, CIP, and CIP O&M Supplementals)

Horatio Skeete, Deputy City Manger for the Community Development Group, explained that the projected costs for the 2005-2029 GO program are based on current budget projections and extrapolations based on 3%-4% growth. He said the majority of construction would occur in the first five years of the 25-year plan. He stated that staff will not present any recommendations with regard to light rail this

fiscal year even though it is included the preliminary CIP for FY2006-15. He explained that staff is waiting until the Maricopa Association of Government (MAG) study is completed so the city has a better understanding of the scope of what is available regionally.

Councilmember Clark inquired about the scope and purpose of the MAG study and who will determine the location of the final corridor in Glendale. Mr. Skeete explained the study would look at the regional light rail program as it was defined in Proposition 400. He said the exact corridor for Glendale would be defined and decided by the City of Glendale; however, some very important connection points will have to be made with Phoenix. He said the study would address the crossing of I-17, explaining the location of that crossing will heavily dictate discussions concerning Glendale's corridor.

Mayor Scruggs explained the study would look at the feasibility of crossing I-17 with the money that is in the program or if additional money will be required. She said the study would provide very useful information and guidance.

Mr. Skeete said staff is proposing Council add $750,000 per year for each of the next five years to enhance the Pavement Management Program. He said that as the light rail decision is better defined staff would determine if the additional funding could be continued on an ongoing basis.

Mayor Scruggs asked if staff's suggestion is the same one Council made a year ago, only to be pilloried because the Citizens Transportation Oversight Commission (CTOC) thought the city was raiding their funds. Mr. Skeete said he was not with the city at that time, but he believes there was a misunderstanding in terms of the need for an extended ongoing program. He said the GO Program can interject $3 to $4 million over the next four or five years into the Pavement Management Program and not hurt the overall program.

Councilmember Martinez asked if the GO Program funding comes from the half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation. Mr. Skeete responded yes. Councilmember Martinez asked if the money could be used for the Pavement Management Program since that use was not specified in the ballot language. Craig Tindall, City Attorney, said legal staff has visited the ballot language on numerous occasions, and he is not aware of anything that would restrict the use of the funds in the proposed manner.

Mayor Scruggs suggested 50% of the GO Program projects before Council for consideration were not included in the ballot language because the city did not know it would have an arena, stadium or an interchange at Bethany Home Road.

Councilmember Lieberman said the ballot did not specifically state the money could not be used for street corners, but it also did not say it would be used for pavement maintenance. He stated he is not necessarily against directing $750,000 for five years to the Pavement Management Program since it would not have a great impact on the GO Program or CTOC. He asked if Glendale would be reimbursed by MAG for the Maryland overpass. Mayor Scruggs said the city was to be reimbursed for the Bethany Home interchange, not the Maryland Avenue overpass. Terry Johnson, GO Program Administrator, explained that the city did not know if Proposition 400 would pass in the November 2004 election when staff put the program together in September 2004, so staff put together a $6 million loan to advance the interchange.

Given the fact that Proposition 400 passed, the interchange is fully funded and the city is attempting to recover its design costs. Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city will be reimbursed for the Maryland overpass. Mr. Johnson said the city is sending a check for $4 million to ADOT to complete the interchange; however, the city will seek to obtain additional reimbursement out of the upcoming closeout funds. Councilmember Lieberman asked about the total cost of the north and south halves of the Bethany Home interchange. Mr. Johnson said the cost is close to $20 million. Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city has approved and will be paying for the roadway over the canal. Mr. Skeete responded yes. Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city expects to be reimbursed for the roadway. Mr. Skeete answered no.

Councilmember Martinez asked if CTOC reviewed and approved staff's recommendation to redirect $750,000 per year for five years to the Pavement Management Program. Mr. Skeete said no. He explained staff talked to CTOC about the overall program three months ago and presented two scenarios. He said one of the scenarios completed the projects with less of the half-cent sales tax and an expectation that more would be funded through federal grants and other regional funding. He stated the proposed cost at this point is $1.24 billion and the expected revenues in the same cycle, using a 4%-5% growth factor, is $1.26 billion. He said, given that staff will bring the issue back to Council for an annual review, staff believes it can continue to deliver all of the stated programs and still add some of the smaller opportunities.

Mr. Johnson discussed some of the program strategies behind the GO Program, stating it is structured throughout all areas of the city. He said there is a commitment to early construction and that the program be multi-modal. He noted several ongoing programs are supported by the GO Program, including neighborhood traffic mitigation, children safety education, the smart traffic signal system, bicycle programs and safety projects.

Councilmember Martinez asked if speed humps are funded with GO Funds. Mr. Johnson said there are approximately $50,000 in General Funds and $100,000 in GO funds for construction. He said, however, most of the staff is supported with General Funds. Councilmember Martinez noted last year Council discussed that it was behind schedule on the speed hump program. He said it was his understanding there was only $50,000 in the program and asked if additional money could be allocated for the program. Mr. Skeete said there is a total of about $116,000 available for traffic mitigation measures. Councilmember Martinez how the $116,000 will be used and what projects will be completed. Mr. Skeete said the average cost for a speed hump over the past six months has been $10,000 to $12,000. Councilmember Martinez asked staff to report to him the number of requests that have already been approved, the number of outstanding requests, and how much it will cost to fulfill those requests. Dave Hoffman, Senior Management Assistant in the Transportation Department, responded to Councilmember Martinez' request for information about the speed hump program. He assured Councilmember Martinez that the city has caught up on the backlog of speed hump requests, noting that staff recently issued a contract for the spring speed hump program. He said staff requested carryover of $46,000 to make the total speed hump program funding at about $200,000. Councilmember Martinez asked if any approved neighborhoods are currently waiting to have speed humps installed. Mr. Hoffman said staff is in the process of completing the list, stating that any remaining projects will be completed this spring.

Councilmember Lieberman noted that Jim Book, the former Transportation Department Director, reported during last year's budget workshops that the speed hump program was behind by 26 requests. He said the Council added one-time funds to the FY2004-05 budget to ensure that there was adequate funding to complete do all 26 sites.

Mr. Johnson said the 25-year program totals $1.24 billion, with bus and Dial-A-Ride, light rail transit, Northern Avenue, and street construction making up the largest components. He stated the bulk of the money comes from the dedicated half-cent sales tax for transportation, but a very large share of funds also is coming from federal, state and regional sources. He said a smaller amount of City GF dollars is committed to transit and fares. Other revenue sources include interest earnings and bond proceeds.

Mayor Scruggs asked about the dedicated sales tax projection when the program was presented to the voters. Mr. Johnson said the half-cent sales tax was projected to cover 58%, or $580 million, for 24 years over the 2002-2025 period. He said the economy declined immediately after the vote causing sales tax revenue to decrease, but the economy and sales tax have both since recovered. Mayor Scruggs pointed out the city did not know about Westgate at that time, and there will be additional dedicated sales tax revenue from Westgate that was not included in the initial revenue projections.

Mr. Johnson said the five-year program is expected to total $116 million, with operating costs of $58.3 million.

Councilmember Lieberman pointed out there is a drastic decline in the later years of the five-year program. He suggested the program might be undercapitalized if significant development occurs along the Loop 303.

In response to Vice Mayor Eggleston's question, Mr. Johnson explained the money in 2006 is a function of incoming revenues and money already in the bank. He noted a bond issuance would be necessary in 2007 to continue.

Mr. Johnson reported the design concepts are nearly completed, with the remaining eight expected to be completed within the next few months. He stated 10 major engineering contracts are currently underway and 20 major construction projects will be done over the next three years. Mr. Skeete noted the 20 construction projects on the books for the next three years will be closely monitored for the convenience of residents of Glendale. He said they do not intend to have all 20 projects underway at the same time.

Mr. Johnson stated they hope to get GO Project 1 out the door this year, but a number of right-of-way, utility and design issues have to be resolved. He said the design of the 67th Avenue Camelback to Grand project is nearly completed, but there are some issues with Salt River Project because of the increased rains. He reported 60% design on the 67th Avenue Olive to Bell project, with construction in 2006. He said they hope to complete the Sports Complex – Variable Message Signs project in 2006.

Councilmember Clark asked when would the city host the NHL All Star game. Mayor Scruggs said January 2006. Councilmember Clark suggested they begin construction of the 75th/83rd/Glendale project after the NHL game, but before the Fiesta Bowl. Mr. Skeete assured Councilmember Clark they would take those kinds of issues into consideration as the put construction schedules together.

Councilmember Frate asked if the intersections on 67th Avenue from Olive to Bell have been prioritized. Mr. Johnson was not certain if the construction contract for that project specified a particular order for the intersections. Mr. Skeete said the city could prioritize the intersections.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked why the 75th/ 83rd/Glendale project costs so much more than the other street projects. Mr. Johnson said the project is quite extensive, involving intersections on Glendale from 67th to 91st Avenue as well as improvements to 75th and 83rd Avenues.

Mr. Johnson said the Sports Complex – Freeway Overpass will hopefully be done in 2006. He stated intersection improvements to 43rd Avenue, Bethany Home Road to Peoria, are almost at 100% design.

Councilmember Lieberman pointed out half of the streets lie in Phoenix, asking how the costs are being divided. Mr. Johnson explained the projects Glendale is doing are on its half of the street and they have approved an IGA with Phoenix, which will make a financial contribution on some of the 43rd Avenue and Camelback projects. Councilmember Lieberman noted Glendale's side of the street in some areas is actually located in the City of Phoenix. Mr. Johnson agreed.

Mr. Johnson stated the Sports Complex, 43rd/51st/Bell is at 60% design, while a design firm has been selected for the 57th Avenue and Skunk Creek project. He said construction of the street projects on 59th Avenue, Grand to the Loop 101, is spread over a three-year period. He reported a design firm has been selected for the Grand Avenue project and negotiations are almost complete. He stated there is more uncertainty about the time schedule on the Grand/43rd to 71st project, explaining $30 million in regional funds are committed during the first five years, but they are not sure if the funds are coming to Glendale or Phoenix.

With regard to Bicycle/Pedestrian projects, Mr. Johnson reported receiving federal funds for the Loop 101 and 63rd Avenue project. He said they are currently in the design negotiation process and expect a contract in the next few months. He noted CMAQ funds would pay for half of the project. He said the bicycle lane project on 63rd Avenue, Grand to Olive, is in design and design has not yet started on the Grand Canal/91st to New River bicycle path. He stated the design concept has been completed for the Arrowhead Mall Area.

Councilmember Lieberman asked to see the design of the Loop 101/63rd Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overpass, stating he finds it hard to believe it will actually cost $3.3 million. Mayor Scruggs reiterated half of the amount would be paid with CMAQ funds. Councilmember Lieberman asked if there would be any kind of obstruction to prevent people from riding motorcycles on the overpass.

Mr. Johnson reported the Downtown Pedestrian Improvements project design concept is being completed as are the design projects along New River, from Missouri to Northern.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the downtown pedestrian improvements include the pedestrian plaza. Mr. Johnson said some of the money will be used for the Civic Center area, the deck area, an extension of the downtown concept outward, and gateway features to the downtown.

In response to Councilmember Lieberman's question, Mr. Johnson said they are working closely with Peoria and Maricopa County to develop and refine a design concept for the Northern Parkway. He stated they are currently moving into 30% design and working on governance issues. He said regional funds require a 30% match and the city's commitment to voters was that Glendale would require matching funds.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked about the New River bike path. Mr. Johnson explained it is a regional concept to take a bicycle path along New River, stating Glendale will match up to the Peoria project. Vice Mayor Eggleston asked how would the city benefit from the New River bike path. Mr. Johnson said the project helps complete the regional plan and part of the city's recreational plan. Mr. Skeete stated the regional project is predominantly a recreational corridor. Vice Mayor Eggleston expressed his opinion there are better places to focus the city's recreational dollars.

Mr. Skeete proceeded to the slide that summarized the budget requests for the GO Program. He reported a base budget of $9,145,127, with $177,724 in carryover requests, $235,521 in supplemental operating budget requests and $52,111 in CIP O&M supplemental requests.

Mayor Scruggs stated, last week, Council talked about the need to free up 6% money, asking if 6% funds have to be used on the Loop 101 Park and Ride facility given all of the other funding sources for transportation. Ms. Schurhammer said they would have a list of projects in the 6% and 20% categories that could be delayed when they return next week to discuss how to find money for the Emergency Operations Center. Mr. Skeete reported the $3 million budgeted for the Park and Ride lot will be pushed into the out years.

Councilmember Clark asked if it would make more sense to build the first Park and Ride lot away from the stadium to encourage people to use mass transit to the stadium. Mr. Skeete explained the Park and Ride facility the city contemplates building is not exclusively for the stadium, stating it is intended to facilitate people who drive the freeways into downtown Phoenix. Councilmember Clark agreed with Mayor Scruggs that there are other funding sources for the project. Mr. Skeete said they would look for alternative funding sources now that the project has been pushed out.

Mr. Skeete explained that the operating budget supplemental requests include $62,869 in ongoing funds to increase the number of hours for temporary workers in the Dial-A-Ride program; $100,000 in one-time funds for a taxi subsidy program; and $72,654 in ongoing funds for other operating budget supplementals, as well as the previously mentioned $750,000 per year for five years in one-time funds for the Pavement Management Program.

Mayor Scruggs pointed out bus service has to be present before there is a need for a Park and Ride lot.

Councilmember Clark said many people have commented to her that they most appreciate the shaded parking and security of the Phoenix lots. Mr. Skeete said those elements would be considered when designing Glendale's facility.

Councilmember Lieberman expressed his opinion the taxi subsidy program is a terrible idea, stating he sees numerous problems in terms of monitoring the program.

Councilmember Clark disagreed, noting it arose out of a situation that occurred in her district. She explained a gentleman on dialysis was having trouble with Dial-A-Ride getting him to his dialysis appointments on time. She said the proposed program is a creative solution for people who have serious medical problems that require them to be at regularly scheduled doctor appointments on time.

Councilmember Martinez asked if the county has a similar program. Mr. Skeete said the proposed program is modeled after the Phoenix and Scottsdale programs.

Michael Munroe, Acting Assistant Transportation Department Director, said Glendale currently has money in the General Fund and GO Program to provide the service. He explained the county's program is intended to assist those who have to cross the border into other cities to attend doctor appointments.

Mayor Scruggs asked how far outside of Glendale would the program allow a person to travel. Mr. Munroe said the proposed taxi program would be limited to destinations within Glendale. He said people who need to go beyond the city's limits would be referred to the county program.

Councilmember Frate asked how they arrived at $100,000. Mr. Munroe explained they talked to other cities that provide similar cities and found the administrative cost to provide the service runs about 30%. He said that leaves approximately $70,000 to provide the service. He stated they intend to put out an RFP for contractors that provide this type of service. He noted Dial-A-Ride users pay a fee equal to about 25% of the cost of their trip, stating they used the same percentage when estimating the cost of using a taxi. He pointed out taxis are able to provide door-to-door service, whereas Dial-A-Ride typically has to drop riders off at the entrance to a building or complex. Mr. Skeete noted they anticipate 15 to 20 people using the program on a daily basis.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked how the process would work and if the taxi company will bill the city for the amount not paid by the passenger. Mr. Munroe said cab companies who want to participate in the program would have to demonstrate that they have sufficient coverage. He stated the people who choose to use the program will be issued vouchers, which will specify both the origination point and destination, pointing out the vouchers cannot be used to go anywhere else. He said the passenger will pay 25% of the trip's cost at the time services are rendered and the taxi company will then submit the voucher to the city for payment. Vice Mayor Eggleston asked if the actual per-trip cost is higher for Dial-A-Ride. Mr. Munroe responded yes, noting the average cost per trip is $26.00.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the city would conduct the screening process. Mr. Munroe answered no, stating they will contract that service out as well. Mayor Scruggs asked who will determine the screening criteria to be used and who will be held liable in the event of an accident. She asked why the program is limited to those 65 years or older or disabled, stating many people on chemo need transportation to appointments as well. She also asked if the program meets the test of use of public funds since only 15 to 20 people in the city are expected to qualify for the program. Mr. Munroe clarified they anticipate 15 roundtrip trips per rider per month. He said the program covers patients on dialysis, chemotherapy, physical therapy and other medical services that are needed on an ongoing basis. Mayor Scruggs said she is not necessarily comfortable having a taxi company screen potential users, stating the city should take responsibility for that component of the program. She said she is not comfortable limiting the program to people over 65 either. Mr. Skeete agreed they were somewhat shortsighted in establishing an age limit. He clarified the screening process will not be done by the taxi company, stating it will be done either by the city or by a contracted service, such as Red Cross. He stated taxi companies would be required to list the city as an additional insured.

Councilmember Lieberman said he is still concerned that the program will be misused. Mr. Skeete said they recognize there might be concerns. He said there would be ample opportunities to discuss the issue as the city proceeds through the process. Councilmember Martinez asked if income level would be one of the criteria. Mr. Skeete said they would come back to Council once the criteria have been identified.

Councilmember Clark asked that they consider place-holding money for the program, revisiting the criteria and details of the program at a later date.

Councilmember Martinez said he supports the program.

Mayor Scruggs asked staff to bring the Stadium and Westgate budget items back to the April 19 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.