

***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 OF THE
GLENDALE CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL BUDGET WORKSHOP SESSION
Council Chambers
5850 West Glendale Avenue
March 20, 2012
8:30 a.m.**

PRESENT: Vice Mayor Steven E. Frate and Councilmembers Norma S. Alvarez, Joyce V. Clark, Yvonne J. Knaack, H. Phillip Lieberman, and Manuel D. Martinez

ABSENT: Mayor Elaine M. Scruggs

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

1. 5TH BUDGET WORKSHOP

PRESENTED BY: Sherry M. Schurhammer, Executive Director, Financial Services Department; Jim Colson, Deputy City Manager, Development, Neighborhood and Human Services; Pamela Hanna, City Clerk; Craig Tindall, City Attorney; Horatio Skeete, City Manager; Erik Strunk, Executive Director, Parks, Recreation and Library; Debora Black, Interim Police Chief; Mark Burdick, Fire Chief; Stuart Kent, Executive Director, Public Works; Jamsheed Mehta, Executive Director, Transportation.

This is a request for City Council to review the material presented in the budget workbook. This workshop will cover the following:

- Neighborhood & Human Services, pages 269 – 293;
- City Clerk, pages 134 – 142;
- City Court, pages 143 – 156;
- City Attorney, pages 129 – 133;
- City Manager, pages 157 – 161;

- Parks and Recreation section of Parks, Recreation, and Library, see 3/20/2012 agenda packet materials for revised cost of service pages that replace pages 311 – 352 in the council budget workbook;
- Police Department, pages 26 – 48;
- Fire Department, pages 49 – 75;
- Public Works Department (Streets Maintenance, Landfill and Sanitation) pages 76 – 85;
- Transportation Services (Transportation, Airport) pages 86 – 103;
- Water Services (Environmental Resources, Utilities), pages 104 – 125;
- Mayor and City Council, pages 126 – 128; and
- Human Resources and Compensation, pages 255 – 263.

In response to Council’s request for more time to review the city’s budget, five budget workshops have been scheduled for February and March 2012. Additional workshops will be scheduled if needed.

The material to be reviewed at the budget workshops is contained in the budget workbook that was posted with the meeting agenda.

The City Council budget workbook was prepared to facilitate Council’s review of the operating budgets for city departments. A detailed explanation of the budget workbook that is labeled “Budget Workbook Material – Explanation” is included in the workbook.

Please note that the budget workbook materials include a draft FY 2013 budget for each department. Any revisions to departmental operating budgets agreed upon by Council during its review will be incorporated. After that review is completed, we will return with a revised FY 2013 budget and a proposed balancing plan for the GF.

The 4th budget workshop occurred on March 6, 2012.

The 3rd budget workshop occurred on February 28, 2012.

The 2nd budget workshop occurred on February 21, 2012.

The 1st budget workshop occurred on February 14, 2012.

At the January 10, 2012 Council meeting, an ordinance was adopted authorizing the refunding/restructuring of outstanding water/sewer revenue obligations and Municipal Property Corporation (MPC) excise tax revenue bonds and authorizing the issuance of these bonds in an amount not to exceed \$99 million and \$70 million respectively.

At the January 3, 2012 Council workshop, staff presented the debt management plan and options related to refinancing outstanding MPC debt and refunding outstanding water/sewer debt.

Glendale’s budget is an important financial, planning and public communication tool. It gives residents and businesses a clear and concise view of the city’s direction for public services,

operations and capital facilities and equipment. It also provides the community with a better understanding of the city's ongoing needs for stable revenue sources to fund public services, ongoing operations and capital facilities and equipment.

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

This workshop is for information only. Decisions on the FY 2012-13 budget will not be requested until a later date.

Vice Mayor Steven E. Frate called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was Neighborhoods and Human Services Department which consists of four divisions.

Jim Colson, Deputy City Manager, Development, Neighborhood and Human Services; provided a power point presentation on the following: He asked for Council to interject with any questions or comments they may have as staff is presenting their departments. He explained the vast majority of the funding for personnel and project direct services delivery for the Neighborhood and Human Services Department comes from federal and state grants. He noted there were a total of 6.35 vacancies in the departments and all are federally funded. The total FY 13 operating budget for the department is \$21,103,291 and a total of \$895 is funded through the general fund. The remaining was sourced through grants.

Community Partnerships & CAP: N'Hood Partnership, Community Revitalization, CDBG, Community Housing and CAP

FTEs: GF 6.5, CDBG 8.8, Housing 25, CAP 7

Salary & Benefits (A6000) \$3,360K

Internal Service Premiums (A7500) \$132K

Non-Salary (A7000) \$17,611K

(GF \$275K, CAP \$1,084K, HOME \$695K,
ESG \$93, NSP III \$3,018K, CDBG \$1,555K,
Housing \$10,891K)

Councilmember Clark commented this was a pass-through program with the city only paying for the use of the facility that houses the employees. She noted approximately 4,000 people were assisted with CAP. She remarked this program also assists people with utility payments.

Councilmember Martinez asked a question on page 271. He noted a significant reduction in case management from 180 to 78. Mr. Colson explained that figure reflected a funding spike, however funding has been generally consistent and has no adverse impact on operations.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was Neighborhoods and Human Services.

Mr. Colson explained the mission for the Community Revitalization Division was to promote affordable housing, economic revitalization and offer support to provide suitable living environments for Glendale residents. The total Community Revitalization budget is \$6.3 million

and of that more than \$6 million was from federal sources and \$361,000 from the general fund. The general fund expenditures include the salary cost of two employees which was down from three in FY 12. It also funds two non-profits programs and provides matching funds for home projects. In addition, staff also uses the general fund to cover any non-grant related activity of staff. He noted their administrative costs run about 14.7% of their overall budget.

Mr. Gilbert Lopez, Revitalization Administrator, explained this department was handling all the stimulus funds and were on track with NSP 1 and NSP 3 and looking closely at the federal budget and it appears that they might receive a slight increase in their budget in CDBG. He stated the department has assisted approximately 21,000 people including the non-profits.

Councilmember Lieberman asked a question on page 281 regarding the high figure for employees. Mr. Colson explained the \$360,000 was a reflection of the FY12 budget, however, the FY 13 budget has been reduced to \$219,000. This figure also funds the non-profits as well as the matching. Councilmember Lieberman asked how much payroll was covered by CDBG funding in percentage. Mr. Colson stated approximately 80% of staffing was covered by CDBG. Councilmember Lieberman commented on another program under CDBG. Mr. Lopez explained that program, in conjunction with Habitat for Humanity, was helping people with foreclosed homes with buying and reselling them. They have worked on a total of 23 homes and have had a very positive impact in the community.

Councilmember Knaack commented this was a very necessary element needed in the community and she fully supports it. She said this program really does serve the neediest citizens, especially in these economic times.

Councilmember Alvarez asked if there was a limit they could spend on revitalizing a home. Mr. Lopez explained they had guidelines to which they must adhere. Councilmember Alvarez asked how much warranty the home owner has when they move into the home. Mr. Lopez said it was the same as when you purchase a home on your own. He explained the emergency repair program for seniors. Councilmember Alvarez asked how many homes were done last year. Mr. Lopez state it was 21 with the rehabilitation program, however, in total it was about 230 to 250 homes. Councilmember Alvarez wondered who paid for the apartments when a client has to leave the home for the repairs. Mr. Lopez stated they had temporary CDBG funds available for relocation which was usually three months.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was Neighborhood Partnership.

Mr. Colson explained the Neighborhood Partnership serves neighborhoods and residents throughout Glendale. The activities include Neighborhood capacity building and outreach, focusing on engagement, problem solving and support. This program was entirely funded by the general fund. The fiscal year budget is \$402,964 which was a reduction from last year. There are currently 4.5 FTEs with no vacancies in this department.

Councilmember Clark inquired if the 4.5 FTEs were used for all these programs. Mr. Colson explained each member has their expertise; however, they have a lot of cross training.

Councilmember Clark noted she would have liked to have seen a total cost of what each FTE cost a department on an annual basis. Mr. Colson noted there was a cost of under \$30,000 for a part time employee to run the mediation program. The community volunteer program's impact was \$131,000 from a staffing perspective and from the A-7000 would be \$15,000. Councilmember Clark asked what the latest count was for the homeless in the city. This count is done through the Maricopa Association of Governments valley wide. The count, however was not done since many of the municipalities did not approve of the methodology that was used for conducting the count. Councilmember Clark asked if there was any cost associated with the Adopt-a-Neighborhood Program. Mr. Colson stated they allocate \$25,000 to that program from the A-6000 perspective.

Councilmember Lieberman asked to come back to the homeless prevention topic and asked if the city had any homeless prevention programs. He wondered why, with a budget of \$131 million, the city was not doing more for the homeless. He feels very bad and sorry for the people who have lost their homes and jobs and believes the city should be doing more to help them. Mr. Colson stated the city was actively involved with many programs which help the homeless. Mr. Lopez discussed the great focus and the many programs the city was involved with to help the community and it's homeless. They have helped over 3,700 people who claimed Glendale as their home with food and shelter. Councilmember Lieberman commented on the hail storm that happened in October of 2010. Mr. Lopez stated his department helped about 15 people with their roofs that did not have home insurance and were eligible.

Councilmember Lieberman stated he was very cognizant of the life he has as opposed to the people who have lost their homes and jobs. He hopes the city was doing everything possible with the funding they receive to help these unfortunate people.

Councilmember Knaack asked if there was any efficiency in combining these departments since it seems a little confusing as to who does what. Mr. Colson indicated these departments are combined, however, believes there was room for communication between groups which can be very beneficial and result in better service delivery.

Councilmember Martinez commented on the homeless count and believes it was somewhere between 40 and 60. He asked if the city had a contract with the Phoenix shelter. Mr. Lopez stated the department does partner with the Phoenix shelter through federal funding. He noted they served about 700 people that claim Glendale as their last home before they became homeless. He added the street count was 33 last year. Many of the homeless turn around quickly since their situation was only short-term and are promptly on their feet again with the aid provided.

Councilmember Clark asked for clarification on the area under Service Alternatives on page 287. Mr. Colson explained that reference pertains to reassigning activities within the Neighborhoods Partnership and Homeless Division to bring it closer with the point of contact with the programming. Councilmember Clark asked a question on Service Alternatives on page 288 regarding Civic Participation and Community Education. She wondered if the online virtual reality class proposed was in addition to the current physical classes that are offered to citizens or

instead of those classes. Mr. Colson noted it was premature to comment on this now, however, the thought process was to increase the reach of the program and to potentially address long term budget issues. At this point, there are no plans to stop doing what they were doing physically but are currently looking at how to increase a more technology based delivery system. Councilmember Clark stated this was a great idea since there was the potential to reach more people and make it more accessible at any time since it's the wave of the future. She hopes staff does look into this and try to create an alternative. Councilmember Clark asked how much were they contributing annually to CASS. Mr. Colson replied it was \$110,000 per year. Councilmember Clark noted she would like staff to consider not funding this program next year.

Vice Mayor Frate explained CASS was a program used for anyone needing immediate housing. These people were short-term homeless that needed to be housed. Councilmember Clark remarked that over the years she has supported CASS, however, in these economic times, she would like to take a closer look at that item.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was Community Housing.

Mr. Colson stated the department receives federal funds to administer primarily two programs which were the Conventional Public Housing Program and Section Eight Housing Choice Voucher Program. Both programs are designed to assist low and very low income Glendale families with long term rental assistance. The city owns and manages 155 public housing units in three complexes and allocates 1,054 section eight vouchers as well as 500 vouchers for families that reside in Glendale with a voucher from another jurisdiction. Currently Glendale is assisting 4,443 residents with nearly 50% of them under the age of 18 years and out of almost all those assisted, 54% are elderly or disabled. The total housing budget is \$12.6 million which was almost entirely made up of federal funds. He noted all staff positions were federally funded. There are six vacancies within the housing division. He noted staff was currently recruiting for an additional employee transfer.

Vice Mayor Frate commented these programs were federally funded to help the less fortunate, both children and elderly. He supports these programs fully.

Councilmember Clark remarked on how often employees were moved from one division to another and wonders how often it happens during the course of the year. Horatio Skeete, City Manager, explained this was not a regular occurrence; however, it does occur from time to time. He stated it is usually done when an evaluation was done on where a specific person was needed. Councilmember Clark asked if the transfer occurred when the department needed additional help or because there was not enough work in a particular department. Mr. Skeete replied it was usually because a department needed additional help. Mr. Ed Beasley, City Manager explained further, adding there were many factors that were looked at before any transfer occurs. Councilmember Clark wondered what occurs with the salary and benefits of that employee and who gets charged. Mr. Skeete noted that if it's a temporary move, it stays in the original department, however, for a long term move it will change to the new department.

Councilmember Knaack questioned if the city often tries to move that person to another department rather than laying that employee off. She noted that in this economic environment, that person should be laid off.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was the City Clerk's office. Pam Hanna, City Clerk, stated the city clerk's department responsibilities were defined by the City Charter, City Code, State Statutes and Federal Laws. The department's primary functions are focused on informing the citizens about public meetings, public records, the City Charter, Code, and Municipal Elections. The department contributes to municipal transparency by formatting and linking the items in the City Council agenda and support documents for posting on the City Clerk's web page prior to every City Council meeting. The department holds the official record of meetings; the City Council minutes are prepared and posted to the same website after every meeting. In addition, staff compiles the minutes of all other city public meetings assuring their availability on the internet. The office also verifies and processes all Charter amendments and ordinances as part of the codification process. The City Charter and City Code are available in the city clerk's office, city libraries and on the internet. The department also oversees and implements the city's record management program which directs the processing, organizing and storing of all city records. The city clerk department teaches records management classes and assists other departments in indexing, scanning and researching in the city's electronic records data base. The office provides voter and political committee services which are vital and necessary to the community as well as planning and conducting municipal elections. Recently, the city clerk's office managed the city's redistricting process, successfully complying with City Charter and Federal Laws. The six employees in the office are functional in all areas of departmental processes and procedures making sure all city requirements are fulfilled. The city clerk's department facilitates the rights of citizens to participate in city government.

Councilmember Knaack asked if this department was as lean as it could be for the work they do. Ms. Hanna explained she has looked for areas in which to cut, however, has not found any since much of what they do was mandated by law. She stated they were one of the leanest offices in the valley since most of the other departments have eight people working in their department. Additionally, in 2008, the office had a reduction of a part-time person that was scanning and indexing for the city court. They are now providing that service to all city departments through records management and have saved the city court almost \$11,000 since they began doing that project. She indicated her staff absorbed the 20 hours from the part-time employee within the six people to continue to perform that service for the court. She noted they were a service based department which serves the public and organizations. She added part of their budget was also providing the courts software annual fee for electronics records management as well as for building safety and community development.

Councilmember Knaack thanked staff for the amazing job their office did with the redistricting process. She stated that other cities did not even come close to what was done in Glendale. She remarked that the accolades came locally and nationally on the wonderful work done by staff in the areas of transparency and participation by citizens.

Councilmember Lieberman thanked Ms. Hanna for all she and her staff do with their limited resources, which was truly amazing. However, he would like clarification on the increase for FY 13 in that department. Ms. Sherry Schurhammer, Executive Director, Financial Services Department, reminded Councilmember Lieberman that the FY 13 does not include the furloughs.

Councilmember Martinez asked for clarification on why there was a large decrease in the non-salary figure. Ms. Schurhammer explained that portion had to do with the carryover for the elections budget in FY11/12.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item on the agenda was the City Court.

Judge Elizabeth Finn, City Court Judge, provided a brief summary. She explained much of what they do was either mandated by the Constitution, the Supreme Court Rules, City Ordinances or other mandates. Their mission is to provide a prompt, fair and just resolution of cases in a professional, efficient, courteous manner. They are one of the few entities within the city that must accept all work given to them and process those cases within a mandated time.

City Court, Court Security and Court Time Payments

FTEs: General Fund 38.8, Court Fund 3

Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$3,145K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$48K
Non-Salary (A7000)	\$1,082K
(GF \$686K, Court Fund \$396K)	

Councilmember Clark asked a question on page 146. She asked where the \$6 million in revenue generation went. Judge Finn noted that about half of that goes into the general fund and the other was a pass through for the state. The projection for the general fund this year was approximately \$2.8 million.

Councilmember Clark asked a question on page 154 regarding a person that possibly generates revenue. Judge Finn explained their treatment court was primarily for domestic violence cases. Therefore, this was close monitoring that was performed by a compliance specialist and provides information to the judge on whether they are current on their restitution as well as compliance with other judicial orders. Councilmember Clark inquired as to the FTEs mentioned on pages 146 through 155 and asked why they were separated. Judge Finn explained the three areas shown were all from three different fund areas. She explained the duties of the three areas. Councilmember Clark asked if these employees were all crossed trained. Judge Finn replied yes. Councilmember Clark inquired as to the gross receipts of \$868, 298,077 and how much of that goes back to the court or the state. Judge Finn explained that just about everything was 50% goes to the city and 50% was a pass through to another entity. Councilmember Clark asked how much goes into the general fund of the 50% that stays with the city annually. Judge Finn restated their projection was \$2.8 million to the general fund. Councilmember Clark asked what their total budget was. Judge Finn stated it was \$3.3 million with 85% cost recovery.

Councilmember Martinez questioned why they were projecting reductions when they had a lot to do in the court system. Judge Finn stated her staff was down about 20%, however, they have also seen a decrease in case load numbers as other cities nationwide have also seen.

Councilmember Knaack inquired as to the vacancies they currently have. Judge Finn noted that within the last three weeks she has seen three vacancies in her department. Councilmember Knaack inquired as to the domestic violence person grant and if that will continue. Judge Finn replied that person will remain in place with other grant funding that was acquired. Councilmember Knaack noted that from 2008/09 to present they were down a lot of employees. She asked Judge Finn if her department was as lean as they could have it. Judge Finn replied yes.

Councilmember Clark asked what the alternative funding source was for the domestic violence person on staff. Judge Finn stated that person's funding was in the courts improvement fund.

Vice Mayor Frate thanked Judge Finn for all she and her staff accomplished for the city and public.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was the City Attorney's Office.

Mr. Craig Tindall, City Attorney, stated the city attorney's office is divided into two divisions, criminal and civil. They supplement their services with outside counsels either to maintain their resources or for a short term need for a particular expertise. He noted that because of shared administrative functions, their budgets run about 50% between the two departments. He stated that staff has exactly 28 position, 11 in civil and 17 in criminal with two being grant filled positions. The office handles approximately 50 cases on an ongoing basis. The prosecutor's office handles approximately 10,000 prosecutions per year and about 20 code cases. They also develop during the year about 120 ordinances and resolutions, review about 250 proposed legislative bills and review approximately 800 public records requests for the year.

Councilmember Clark asked if the two grant positions were on the criminal or civil side. Mr. Tindall replied they were on the criminal side for domestic violence cases. Councilmember Clark noted their budget was \$2.3 million and asked if they had an increase over last year. Mr. Tindall replied no.

Councilmember Lieberman inquired as to the additional legal cost from outside counsel. He asked for a dollar and cent figure for how much that amounted to and not shown under city court expenditures. Mr. Tindall explained he could not provide an exact number since they do not maintain a budget for outside counsel for particular items that may be charged back to a department.

Councilmember Martinez commented on the memo provided by the attorney's office which highlights other cities legal staff and ratio to population, with Glendale being one of the lowest. He wondered why Peoria was not one of the cities listed. Mr. Tindall explained it might have been overlooked when he prepared the memo; however, it was also in line with the rest of the cities mentioned.

Councilmember Clark asked Mr. Tindall to explain what “disintermediation” meant. Mr. Tindall remarked on the cost associated with using an outside agent and bringing them up to speed as well as paying for their lodging.

Councilmember Clark commented the city attorney’s office ran a pretty lean staff and office. She stated the Council and the city appreciates everything they do. She noted it showed that Tempe, Chandler and Glendale operate with minimal staffing and yet serve the interest of their community very well. She thanked Mr. Tindall for all his work with the critical issues taking place in Glendale today.

Vice Mayor Frate stated next on the agenda was the City Manager’s office.

Horatio Skeete, Assistant City Manager, provided a brief summary. He explained the department provides direction and support to the entire city operations with the exception of the city clerk, city attorney and city court offices.

City Manager

FTEs: General Fund <u>6</u>	
Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$814K
Non-Salary (A7000)	\$108K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$10K

Councilmember Clark commented that this department has gone from a high of 15 employees in FY 2009/10 down to six employees. She stated staff has done a tremendous job in reducing the number of FTEs while still producing the same products and in some cases better. She noted they were the example of doing more with less. She greatly appreciates it.

Vice Mayor Frate asked if they still have people from different departments come in to train. Mr. Skeete replied that this year, they did reinstate their intern program. He added they had expanded the program to include two other departments of choice in addition to the manager’s office to train in.

Councilmember Clark inquired as to the salaries and benefits of the employees who were training. Mr. Skeete replied those costs stay with their departments.

Vice Mayor Frate called for a 10 minutes break. The meeting was called back to order.

Erik Strunk, Executive Director, Parks, Recreation and Library; provided a brief summary.

Parks: Parks Maintenance, Adult Center, Foothills Recreation Center, Recreation Support Service, Youth & Teen, Sports & Health, etc. and Parks Self-Sustaining.

FTEs: General Fund <u>69</u> & Self Sustaining Fund <u>7</u>	
Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$4,996K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$268K

Non-Salary (A7000) \$5,626K
(GF \$4,004K, Self-Sustaining \$683K, Designated
\$177K, YSC \$262K and Grants Fund \$500K)

Councilmember Clark stated she would like to see these programs recapture 50% of their revenue as a policy. She said this would make a tremendous difference when it came to the general fund.

Councilmember Clark asked what was meant by service alternatives such as adjusting staff levels or outsourcing. Mr. Strunk replied this had to do with some maintenance obligations they were looking at. Councilmember Clark also inquired as to the IGAs that were mentioned. Mr. Strunk stated the IGAs had to do with swim lessons the city contracted with the pools at Cactus and Ironwood High Schools. Staff was looking at cost savings if those were eliminated. Councilmember Clark asked how many swim lessons were done at these locations. Mr. Strunk stated that in FY2010/11 lessons at Ironwood were 649 and at Cactus it was 900. The cost to the city for Cactus was \$42,413 and for Ironwood it was \$77,122. Councilmember Clark noted it cost the city approximately \$100 per swim lesson. Mr. Strunk replied yes. Councilmember Clark said the cost saving to the city if they did away with this program would be \$158,000.

Councilmember Martinez asked if there were fees for the swim lessons. Mr. Strunk replied yes. Councilmember Martinez asked if the fees were different for non-residents and residents. Mr. Strunk replied yes and stated fees are \$21 for residents and \$38 for non-residents for two week lessons.

Councilmember Alvarez asked how many pools they had south of Olive. Mr. Strunk stated they had one pool in that region which was the Rose Lane Aquatic Center. Councilmember Alvarez inquired as to the agreement with Glendale High. Mr. Strunk explained the IGA contract with the Glendale Unified School District was rescinded at the end of FY2008 due to low attendance and cost. Councilmember Alvarez asked what the attendance was when the contract was done away with. Mr. Strunk stated that in 2008 it was 1,569 for open swim and 140 for lessons. Councilmember Alvarez asked what the count at Ironwood was. Mr. Strunk replied there were 649 swim lessons and at Rose Lane it was 4,155 open swim. Councilmember Alvarez inquired as to the O'Neil pool. Mr. Strunk explained the O'Neil pool was last open to the public in the summer of 2009 since it was deemed inoperable due to serious structural damage. Because of the cost involved and the economic downturn, the city was not prepared to start reconstruction of the pool. Councilmember Alvarez asked what the cost was to build a new pool. Mr. Strunk stated the cost to build a new pool was \$2.5 million and the cost of operating it would be another \$96,000 a year to maintain.

Councilmember Clark commented on the structural failure of the O'Neil pool and its closure. However, by examining the information further, the IGA would have been done away with regardless of that fact. She questioned the criteria used since the pool was the only one offering open swim in the area. Mr. Skeete explained the decision to close the pool was primarily because of the catastrophic structural failure and not low swim numbers. He added the city had been doing repairs to that pool, however, could not continue to do those repairs because of the

cost. Councilmember Clark reiterated she would like to use different criteria when assessing pool IGAs for the city. She still believed the O'Neil pool was targeted before it was deemed unusable.

Councilmember Martinez disagreed with Councilmember Clark's comments. He stated the city continued to repair that facility repeatedly until it became too expensive and the city did not have the money in the CIP to build a new pool. He does not believe the process that was used was flawed. The decision was made because of lack of resources.

Councilmember Knaack asked for non-resident and resident numbers on those two pools. Mr. Strunk stated that in 2011 total use of their aquatics facilities for non-resident was 27,703 and the resident usage was 57,308. He added the O'Neil Pool issue was reviewed with the public as part of last year's budget process.

Councilmember Alvarez stated she does not want to hear staff try to defend what happened to O'Neil Pool since kids need services anywhere south of Glendale other than Rose Lane. She noted kids who went to O'Neil Pool could not go to Rose Lane because of the distance. She said the reason given for not keeping the pool open was lack of funds; however, the city was paying \$20 million for the Coyote issue. She explained the city was forgetting about the community and the people who pay taxes and the kids that don't have the pools or recreation. She remarked she was not blaming staff or the Council, but believes they need to start thinking about services for the community first.

Vice Mayor Frate inquired if they had provided transportation for kids wanting to attend Rose Lane Pool from O'Neil. Mr. Strunk replied yes, however, the level of interest was almost non-existent and that offer was discontinued. Vice Mayor Frate stated he wanted everyone to know this Council was dedicated to the citizens of Glendale. He assured the public they will, in the future, when the economy turns around get back on track with revenues to be able to make these improvements and offer different programs for the communities. However, as everyone was aware, these were hard economic times for everyone in the country and the city was doing the best they can. He added they were trying to do things that were fiscally responsible.

Councilmember Alvarez commented that the kids from O'Neil who went to Rose Lane were being referred to Phoenix pools because of no room. Mr. Strunk explained they did have rules for capacity and if that happens, staff does provide options. Councilmember Alvarez said she was not blaming anyone and just trying to make the point that the need was there and the city does not have it.

Councilmember Clark remarked she was not aware that O'Neil kids were being turned away. She noted the dense population in the area where the O'Neil Pool was located and the need for this recreation. Councilmember Clark said the city should explore options for funding a new pool at O'Neil Park, near 64th and Missouri avenues. She hopes staff keeps that in mind when the economy turns around and has CIP money to devote to recreational projects and that O'Neil Pool will be a priority.

Councilmember Lieberman questioned the high cost to repair the O'Neil Pool. He would like to see new figures from a different contractor for replacing the pool. Mr. Beasley stated the last pool figures were over \$2 million. He added alternative funding sources were discussed when they provided that information to the public last budget cycle. Councilmember Clark agreed that acquiring alternative funding sources was a great idea.

Vice Mayor Frate inquired if the full capacity figures at Rose Lane were possibly due to residents coming from Phoenix. Mr. Strunk replied that was possible, however, he had no real figures to show that fact. He added the facility was very well received and was used quite heavily. Councilmember Clark noted the Rose Lane facility was very beautifully built and very popular.

Councilmember Martinez suggested setting the non-resident fee higher to avoid the capacity issue and let the residents have first choice. He asked staff to look very closely at those gate fees.

Vice Mayor Frate agreed that the area did not have enough swimming pools. He suggested Councilmember's Alvarez and Clark bring that to the attention of the new district Councilmember for the Phoenix area near Rose Lane. Councilmember Lieberman agreed that many Phoenix citizens are using the Rose Lane Pool quite a bit.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was the Adult Center.

Mr. Strunk provided the summary on this item. He stated the Center was a gathering place for adults and a place for them to go to participate and learn new skills and traits. He noted last year they had a little over 162,690 visitors that attended the Adult Center.

Councilmember Lieberman commented he was very appreciative on how the numbers were presented. He stated the Adult Center was returning 25.63% of the cost of running it. He agrees with Councilmember Clark's assessment that they need to get to a 50% return on their city investments. He wondered why the city has not contributed any funding to complete the 2nd floor since the center was very popular. He would like staff to look into it once the economy turns around.

Councilmember Knaack restated her belief they were getting away from the real issue of the city being in a difficult situation regarding their huge budget deficit. She noted the Adult Center was very low priority when there were deficits in fire and police. However, she does agree with the alternatives presented by staff on this issue. She suggested leasing out the second floor to a company that would augment services offered by the center. She recommends they get back to the issue at hand and balance the budget. Councilmember Clark agreed with Councilmember Knaack's comments and added she too would like staff to peruse the alternatives mentioned.

Councilmember Martinez asked for the break down for non-residents and residents who visit the facility. Mr. Strunk stated for FY 2010/11 for non-resident it was 874 and for residents the number was 2,244.

Vice Mayor Frate asked what the membership fees were for the Adult Center. Mr. Strunk stated it was \$10 for residents and \$15 for non-residents.

Councilmember Alvarez remarked the city was very lucky to have Mr. Strunk heading the Parks and Recreation Department. She stated he was a very intelligent individual that cares a lot for the community. She noted she was very proud of Mr. Strunk and his abilities.

Vice Mayor Frate called for a lunch break from 11:30 to 1:00pm. Meeting called back to order.

Erik Strunk, Executive Director, Parks, Recreation and Library, continued his presentation on Parks and Recreation Department.

Councilmember Lieberman asked for the cost to provide these services. Mr. Strunk stated the total was \$948,954. Councilmember Lieberman asked for figures relating to revenues. Ms. Christine Frederickson, Parks and Recreation Department, stated they collect Ramada reservation fees and in FY 2011 the city collected \$140,000 in Ramada revenue and an additional \$15,000 in special use permits as well as another \$6,000 from the municipal complex reservation. The total was \$161,000 for FY 11.

Mr. Strunk stated the next item was the Youth and Teen Division. This division is responsible for coordinating all activities of their summer recreation programs, 13 citywide after school program and the three recreation centers that include Glendale Community Center, Rose Lane Recreation Center and O'Neil Recreation Center. The division also coordinates the senior program in partnership with the YWCA. The total cost to provide these services is \$971,283.

Councilmember Knaack remarked that under service alternatives, staff needs to take a hard look at increasing the fees as appropriate and possibly cut some programs. She knows these programs are great for the community; however, they really need to take a hard look at streamlining the budget.

Vice Mayor Frate agreed with Councilmember Knaack's assessment of increasing the fee structure.

Councilmember Lieberman remarked he was in favor of most of the service alternatives, however, would like to reconsider keeping the programs if possible. Vice Mayor Frate agreed that these teen programs were important and keep teens safe; however, this was a tough budget year and everything needs to be looked at.

Councilmember Alvarez asked for the fees to the GRASP Program. Ms. Frederickson stated the current rate fee per semester was \$35 for resident and \$45 for non-resident. Councilmember Alvarez inquired about the Summer Drop-In Program. Ms. Frederickson replied the fee for that program was \$45 for resident and \$55 for non-resident.

Vice Mayor Frate asked Ms. Frederickson to explain the GRASP Program process. Ms. Frederickson explained the program is the acronym for Glendale Recreation after School

Program and started from when school was dismissed until 6:00pm. The semester fee was used for supplies and payment for teachers. The semester fee is paid in August and January.

Councilmember Lieberman asked how many non-resident registrations they receive per year. Ms. Frederickson replied she did not have that information, however, they were minimal.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was the Youth Sports Complex.

Mr. Strunk provided a brief summary on this item. The Youth Sports Complex primarily serves as an athletic venue for youth and special events. It also serves as a vehicular parking lot during mega events for the Arizona Cardinal's games and special activities associated with that. The cost to operate this item was \$262,000 per year and an additional \$50,000 a year that was in the electricity budget that has already been discussed by Mr. Kent.

Councilmember Martinez asked for clarification as to why the contract expired and now they were looking at other bids. Mr. Strunk explained the contract could not be extended contractually and staff was currently working on the bid process. Councilmember Martinez remarked that with a cost of \$262,000 and revenues only coming in at \$27,674, they really need to see how they could generate more revenue. Mr. Strunk agreed and explained staff does understand the nature of it and hopes to have it addressed through the RFP.

Councilmember Clark questioned why in their summary it states that management fees might increase with the impact of changing services and bid process. Mr. Strunk explained that as with everything over time, costs increase. He noted the city had a set rate with the previous company, however, does not know what the bid process will bring. Councilmember Clark asked what was wrong with Global Spectrum's bid on renewing this contract since they were willing to reduce their fee. Mr. Strunk explained the bid process the city goes through to renew contracts called out a series of elements that were not satisfactorily addressed in the initial RFP they received from them. Subsequently, the panel that oversees the RFP process deemed it non responsive and following protocol cancelled the bid.

Vice Mayor Frate recommended staff to look into maximizing the use of the fields and the different charges and fee structure. He believes there were team and groups out there that would be very interested in renting these fields

Councilmember Knaack commented on the high cost to run those fields with very little revenue generated from them. She asked how this compared with the Sahuaro Ranch Complex since she believes those fields do generate revenue. Mr. Strunk noted he did not have that information available at the moment, however, can provide it later since they do side by side comparisons all the time in budget discussions. Mr. Skeete remarked it was important to understand the different dynamics between the youth sports fields and the other fields like the Sahuaro Ranch field. The Sahuaro Ranch fields are managed internally by the Recreation Department; however, the Youth Fields were a package contract arrangement where they provided all the maintenance as well as making the facilities available to the public. As part of the agreement, they keep 60% of the

revenue collected for youth on the fields. He noted all this information will be brought back when staff presents the budget as well as comparisons side by side on this item.

Councilmember Clark asked if the city was managing the fields to the same standards internally as they required the previous management company. Ms. Karen Hesser, Deputy Director, Parks, Recreation and Library Services, stated she was pleased to answer that the city was meeting those standards and exceeding in several others.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was Park Maintenance.

Mr. Strunk stated the mission of the park maintenance division is to ensure safe, aesthetically pleasing and well maintained parks and facilities for the enjoyment of their citizens and facility opportunity for those to participate in. The division was responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of 92 park and open space facilities, 55 neighborhood parks, 9 community parks, 6 regional parks, the Thunderbird Conservation Park and the retention basins. The division was also responsible for 4 sports complexes, the public safety building, historic Sahuaro Ranch Park and the landscape and water services for these facilities. Additionally, they are responsible for restrooms, shade awnings, park and playground equipment. The total cost to provide these services throughout the city last year was \$4.2 million. There are 31 positions in this division.

Vice Mayor Frate asked what was appropriated for water in FY 2010/11/12. Ms. Hesser replied to her recollection they did receive a slight budget adjustment. The amount budgeted for the previous FY was \$829,000. Vice Mayor Frate remarked that he had received comments from the public that the grounds did not appear to be watered in a timely manner and some areas were dying. Ms. Hesser stated that was the appropriated amount, the expenditures for last year was about \$1.3 million.

Councilmember Martinez asked what was appropriated for this year. Ms. Hesser stated it was \$1,080,880. Councilmember Martinez noted that the appropriation was lower than the expenditure. Ms. Hesser stated he was correct. Mr. Strunk explained that within a budget of \$4.2 million, there was movement in the budget when certain areas come in short. Ms. Schurhammer further explained their total budget was \$4.2 million and while they refer to budget items by line item, they must, at the end, balance to the bottom line. Therefore, they were not exceeding their budget.

Councilmember Knaack commented that Park and Recreation was a very huge department and has to be maintained since they cannot just stop watering the plants and stop taking care of the parks. She added that parks and recreation was the city's pursuit of happiness. She asked them to continue to do what they were doing and try to be as efficient as possible.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was the Foothills Aquatic Center.

Mr. Strunk stated the Foothills Aquatic Center is a 59,000 square foot family friendly community recreation center that provides recreational programs for all ages. They also hold various special interest classes and have an aquatics center. The facility is designed to offer multiple levels of

fee based programming that is priced according to their cost recovery objectives which was approximately 78% for the entire operation. Last year in FY 2010/11 it had a little over 427,000 visitors. The total cost to provide these services is \$1.426 million. In FY 10/11 the city received approximately \$1,050,374 million in revenue. There are 7 FTEs in this facility.

Councilmember Clark inquired if the figure of \$1.426 million to provide total services included aquatics. She asked if they were adding the aquatic revenue on the revenue side and also adding the aquatics cost on the cost side in these figures. Mr. Strunk replied yes.

Vice Mayor Frate asked a question regarding service alternatives which states “to pursue faithful cost recovery of the facility and delete all general fund contributions of \$450,000.” He asked if that was even feasible to do. Mr. Strunk explained staff was working on the premise of getting the operation off the general fund and seeing if they can get it more toward a self-sustaining endeavor. Vice Mayor Frate and Councilmember Clark stated they could support that endeavor.

Councilmember Lieberman remarked that according to these figures, the return was 73.63% which was absolutely excellent. Councilmember Martinez agreed with Councilmember Lieberman’s comments. He noted they need to remember this was the only facility that recovers that much of its cost. However, he believes to expect 100% from this facility was a bit much.

Vice Mayor Frate stated next on the agenda was the Right-of-Way.

Mr. Strunk stated the Right-of-Way division is a 14 member team that’s responsible for maintaining all city owned developed and undeveloped areas along the roadsides to ensure they are aesthetically pleasing and safe for cars and pedestrians. Activities include tree trimming, litter collection, water and irrigation maintenance, replacement of damaged, stolen or broken trees, and clearing of streets and sidewalks. Additionally, they review a variety of contracts for developed and undeveloped areas. The total cost to provide these services for this division was \$2,141,686.

Councilmember Clark asked if the entire amount was funded through the HURF program revenue funds. Ms. Hesser replied yes. Councilmember Clark inquired why Right-of-Way was under Parks and Recreation. Mr. Strunk explained it used to be in field operations, however, because of commonalities with park maintenance, it was decided almost a year ago to bring them into Parks and Recreation. As a result, they expect to see lower costs with respect to capital replacement as well as being able to leverage staff on the parks side. They are trying to work a lot smarter at less cost. Councilmember Clark asked if Parks and Recreation would be assisting in the development process by reviewing construction plans and operation configuration as well as blue stake request. Councilmember Clark suggested those functions were better served being out of engineering. Mr. Skeete explained the process of blue staking was actually distributed throughout city operations and all impacted departments are required to be certified and identify blue staking such as the water department identifies the water lines and so forth. He added that through the years, staff has found it more efficient to have the department closely related to the service on the ground be responsible for identifying where the service lines are located.

Councilmember Knaack asked if they were doing that themselves or are they contracting the clean-up for the right-of-ways. Ms. Hesser explained many of the areas were under contract; however, the Right-of-Way staff was still responsible for the emergency calls and the trimming of trees over all the areas.

Councilmember Clark asked if they had any kind of service in regards to dead animals on the road. Ms. Schurhammer stated that was handled through the public works department and was contracted out.

Vice Mayor Frate stated they will move on to page 333.

Mr. Strunk explained the following were peppered throughout the previous item that was sent to them. These items were all in reference to appropriation authority for a series of IGAs and other obligations they have in the budget. Staff listed these out in case Council had any questions. The money was budgeted for them in each of the categories.

Councilmember Clark asked a question on page 341 in regard to Elise McCarthy Park maintenance in the amount of \$44,000. She questioned initiating a new project and asked where the money will be coming from. Ms. Hesser stated this comes out of the fund balance from the Endowments and not the general fund.

Councilmember Clark asked how often the Foothills equipment was replaced. Mr. Strunk replied once every six years.

Mr. Skeete noted that earlier in their discussions, there had been some questions as to where some of the debt service associated with the outstanding debt and whether or not that was included in any of these numbers. He wanted to reiterate that some of the operations they have discussed in the Park and Recreation Department do have a long term debt service associated with them. However, none of the debt service associated with any of these facilities was included in the cost for service. These figures were simply the operating cost for service, not the long term capital cost for developing these facilities.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item in the agenda was the Police Department on page 26 in the budget book.

Debora Black, Interim Police Chief, provided a brief summary and stated the mission of the police department was to protect the lives and property of the people they serve. The over 500 men and women in the Police Department work together with the community to accomplish their mission. The majority of the officers are assigned to two patrol divisions, Foothills and Gateway and the investigation functions. This past year the department responded to over 128,000 calls for service. They received over 34,000 reports of criminal activity and made over 7100 arrests. She explained that over 25% of the police department employees are not sworn police officers but are essential to their mission.

Police Services:

FTEs: General Fund 473, Stadium Events Op 2, Arena Event Op. 1, Police Special Rev 118, Grants 2, RICO 5, Training Facility 2.

Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$53,107K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$2,422K
Non-Salary (A7000)	\$19,979K
(GF \$5,566K, Spec. Rev \$4,596K, RICO \$3,720K, Grant Approp \$4,061 & Other Funds \$2,036K)	

Councilmember Clark asked a question regarding the FTEs. She noted that for the central patrol bureau in FY12 there were 118 patrol positions, however, in FY 13 that was dropped by 6 positions. Foothills, which had 115, had increased by 5 positions. Additionally, based on the information provided, there were currently 7 vacancies in the central bureau in patrol division. She wondered why the central patrol bureau was reduced and with that, their ability to respond to situations by reducing that number by a squad.

Interim Police Chief Black explained the reduction that was reflected on that page was not actually how the movement was occurring since it did not include the positions paid for by the public safety sales taxes, which were an additional 33 positions. She added that at Foothills the number was 134 with an additional 14.

Ms. Schurhammer explained that all FTE staffing shown for every department in this book was shown by fund. Councilmember Clark noted that was very confusing.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if the FTE funds were from all funds including the public service sales tax as well as other sources of revenue. Ms. Schurhammer explained the numbers shown on page 27 reflect all funds including the general fund, public safety sales tax, RICO funds and grants. Councilmember Lieberman inquired as to the staffing numbers shown as down 37 officers. He asked if those were all sworn personnel. Interim Police Chief Black explained that figure represents a reduction on the civilian side, not officers.

Councilmember Clark commented on the police vacancy report information provided to all of Council. She noted there were different figures of 55, 33 or 22 that had been floating around. She asked what the total funded vacancies were at the moment. Ms. Schurhammer explained the figure that was released was 55 sworn vacancies on the police side. However, 33 of the 55 or 60% of that total are vacant because there was not sufficient funding to pay for them. She indicated that has been the case for two full fiscal years. Councilmember Clark asked if they were relying exclusively on the public safety sales tax to add new officers to the department. Ms. Schurhammer clarified that the 33 positions were vacant because of lack of funding. However, the 22 were funded, but vacant due to normal attrition. Councilmember Clark asked when they will begin to see those 22 vacancies filled. Interim Police Chief Black stated last fall they conducted recruitment for police officer positions. They had over 900 candidates apply for the jobs; however, they have not been in the position to move forward with the hiring up to this point. She recently has authorized the hiring of 6 police officers. Councilmember Clark inquired why they were only hiring 6 out of 22 vacant positions. She expressed her concern with the

hiring process when they were holding on to 22 positions without filling them promptly when the need was great and the positions were already funded. Interim Police Chief Black indicated that the decision was made in keeping with the range of fiscal responsibility as well as being cognizant of the public safety sales tax and what impact that has on their ability to hire some of these positions. Councilmember Clark reiterated these positions were already funded and staff was not looking for money to fund them. Interim Police Chief Black stated this was all based on revenue projections for the coming year.

Councilmember Martinez noted he was thinking along the same lines as Councilmember Clark. He asked since the positions were funded, could they hire a lateral candidate transfer from another area now if the situation presented itself. Interim Police Chief Black stated this would depend on the revenue projections for the coming year.

Ms. Schurhammer explained the budget was based on projections in revenue which was generally done six months before they adopt a budget. She added staff had to prepare their projections based on the best information available at the time of projection. Therefore, a year ago staff estimated that the public safety sales tax revenue both on the fire side and police was a certain amount. Over the course of the summer those revenues came in a little lower than anticipated. She added staff was, simply as a precautionary measure, waiting a couple of months to fill some of the vacancies. Additionally, there had not been time at the academy to slot them in.

Councilmember Martinez restated his question on if a lateral police officer came looking for a job, does the city have money to hire him. Interim Police Chief Black replied yes. Councilmember Martinez asked how many the city could hire. Interim Police Chief Black stated the department could hire up to 22.

Councilmember Clark expressed her confusion since first they are being told the hiring had to do with revenue projections and now they can hire up to 22 if lateral police officers applied.

Mr. Skeete further explained the process. He reiterated Ms. Schurhammer's comments on revenue projections for last year. He explained that as of today, the city cannot support all 22 of those vacancies in the police department because the revenues they projected that would have been sufficient to support those 22, were not coming in as projected. The revenues are coming in 4% to 6% below the overall revenue projections. He added should the down trend continue they would not have sufficient money to cover all the budgeted expenditures as anticipated. Therefore, each department, including police and fire had to manage the hiring of personnel and other expenses based on the inflow of revenue. He indicated that in the police department they have not deleted any vacancies, but delayed the filling of those vacancies until staff was reasonably comfortable that the revenues needed to service those vacancies are available and ongoing.

Councilmember Lieberman asked once again how many of the 22 can they fund today. Mr. Skeete stated that because of budget constraints, they will follow Interim Police Chief Black's recommendation of six possible hires for the academy. He noted he had not done specific

calculations to tell them how many of the 22 they can hire today. Councilmember Lieberman asked how long it will take for those six to finish at the academy. Interim Police Chief Black stated it takes about nine months from the point of hire to the completion of training and the officer to be solo qualified. She explained the number of 55 vacancies was a bit of a misnomer since many of those were authorized, but could not have been filled because of funding. She noted the actual highest sworn strength of the Glendale police department was actually 425 and today they have 398. Councilmember Lieberman said they were actually only 27 officers off from the highest they had ever been.

Councilmember Martinez noted he understood the situation much better when they put it in this perspective.

Councilmember Knaack asked if there were positions in the department that could be transferred out and filled by police officers. Interim Police Chief Black replied that nothing came to mind that would help in that situation. Councilmember Knaack noted what it came down to was that they all want more police officers in the area. She disagrees that this department should be treated the same as other departments since they are far more important in the fact that they save lives in the community. Therefore, she believes they need to reallocate more money to fire and police. She hopes they find a way to fill the other 21 positions.

Councilmember Clark commented on the COPS program that was still ongoing, however, the criteria had changed with a 25% match that was now necessary. She believes the city should be applying for this grant since it could provide a cushion to hire new officers with less money. She expressed her displeasure with the fact that staff had misrepresented the number of 22 funded vacancies and now are saying they were based on how revenue projections come in. She stated staff should have disclosed that fact in the informational material provided and explained that was staff's best guess from a year ago. She asked what they were planning to do to address the seven vacancies in Central Patrol Bureau and the seven vacancies in Crime Investigations. She was very concerned about these vacancies and would like to know how they plan to address them in the coming year. Interim Police Chief Black explained some of those positions are vacant as place holders and will be filled when the revenues support the hiring of those positions. She noted most of those positions were created by transfers, retirements or the employee left. She noted that every year, the department goes through a shift patrol bid where the squads are aligned based on cost for service and crime. She stated they were approaching the point where they will be doing that bid and will make those adjustments. Councilmember Clark noted she still was not very happy with this whole matter.

Ms. Schurhammer asked to clarify as to Councilmember Knaack's comments of department cuts being across the board. She explained fire and police did not do across the board cuts like the rest of the city departments. Police and fire came up with reductions that were approximately 5.4% in FY10 and all other department had cuts that ranged from 15% to 27%.

Councilmember Clark commented on page 41 regarding declining numbers in the booking division that was down 20% from FY2008. She also remarked on an expedited program years ago that helped the officer drop off the suspect in booking and was able to get back on the street

again quickly. She believes that program was somehow cut and no longer available. She wondered how detention can function when they were down so many people in their division. Interim Police Chief Black explained they had two vacancies that they were in the process of filling. She explained the program Councilmember Clark was referring to was called Express Booking and was no longer offered. She added she was well aware of the vacancies in those areas; however, those vacancies have not had an impact on the safety of those officers or prisoners since the detention offices were charged and are providing a safe environment for everyone.

Councilmember Clark asked for clarification on the FTEs in the emergency management division and why they needed seven people in emergency management. Interim Police Chief Black explained that was the same staffing that has been in place since FY2007 and they are all non-sworn. Councilmember Clark asked why staff was putting communications management under emergency management. Interim Police Chief Black stated that decision was made solely because of efficiency to fully utilize the staff. Councilmember Clark asked if there were any sworn personnel that had to report to a supervisor in emergency management. Interim Police Chief Black replied no.

Councilmember Alvarez remarked she was pleased the department was going to be hiring additional officers since there was a great need in the community. She added they need to be responsible and do it as fast as possible.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city paid the salary of all the officers from other municipalities that come to help them in trafficking for events such as the Fiesta Bowl. Assistant Chief Greg Dominguez, explained the city does have an account that was budgeted for the staffing that was specific to the Fiesta Bowl. Therefore, the city does cover salaries for those events. Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city of Glendale paid the salaries of police officers from other cities. Assistant Chief Dominguez replied yes. Councilmember Lieberman stated there had been a misstatement about six months ago with Mayor Scruggs on this same issue. He said Mayor Scruggs had stated that police from other areas that came here to work at the events were paid by their cities and not Glendale.

Councilmember Alvarez asked why Glendale pays for the whole salary bill for other city's police officers. Assistant Chief Dominguez noted that they were reimbursed for some of those fees from the Fiesta Bowl committee based on their contract. Councilmember Alvarez asked how much the city was reimbursed for these events. Assistant Chief Dominguez stated it was \$160,848.

Vice Mayor Frate noted this was nothing different than from what the city of Glendale has done in the past when the Fiesta Bowl was in Tempe and they provided officers.

Councilmember Alvarez stated she understands how things were done in the past; however, because of the budget situation, she believes they should renegotiate their contracts. Vice Mayor Frate noted they have to remember the city of Glendale was responsible for the safety of the people who visit these events, therefore they should not cut corners. Mr. Beasley agreed with

Vice Mayor Frate and added that as the host city they had a responsibility to keep people safe at the level required. He added because of the reciprocal contract agreements with other cities; they have been able to keep the events pleasant and very safe for everyone. He noted they could possibly examine those contracts however it will have a ripple effect when the city needs assistance from other cities in other venues. Assistant Chief Dominguez stated that Glendale was known and has a reputation with the way they staff and how they provide security. He added that yearly the NFL does best practices and inspects them and every year Glendale comes up as the highest standard set for special events and special events management.

Councilmember Alvarez wondered what responsibilities Mr. Bidwill had or was he only collecting the money. Mr. Beasley explained Mr. Bidwill does not have any responsibility regarding the Fiesta Bowl; however, he does have other responsibility regarding city events. Assistant Chief Dominguez stated that in response to her question, there was a partnership that occurred with everything that went into these events. He referred to the partnerships they had with the Fiesta Bowl and Global Spectrum as well as their responsibilities to the public and event. Councilmember Alvarez said she understood there had to be partnership; however, when it came to money, Glendale was the only partner that seemed to be paying. She indicated that crime has increased in Glendale and the city had seven positions where they could put more money, but are spending it elsewhere. She was concerned that the city was doing this because they want to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Skeete stated it was important to put this into perspective and outline the city's responsibilities. He explained that the facility was in the city of Glendale and therefore, their responsibility to take care of all of the public safety needs. By the agreements they have been able to negotiate with AZSTA and other users. He explained one of the decisions the Council made at one time was that they will not short-change the rest of the community by deploying all the necessary officers and firefighters needed to service those events and have committed to not take them away from the rest of the community. The Chief was charged to come up with a plan to maintain coverage and security in the rest of the community and secure the necessary law enforcement to also have a successful safe event at the stadium. Mr. Skeete continued that as a result, in order to do that they had to partner with the different public safety jurisdictions around the valley in order to have the staff needed to protect the city and provide a safe environment for the operations. He explained the agreements negotiated successfully that allowed for some reimbursement in funding for these officers. Councilmember Alvarez said she understood all of these facts, however, she believes the city was neglecting services in the community. She cited the pools as being one of the services being cut as well as library hours in Glendale. She stated they had to be responsible to the community and the people who pay the taxes and voted for the Council. She knows she cannot convince anyone of this, but she was able to sleep at night knowing what she was trying to do in the community. She believes helping several millionaires was not the way the city should be operating.

Vice Mayor Frate remarked that Councilmember Alvarez does not differentiate between the Fiesta Bowl events hosted and events that the Cardinals host. He stated he can publicly state, the city has never had any safety problems with the big events happening at the stadium, the arena or anything else happening in the rest of the city. He explained the city of Glendale has

meticulously planned for all these events in order for them to run smoothly and without complications.

Councilmember Lieberman stated it was more complicated than that since Mr. Bidwill does not own the stadium. He said AZSTA owns the stadium and contracts with Global Spectrum for \$9.2 million a year to manage the stadium. In that agreement, it states Glendale will be the primary responsible party for fire and police and what happens at events at the stadium. Mr. Beasley explained the leasing agreements and added the city did negotiate Glendale being the one in control and in the lead in order to be able to control their own environment. He added staff could always take a second look to see if they were equally compensated in those contracts next time the opportunity arises. He indicated the department was trying to keep the community safe, keep it safe during the events and make sure the people are safe during the events so the city can maintain the image they have developed. Councilmember Lieberman asked if the city gets reimbursed for the EOC. Mr. Beasley replied no.

Vice Mayor Frate stated it should be noted that the public safety tax was still paid and not waived. Mr. Skeete stated it was important to note that the Fiesta Bowl was a tax exempt organization and therefore they do not collect or refund any taxes. The agreement with the AZSTA is to use the 1.2% general fund sales tax to pay back to the AZSTA for infrastructure cost. He said this was not to cover any of the operating cost. The Cardinals do not receive any refunds from the city.

Councilmember Clark remarked that years ago, the city negotiated and agreed that a stadium could be built in their community recognizing there would be certain contractual obligations as a result of that stadium coming to the community. She explained those agreements were equal to having a mortgage contract; therefore those contracts could be modified based on the current market. However she believes this was a bad time for everyone, not just for Glendale so like refinancing a home, sometimes modifying a contract was not an option. She added they could try to renegotiate with AZSTA or the Cardinals but they will probably say no. She understands Councilmember Alvarez's point, however, the city has contractual obligations that were made many years ago and the city cannot abrogate those relationships or those contracts.

Councilmember Clark asked staff to look into the Emergency Services Division to see if there were any reductions in personnel or expenditures since she would rather see that money go to another officer on the street than having seven people in emergency management.

Councilmember Knaack agreed with Councilmember Clark's comments regarding Emergency Services. She asked how many officers they envision they need on the street disregarding all the numbers mentioned. Interim Police Chief Black stated they could manage very well at 425.

Councilmember Lieberman remarked the city did not collect any sales tax on the first Super Bowl since it was not put into the contract as it should have been. Mr. Beasley noted he was correct. The contract was the same as was done in other cities; however, the public safety sales tax was not waived. He added what has subsidized the Super Bowls has been the corporate participation and state legislation that allowed the city to recover some of those taxes.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the consensus from the Council was they did not want any more reductions in the police department and want to see the six positions filled as well as looking into lateral transfers.

Councilmember Clark asked that after the department goes through their bid process, she would like to see what the staffing levels are like at Central and Foothills.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item was Fire Department.

Mark Burdick, Fire Chief, presented a brief summary on this item. The services provided by this suppression department are fire prevention, public education, emergency medical services, special operations, and response teams. He explained that by ratio, they were the busiest department in the valley. He noted their goal was to have a four minute travel time 90% of the time. Their current performance level is five minutes and 37 seconds, 90% of the time.

Fire Services:

FTEs: General Fund 222, Arena Ops. 1, Fire Special Revenue 51, Training Facility 6.

Salary & Benefits (A6000) \$26,218K

Internal Service Premiums (A7500) \$771K

Non-Salary (A7000) \$10,697K

(GF \$3,862K, Spec. Rev \$2,077K, Grant

Appropriation \$4,000 & Other Funds \$758K)

Vice Mayor Frate asked for clarification on the department having the highest call volume in the valley. Chief Burdick stated that by ratio they are the busiest in the state out of each truck. Vice Mayor Frate inquired as to the performance level of personnel with the department being so busy. Chief Burdick noted that fatigue was an important factor they were always looking at; therefore, they do have rotations with other stations that are not as busy. Vice Mayor Frate commented on their response time goals in order to save the injured party's brain in less than five minutes. Chief Burdick remarked on the peak time demand units called Medic Rides. Unfortunately two units have been cut due to budget cuts. However, they do have one unit running which was funded through reimbursements they receive from Southwest Ambulance. This unit runs five days a week during their busiest days and times.

Councilmember Clark commented on the 10 FTEs that do inspections and plans review. She asked since no new development has occurred because of the economy, do they see reducing this division's FTE's. Chief Burdick explained that these personnel were dual trained and do not just work on the new construction aspect. The city has over 6000 existing businesses in Glendale so when they are not doing new construction they are assisting in getting other buildings inspected.

Councilmember Clark asked how many inspections were done last year by the fire department. Fire Marshal Jenkins replied they had annual inspections, two year inspections and four year inspections. On an average they conduct 3000 inspections each year.

Councilmember Clark commented on an email Mayor Scruggs sent to the fire department regarding replacing or refurbishing fire trucks. She noted the fire department has created a plan to refurbish those three fire trucks instead of replacing them because of budget constraints. However, somehow that money was used to purchase a new foam truck called Wildland. She questioned their decision to buy an expensive new truck when they need to refurbish older equipment. Chief Burdick stated the Wildland truck has only been looked at, but not purchased. He explained the benefits and the departments thought process for acquiring this specialized truck which included revenue generation from the state, who may want to employ the truck. They were looking at this truck not as a primary truck, but a reserve truck. This truck could be used both in a wilderness setting or building fire so they would have the best of both worlds. He added that they were still looking at that possibility in the future; however, it would have to come before Council for their approval. Currently, staff was assessing the cost to refurbish the older trucks. Councilmember Clark was pleased with the department's decision to wait and believes taking care of the equipment they currently have was really important.

Vice Mayor Frate asked about the purchase of a ladder truck and how they were able to man it with current budget cuts. Chief Burdick explained the process of deploying the ladder which was mostly based on where it was located.

Councilmember Knaack asked if they had one or two emergency ambulances operating. Chief Burdick stated they had one operating and two parked until they receive further funding. Councilmember Knaack asked Chief Burdick as she had asked Interim Chief Black, how many people he thought they needed to be able to do their job effectively. Chief Burdick explained they were currently working on a deficit and were approximately 18 people short and would need about 15 to get them to an adequate level. He believes once the economy turns around they will be able to meet staffing demands. Councilmember Knaack believes the fire department was doing everything possible to withstand decreased staffing and holding their own; however, she was concerned with the fatigue and amount of call volumes in the future. Additionally, she was very appreciative with how all the grants in fire and police are helping with the downturn. Chief Burdick commented on grant appropriations and how they are administered. He noted the grants were mostly appropriation funds that have requirements attached to them, not real funding.

Vice Mayor Frate and Councilmember Knaack remarked on the volunteer campaign at the Fire Department which was phenomenal. Councilmember Knaack provided examples such as Christmas toy drives and car seat education.

Councilmember Martinez asked for more information on Special Operation Assignment Pay. Chief Burdick explained the reason some receive assignment pay was because those people have additional training and education and have to maintain that education. He noted this operation was standard in the fire department.

Councilmember Clark asked if the total cost of operating and maintaining the Public Safety Training Facility. Ms. Schurhammer stated the figure for operations across the board was \$1.5 million for FY12 with revenue of approximately \$1.4 million. Councilmember Clark asked if

that revenue came from renting out the facility and partner agencies. Ms. Schurhammer replied she believes that was the case; however, will check and send that after the meeting.

Vice Mayor Frate asked if the city was competitive with other cities in fire and police if a transfer should occur. Chief Burdick said he was not sure and had to defer to HR on that matter. He added the fire department does not typically do lateral transfers and normally trains their own since they have formed relationships with other cities and don't take from other cities.

Councilmember Martinez wondered if the city plans to conduct their own training for Glendale fire and police at the facility. Chief Burdick explained fire does train at that facility as well as other departments from other cities. The fee for recruits is \$4500 a person and will accommodate many departments from different areas.

Ms. Schurhammer indicated the answer to Councilmember Clark's earlier question in regards to the Training Facility was \$1.5 million, which was made up of three components. One was in Fire with \$73,000, Police with \$32,000 and the third was in Public Works with \$455,000. The revenue projection for this year was \$1.4 million coming from partner revenue. Chief Burdick noted that for FY11 the city received \$71,472 in rentals.

Councilmember Lieberman inquired about the \$853,284 in revenue from HALO. Chief Burdick explained the city has a contractual agreement with the company where they pay the city that fee annually. Councilmember Lieberman stated he was very pleased with this partnership and believes HALO makes their money from the health insurance companies. Chief Burdick noted the city of Glendale was the only one that provided that service.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the consensus from the Council, was as stated earlier to Interim Chief Black. The Council does not want any more reductions in fire or police department. He said public safety was their number one concern in the city.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item on the agenda was Public Works.

Stuart Kent, Executive Director, Public Works provided a brief summary on this item. He wanted to reiterate again for the public, that there will be no residential sanitation increase in the coming year and that will be the fourth consecutive year without increases. The rate will remain the same at \$16.30 a month. The landfill and sanitation service comprise a little over \$17 million for the total cost of service. Both of those operations are funded through enterprise funds. Enterprise funds essentially run as a business within a city, they are wholly supported by the fees that are collect and receive no federal, property or sales fund taxes.

Sanitation/Landfill, HURF & Training Center*

FTEs: HURF <u>19</u> , Landfill <u>41</u> , Sanitation <u>79</u> , Training Facility <u>4</u>	
Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$8,586K
Non-Salary (A7000)	\$10,874K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$4,679K

Councilmember Clark asked why this department picks up the cost of the utilities at the Public Safety Training Facility. Mr. Kent stated that as with many other facilities, including almost every city building, the city always tries to capture all the electricity and utility costs as well as the natural gas in one budget. Councilmember Clark noted that made a lot of sense.

Councilmember Martinez commented on the recommendation to reduce residential loose trash collection from monthly to quarterly. He asked if this would reflect any savings for the home owner. Mr. Kent explained the savings would be equal to a one dollar savings in the monthly residential bill. He was not recommending this change since the savings were very minimal and the trash piles would be increasing. Additionally, making this change will not affect anything in the general fund. Councilmember Clark noted she would not recommend this change and shudders to think of the pile up in loose trash and complaints. Vice Mayor Frate agreed.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the next item on the agenda was Transportation and Airport.

Jamsheed Mehta, Executive Director, Transportation, provided a brief summary on this item.

Transportation & Airport

FTEs: Trans. Sales Tax 49.3, HURF 23, Airport 5	
Salary & Benefits (A6000)	\$5,622K
Non-Salary (A7000)	\$10,558K
Internal Service Premiums (A7500)	\$1,519K

Councilmember Clark remarked that 23 FTEs were funded by the highway user gas tax. Mr. Mehta stated she was correct. Councilmember Clark noted for the public, when they look at these budgets and see line items that refer to the general fund, many were pass-through items and the highway user revenue funds were actually covering the general fund expenditures for the department. The department had three major sources of revenue, the highway user, transportation sales tax and general fund or grants support that come from the airport. Mr. Mehta stated she was correct in terms of FTEs, however, there were expenses beyond the FTEs that do come from the general fund and had to do with the stadium, Fiesta Bowl and arena related traffic management plan. Councilmember Clark asked for clarification on the FTEs for the stadium and Fiesta Bowl arena events. Mr. Mehta stated that the FTEs associated with existing funded positions, are funded by the city and used for those events.

Councilmember Martinez asked for clarification on a reduction in funding for traffic mitigation. Mr. Mehta explained the number of \$150,000 reflected was a carryover from the previous year for certain unfinished projects.

Vice Mayor Frate stated the time was 4:30 p.m. and adjourned the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.