

***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
May 3, 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, and Manuel D. Martinez

ABSENT: Councilmember H. Phillip Lieberman

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

1. MEET AND CONFER ORDINANCE

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Kelly Reed, Police Officer; Mr. Tom Cole, Fire Department; Mr. John Holland, Fire Department; Acting Police Chief Preston Becker; Fire Chief Mark Burdick; Mr. Craig Tindall, City Attorney; and Carolann Cervetti, Shareholder, Ryley, Carlock and Applewhite.

This is a request for the City Council to review and comment regarding a draft ordinance that establishes a process by which regular, non-probationary City of Glendale firefighters in all classifications up to and including Captain, and regular, non-probationary City of Glendale police officers in all classifications up to and including Sergeants, can meet and confer with the City Manager or his/her designee.

Over the last year, the City Manager and designated representatives from the Fire and Police Departments have been involved in developing a process by which employee groups from those two departments could be recognized for the purpose of meeting and conferring with the City Manager regarding issues such as wages, hours, benefits, and working conditions.

These two groups have been working with management for the past 24 months under the umbrella of Glendale's unique Organizational Cooperative Process (OCP) in which departmental issues are addressed in an organized and channeled process calling upon employees to be part of the solution, while learning about the challenges that management faces. The OCP is the basis for the recommended Meet and Confer ordinance. Labor and management work together to craft solutions and timeframes that are marketed together as joint proposals related to such issues as training, equipment, and service enhancements.

The experience that employee representatives have received dealing with management on operational issues through the OCP, has helped give them the skills to responsibly represent their employee groups through a meet and confer process that is fair and open to the conditions and pressures that management faces.

The City Manager worked with the City Attorney and outside counsel, with expertise in the area of labor negotiations, to ensure the draft ordinance would address all pertinent areas related to employee relations and service delivery to the public.

The specifications for how an employee organization can be certified are detailed in the ordinance as well as the annual time frames and flexibility associated with the meet and confer process.

The meet and confer process, as defined in the draft ordinance, covers certain wages, hours, and working conditions.

Employee organization business shall be conducted during non-duty hours and shall not interfere with work. Solicitation of members and dues shall take place in non-working areas.

Staff is seeking comment and direction from the Council to proceed with the Meet and Confer Ordinance.

Captain Tom Cole, Fire Department, said the Meet and Confer ordinance is the natural evolution of their relationship with department and city staff as well as the Mayor and Council. He stated they have had an informal process of participatory management within the Fire Department over the last several years and they have had a good relationship with the city. He reported the Fire Department is working on its third Habitat for Humanity house in Glendale, is a top fundraiser for Muscular Dystrophy, and conducts an annual toy drive. He said labor representation has played a key role in the Department's successes over the past several years. He stated they are an accredited organization, noting one of the benchmark criteria in the accreditation process is that the Fire Department Management has a working relationship with the labor group. He said the labor group has intimate involvement in the decision making process in such significant issues as deployment and station placement.

Officer Kelly Reed, Police Department, identified key points in the Organizational Cooperative Process (OCP); strong commitment, positive impact and quality service for customers. She stated they must maintain a strong commitment to maintaining and improving their relationship with management. She said the Organizational Cooperative Process would have a positive impact on the employees because people take ownership and pride in their work and work environment when given an opportunity to impact their daily lives. She stated quality employee involvement, effective and efficient performance and positive relationships will lead to quality service to internal and external customers. She said members of the Department have served on the Diversity Committee, Total Compensation Committee, Strategic Initiatives Committee, Internal Communications Committee, assisted in writing the business plan for the department, were involved in the accreditation process, and were present during charitable events. She stated they have conducted joint water safety walks with the Fire Department, assisted with the Habitat for Humanity Homes, conducted holiday toy and food drives, held a Shop with a Cop event, participated in a walk to end domestic

violence, and assisted the West Valley Child Crisis Center. She stated, since learning about and implementing the OCP, they have been included at the management level at meetings and planning sessions, Safety Committee meetings, general staff meetings, and budget supplemental meetings. She said they have also been involved in the West Valley Training Facility Planning Committee and the NHL All Star Game, Fiesta Bowl, and Super Bowl strategic planning meetings. She stated their involvement in those meetings means they are prepared for responsible and meaningful participation in a Meet and Confer process. She said OCP is a progressive decision-making process that continues to promote employer and employee involvement and input and leads to growth and success for both.

Councilmember Goulet asked what does “working conditions” mean as referenced in the ordinance. Mr. Cole said working conditions refer to a wide range of topics, including issues related to the safety and comfort of fire employees. Captain John Holland, Fire Department, said working conditions also relates to work schedules and the design of fire stations. Ms. Kelley said, in terms of the Police Department, working conditions can relate to the length of the workday, the amount of time off between shifts, and the proper outfitting of training facilities and stations. Mr. Tindall noted the statute places limitations on the scope of what Meet and Confer can address, including the defined missions and goals of the department; the method, means and personnel by which they accomplish those goals; and disciplinary actions.

Chief Burdick said it is important that the city address the needs of its changing workforce. He emphasized the importance of accreditation, stating it demonstrates through a peer review process that the department meets or exceeds standards. He said the individuals who work in the field are able to bring forth concerns, ideas and innovative solutions that might not otherwise be considered by those in management positions. He stated they are very pleased with the outcomes of the process, noting they have demonstrated tremendous efficiencies. He commented on the importance of educating employees on the budget constraints the departments face.

Chief Becker said the Meet and Confer Ordinance is an opportunity for the management team to work with employees on the issues and concerns of each group. He stated the employees have demonstrated their commitment to public safety and to the citizens of the community.

Councilmember Martinez asked if there is a difference between collective bargaining and Meet and Confer. Ms. Cervetti explained collective bargaining traditionally occurs in the private sector whereas a meet and confer process occurs in the public sector. She said collective bargaining follows the statutory framework laid out in the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Relations Act. She stated, because Glendale does not have that same statutory framework, they need a Meet and Confer process to set forth the manner in which negotiations or bargaining occurs. She said, furthermore, collective bargaining is usually subject to an agreement that sets out the terms and conditions of employment and is enforced with the ability to strike. She stated Glendale does not have a collective bargaining agreement or the statutory right to strike. Councilmember Martinez asked if employees outside of the Fire and Police Departments could participate in a Meet and Confer. Mr. Tindall said other qualified and certified employee groups could participate in the Meet and Confer process. He confirmed for Councilmember Martinez that, at this point, the ordinance covers only the Police and Fire Departments, explaining they are currently the only groups who meet the criteria under the OCP process.

Mr. Tindall explained the ordinance establishes a process by which a recognized employee group can meet and confer with the City Manager on certain employment issues. He said the purpose statement in the ordinance provides a context if the ordinance needs further interpretation at a later time. He stated the initial step in the Meet and Confer process is for the employee organization to be certified. He explained the employee organization collects cards from 50 percent plus one of the employee group and files the cards with the City Manager. He stated the City Manager then calls a Certification Election and, assuming 70 percent of the members who vote in the election vote in favor of certifying the employee organization as their representative, the employee organization would be certified.

Councilmember Clark asked what steps must an employee organization fulfill to meet the OCP. Mr. Beasley said over a period of one year an individual group would come forward and work through the city's process and establish they have met the criteria with regard to job performance, communication and community involvement. Councilmember Clark asked for specific examples of each of the criteria. Mr. Beasley said the goal is to show the group has exercised a knowledge and involvement outside the scope of its regular duties to be able to understand how the department is structured and how it connects to the overall vision of the organization. In terms of the communication criteria, he said the group must show they can effectively communicate both in writing and verbally any information obtained and help formulate a policy. Councilmember Clark asked if the group has a specific timeframe in which to meet all of the criteria. Mr. Beasley said they typically have a track record of one year. Councilmember Clark asked if a group that has participated in a particular process and met the required criteria would be precluded from continuing the process if they take an opposing point of view from that of management. Mr. Beasley responded no; explaining, however, the process by which they disagree, not the disagreement itself, may be an eliminating factor.

Mr. Tindall continued with his explanation of the certification process, stating once the organization receives a favorable vote and is certified, the Meet and Confer process can begin. He said the issues that can be addressed are found in the ordinance, stating it may but does not have to encompass issues such as wages, hours, and benefits, excluding healthcare benefits. He stated certain issues are specifically not included in the Meet and Confer process, including healthcare benefits, the purpose of the department, standards of service, and disciplinary matters.

Councilmember Clark emphasized that she supports the Meet and Confer process, stating a direct benefit can be derived when information flows in both directions. She said her questions are intended only to clarify certain aspects of the process. She referred to a Meet and Confer document from Tempe, noting they only require a 50 percent certified favorable vote. Mr. Tindall explained Glendale requires an affirmative vote from 70 percent of those voting, not 70 percent of the employee group. He said they want to make sure a large majority of the employee group feel the organization will represent their interests. Councilmember Clark expressed her opinion Glendale's bar is too high. Captain Holland explained Tempe's process only has to gather 30 percent of cards to call for an election whereas Glendale chose to collect 50 percent of the employee group's signature on cards. He said the 70 percent positive vote is intended to show overwhelming support for the organization.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the members of Captain Holland's group and the Police Group are satisfied with the process. Captain Holland responded yes.

Mr. Tindall explained the process, stating an employee organization will submit proposals to the City Manager by September 15 for the next budget year, the City Manager will provide a written response to the organization within 30 days and the two groups will meet within 10 days thereafter. He said if an agreement between the two groups were to be had, it would be reflected in a memorandum of understanding, which would be submitted to Council during the budget process. He stated if an agreement is not reached, the ordinance includes a mediation provision that allows the groups to come together with an independent party to mediate the differences. He said an agreement that comes out of that mediation would then be reflected in a memorandum of understanding and proceed to Council during the budget process. He stated, however, if no agreement is reached by February 1, separate submissions from each group would come to Council for consideration.

Councilmember Clark asked if both sides submit names of those they feel would be appropriate for the mediation process. Mr. Tindall said the ordinance calls for the mediator to be selected from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Mr. Tindall said if an employee group decided it did not want to be represented by the employee organization, the employee group could gather 30 percent of cards from their membership, submit the cards to the City Manager who would call for a decertification election. He said decertification would occur upon the positive vote of 50 percent of the voting members. He stated the ordinance anticipates an informal resolution process for any violations that occur during the Meet and Confer process. He explained the employee organization would submit a Notice of Breach, the City Manager would respond within 10 days and a meeting would be scheduled within 14 days. He said a resolution would be submitted for approval to the City Attorney or to Council if an amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding were necessary. He stated the dispute would be submitted to arbitration if a resolution could not be reached through the informal process. He explained an arbitrator would be selected through the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and arbitration would occur within 60 days. He said both sides would submit positions on the breach and resolutions and the arbitrator would select one of the positions to resolve the issue. He said the resolution would be binding on the two parties and would only go before Council if the resolution resulted in a change to the Memorandum of Understanding or the budget process.

In response to Councilmember Clark's question, Mr. Beasley clarified every employee has the opportunity to participate in the process. He said a formalized group could only participate in the Meet and Confer process once it has gone through the steps necessary to become certified in the OCP.

Mayor Scruggs voiced Council's consensus to proceed.

2. DRAFT AMENDED ANNEXATION POLICY

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Kate Langford, Senior Planner

This is a request for the City Council to review and provide direction on draft amendments to the city's Annexation Policy. The proposed amendments are a result of Council direction provided on February 12, 2005 at the conclusion of the fourth workshop discussing the future of the strip annexation area.

Amending the Annexation Policy to reflect recent Council direction supports the promotion of sound growth management methods and managing growth to achieve reasonable, responsible growth.

In 1977 and 1978, the city created boundaries outlining an area referred to as the strip annexation area. The strip annexation area encompasses approximately 35 square miles and is generally bounded by Peoria and Northern Avenues on the north, 115th Avenue on the east, Bethany Home and Camelback Roads on the south, and Perryville Road on the west.

On December 16, 2003, the City Council adopted the existing annexation policy.

The Council recently concluded a four-workshop series focusing discussions on the future disposition of the far western portion of the city referred to as the strip annexation area. The workshops occurred on December 7 and 21, 2004, continued on January 18, 2005, and concluded with a special half-day workshop on February 12, 2005. The main impetus for this workshop series stemmed from the need to develop a definitive policy for this far western portion of the city's Municipal Planning Area (MPA).

As a result of the workshop series, the Council established a clear statement of Glendale's intent for this area, as well other areas where county islands exist, and provided guidance regarding provision of water and sewer services.

Amending the existing Annexation Policy is necessary to:

- Provide water and sewer service beyond the City's existing service area;
- Include an emphasis area for the Loop 303 Corridor; and
- Eliminate annexation requests as Category One (east of 115th Avenue) or Category Two (west of 115^h Avenue). These categories no longer exist per Council direction of February 12, 2005. There are just two types of annexation requests – undeveloped and developed.

On February 12, 2005, the Council directed staff to amend the Annexation Policy to incorporate the following items:

- Viable private companies will provide water and sewer service for any annexed area located beyond the city's existing service area.
- The city will proactively pursue voluntary annexation in the Loop 303 corridor.
- Consideration will be given to annexation requests submitted from any location within the Glendale Municipal Planning area.

Accurate information will be provided, to staff, residents, and other interested property owners regarding the City's annexation policy.

Staff is seeking direction from the Council on the Amended Annexation Policy.

Councilmember Clark said, while she does not have a problem with the three amendments, she continues to have a problem with the Annexation Policy as it relates to annexation of developed areas. She expressed her opinion the policy acts as a disincentive for developed areas to petition for annexation.

Ms. Langford reported receiving many inquiries from parties interested in developing along the Loop 303 corridor. She said they have also had several inquiries from small infill developers in the area of Dreaming Summit, Wigwam Creek and other developments east of Luke Air Force Base.

Ms. Langford stated the next step is Council adoption of the Amended Annexation Policy and an Annexation Open House on May 11, 2005. She said they would then initiate a Major General Plan Amendment for the northern 3 miles of the Loop 303 Corridor. She said they would continue meeting with perspective owners/developers interested in annexation and conduct pre-annexation agreement negotiations with interested parties. She said they would continue to bring annexation applications to Council at a workshop session for review and direction.

Mayor Scruggs referred to a troubling article published in the Phoenix Business Journal, which said the Sierra Club and a conservation group have come out against the city's annexation. She said their opposition is based on fear that Glendale will allow development to occur that is harmful to Luke Air Force Base. She pointed out Glendale has spearheaded efforts for the past ten years to preserve the mission of Luke Air Force Base. She stated Glendale took a lead position in the intensive efforts needed to pass the three major pieces of legislation that address compatibility and controlled development in areas of concern to Luke. She said the Sierra Club's position presupposes only Glendale could grant zoning. She asked if the General Plans that have already been adopted show any incompatible uses in areas the Sierra Club suggests development will occur. She characterized the assumptions made by the Sierra Club and published by the Phoenix Business Journal as inflammatory and unsubstantiated. She said the Council's commitment to Luke and its mission has never been less than 100 percent, pointing out the city held up development at its airport to its own financial detriment because it would have been harmful to Luke's mission. She asked if the two groups have met with the City of Glendale to discuss their concerns. Ms. Langford responded no. She noted the Base's comments in the same article are reflective of the relationship they have with the City of Glendale. She said nothing has been proposed by the County or the City of Glendale that will harm the base in any way. She stated the 65-Idn boundaries are addressed specifically in state legislation in terms of use, sound attenuation, clear zones and assembly areas. She said any development Glendale proposes would be complimentary to the development and infrastructure now beginning to go in with the Loop 303 funding. She said the Base

will participate in the process along with property owners, school districts and utility companies and the Sierra Club and other interested parties are welcome to participate as well.

Councilmember Martinez suggested they invite the Sierra Club to attend the May 11 open house.

Mr. Beasley recommended they draft an official response to the story, one that not only clarifies what has occurred, but that also expresses the city's concern that they were not asked to comment.

Mayor Scruggs noted the Publisher, Don Heineger, has been very supportive of Luke and always recognized Glendale's role in preserving its mission. She said it was shocking that they allowed those two groups to make untrue statements without even offering Glendale an opportunity to respond.

Councilmember Goulet asked if they would hold more than one public meeting. Ms. Langford said only one public meeting is required. She explained the open house is in keeping with the city's decision to be proactive in the Loop 303 corridor area. She stated it is likely there will be other open houses.

Mayor Scruggs directed staff to make the city's position with regard to Luke and its mission very clear. She voiced Council's consensus to move forward with the Annexation Policy amendments.

3. 2005 STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Miryam Gutier, Intergovernmental Programs Director and Kristin Skabo, Deputy Director Intergovernmental Programs.

The Intergovernmental Programs staff will update the City Council on the status of legislative bills and issues that may impact the city or require immediate policy direction. The City of Glendale legislative agenda is developed annually and defines the city's priorities for lobbying activities at the Arizona State Legislature. The city's legislative agenda is a flexible document and may change, based on activities at the Legislature and Council direction.

The 47th Legislature's first regular session began on January 10, 2005.

The Intergovernmental Programs staff presented Glendale's proposed legislative agenda for 2005 to the Council during the January 4, 2005 workshop. The Council provided policy direction on the 2005 Glendale legislative agenda.

Staff provided the Council with an update during the February 1, 2005 workshop and included recommendations on several key bills. The Council provided policy direction for those bills.

Staff returned to the Council during the March 1, 2005 workshop and presented additional recommendations on several key bills and a status report on other legislative issues.

The key principles of Glendale's legislative agenda are: (1) to preserve and enhance the city's ability to deliver quality and cost-effective services to citizens and visitors; (2) to address quality-of-life issues for Glendale residents; and (3) to enhance the City Council's ability to serve the community by retaining local decision-making authority and maintaining fiscally-balanced revenue sources.

The recommendation was to review this item and provide staff with direction on the proposed legislative issues.

Ms. Gutier reported, to date, 1,311 bills have been introduced, 308 have been passed, 204 have been signed by the Governor, and 36 have been vetoed by the Governor.

Ms. Gutier stated both revenue sharing bills, which came forward as strike everything amendments to other bills and were spearheaded by Senator Bob Burns, failed in the Senate.

SB1274 and SB1287

Ms. Gutier stated the tax incentive bills made it through the Legislature and received the Governor's signature. She said, of all the bills before the Legislature, these two are the least hurtful to cities and towns.

HB2499

Ms. Gutier stated HB2499 is awaiting House final read, which means it has passed both the House and Senate and only needs one more vote by the full body of the House to move to the Governor's desk. She stated Glendale, as well as many other cities and towns and the League of Cities and Towns, has been working to ensure the bill is not heard. She said it is her understanding Speaker Weyers will not let the bill be heard.

Budget

Ms. Gutier reported several bills are still in Conference Committee, but could be taken care of in a couple days. She said the all-day kindergarten bill made it through the Committee of the Whole and third read and the Senate is waiting for all budget bills to get through third read in the House before it takes action. She said they could see Senate action as early as Thursday.

Councilmember Martinez asked if the amphetamine bill passed. Ms. Gutier said the bill is currently in negotiations, explaining two members of the Senate have differing views on how to handle pharmacy interaction with drugs used to create meth. She said a number of people are trying to reach an agreement between the two. She noted if the

bill does not pass the legislature, Phoenix wants to pass an ordinance and intends to ask the rest of the cities to pass similar ordinances.

Mayor Scruggs pointed out one of the two Senators is a doctor. She asked if pharmacy industry representatives have been involved in the discussion. Ms. Gutier was unable to say but offered to find out. Mayor Scruggs expressed her opinion they need to jump on the issue if it comes down to the city level, particularly in regards to enforcement.

Councilmember Clark pointed out law enforcement agencies support the bill. She noted other states have enacted laws that preclude people from purchasing more than two packages of over the counter drugs used to produce meth.

Mayor Scruggs questioned how effective limiting the number of purchases would be when there are drug stores located on every corner.

Vice Mayor Eggleston agreed they need to look at the issue closely.

Ms. Gutier offered to compile and bring to Council information the Legislature looked at and speak with Phoenix representatives to see what research has been done.

4. FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

This is a request for the City Council to review and provide direction related to the following Council Items of Special Interest:

- Council Subcommittees presented by Ms. Diana Whittle, Council Services Administrator;
- Wireless Networking presented by Mr. Chuck Murphy, Chief Information Technology Officer;
- Researching a Nuisance Ordinance presented by Ms. Cathy Gorham, Director of City Manager Relations

Council "Items of Special Interest" are discussed quarterly in workshop according to a Council procedural guideline approved in the Fall of 2002. Due to the budget workshops, this item was moved from the first workshop in April to the first workshop in May of 2005.

The attached memorandums provide brief assessments of topics identified by members of the Council at the January 4, 2005 workshop.

At the January 4, 2005 workshop, Councilmember Clark asked that Council subcommittees be reinstated.

At the same workshop, Councilmember Frate asked staff to research the benefits and disadvantages of wireless networking in the downtown area and Westgate.

Vice Mayor Eggleston asked staff to determine what it would take to remodel the entryway to City Hall. The City Manager referred this matter to Field Operations for inclusion in the Fiscal Year 2005-06 building maintenance fund budget. A remodeling plan is being developed and will be shared with the Council before proceeding.

Councilmember Lieberman requested presentations on several topics. He has indicated he will be unable to attend the May 3, 2005 workshop so full Council discussion on his requests for special workshop presentations will be deferred to July 5, 2005, when the quarterly Council Items of Interest are discussed next.

Councilmember Goulet reiterated his interest in having staff research options for a nuisance ordinance. If there is Council support for this research, staff is again recommending meeting with the ad-hoc Council Property Maintenance Subcommittee. There may be sections of city code that are already applicable, depending on how "nuisance" is defined. The term "nuisance" can be interpreted in a variety of ways and ordinances in other cities vary based on policy objectives and goals.

The recommendation was to review this item and provide staff with direction on:

1. Council Subcommittees
2. Wireless Networking
3. Researching a Nuisance Ordinance

Councilmember Frate asked if they are looking at a pilot project because they want to see if it is practicable and affordable. Mr. Murphy said, while they know wireless is being implemented in some communities, their goal is to identify an opportunity for Glendale to implement a wireless project and get a feel for what such technology will mean to employees and citizens of Glendale. He said, in meeting with a group of employees, they identified the locations listed in the Memorandum as possible locations for wireless implementation. He said a pilot project will allow them to identify the costs involved in implementing wireless technology at a given location should they choose to expand the program in the future.

Councilmember Clark pointed out they are talking about a cost of \$71,000 not including ongoing costs of \$14,800 to put wireless in the Civic Center, Meeting Room B3 and Council Chambers. She asked what justifies the exorbitant cost. Mr. Murphy explained security for devices utilized in private homes are retained within the devices, whereas equipment used for the city will be centrally managed and have mechanisms that prevent and fight against attacks on the network. He said the secure internet connection also drives up the cost. Councilmember Clark said the focus should be on developing firewalls that protect city data because once those firewalls have been developed the type of equipment used will no longer matter. She pointed out the city gets SPAM messages despite the security measures it already employs. She asked if technology that provides the highest level of security would bring down the cost of equipment the city uses. Mr. Murphy assured Councilmember Clark the city has significant security already in place with respect to its internal system, stating,

unfortunately, SPAM is a fact of life. He pointed out the city has not had any break-ins or theft of service or data, stating that is directly attributable to the security practices already in place. He stated the city does not want to expose itself to any unnecessary risk, therefore, they would segregate out any internet connection that would be openly available to the public.

Councilmember Clark asked how is Tempe able to make its downtown wi-fi accessible. Mr. Murphy explained Tempe is using a third party to provide internet access. He said the business environment in Tempe is different than Glendale's, with its huge student population and businesses are interested in partnering with Tempe to reach that student base.

Councilmember Martinez asked how will wireless benefit employees and citizens. Mr. Murphy reiterated the memo was in response to Council's request for information about wireless technology. He said the benefits would have to be measured over time. He explained wireless technology would assist the Civic Center in obtaining certain venues they might not now be able to obtain because of their lack of wireless capability. He said it would also allow city employees to access their data from laptops when in Council chambers or Room B3. Councilmember Martinez asked about dead zones in the downtown area. Mr. Murphy said an outside system would have to be engineered to account for various obstructions.

Councilmember Goulet said, while he can see how the technology might benefit the Civic Center or a future hotel, he is concerned about security aspects of wi-fi. He suggested they limit wi-fi to the Civic Center as a pilot project to see if having the capability actually impacts their ability to attract companies. Mr. Murphy agreed, stating there has been a lot of hype about wireless technology. He noted communities that utilize wireless technologies outside are typically remote communities that do not have the benefit of a COX or QWEST infrastructure.

Mayor Scruggs mentioned legal challenges that have been raised by the private sector. Mr. Murphy said the challenges have occurred most notably in Philadelphia where they wanted to implement wireless technology throughout the city. He said disputes by Verizon and other large carriers resulted in the Governor signing legislation that requires cities to give utilities first right of refusal before proceeding with such technology. He noted a similar case in Indiana had the opposite result. Mayor Scruggs asked if staff had already decided to do a pilot wireless project regardless of Council identifying it as an item of interest. Mr. Murphy responded no, stating they developed the pilot project in concept only with the intent of providing a framework for discussion. He said they are looking at projects for implementing wireless, but they do not intend to move forward without Council approval. Ms. Gorham explained Mr. Murphy and other city employees had begun discussions about wireless technology prior to Councilmember Frate raising the issue in January. She said once the issue was raised by Council, Mr. Murphy put the details together to obtain Council direction on whether or not to proceed. She explained the guidelines Council established a couple years ago presents staff and Council with some challenges in that Council lays out a topic and

then staff's goal is to assess the topic in terms of staffing and cost issues. She said, essentially, staff is limited to assessing the topic in the context of a small framework. Mayor Scruggs expressed her opinion the topic belongs in the Information Technology Department.

Councilmember Frate agreed.

Councilmember Clark said, while she believes wi-fi is a tool of the future, she is concerned about security issues. She stated if Information Technology chooses to move in any direction it should be to investigate ways to make the system as secure as possible.

Mayor Scruggs voiced Council's consensus to look at how and when wireless technology might be appropriate.

Council Subcommittees

Councilmember Clark asked if staff surveyed cities that were both smaller and larger than Glendale as well as cities that were comparable in size. Ms. Whittle explained they sent surveys out on a listserve approach to virtually every city that has a City Clerk. Councilmember Clark pointed out most of the larger cities have permanent subcommittees. Ms. Whittle agreed. Councilmember Clark asked if any additional city staff were added as a result of the subcommittees. Ms. Whittle responded no. She pointed out Phoenix's model is different than the other cities because not only do they have eight districts, full-time Council members and full-time assistants, the deputies over the various departments also make available their Management Assistants who staff the various committees that come out of the departments. Councilmember Clark said Glendale used to have subcommittees and more closely resembled the Mesa model.

She asked if staff foresees any additional cost or an inordinate use of staff time if Council were to reinstitute Council subcommittees. Ms. Whittle stated she did not perform a cost benefit analysis; however, she would not find substantial additional costs. Councilmember Clark asked if any of the cities that responded conveyed whether or not they felt Council subcommittees were a benefit to their community. Ms. Whittle said she only talked to Phoenix in that context and Phoenix felt the committees were imperative because they are so vast and large they would not be able to handle all of the items at normal Council meetings. She said other communities she talked to felt subcommittees are valuable for gathering additional input from the community, but in a more advisory capacity. Councilmember Clark asked Council to consider reinstituting at least some Council subcommittees, such as Public Safety and Code Compliance; Transportation, Streets and Utilities; Finance and Budget; Information Technology; Public Relations; and Community Services. She pointed out the membership of the city's Government Services subcommittee has not changed in four or more years. She expressed her opinion Council subcommittees provide a wonderful opportunity for departments to share information with the public and to discuss issues.

Councilmember Martinez noted the city had a Utilities subcommittee when he first came on the Council. He said he believes the way the city operates now works well and he cannot see being able to serve on more than one committee because of the demands already placed on his time. He pointed out Phoenix has full-time Council members.

Councilmember Goulet stated many of the city's needs are met through its Boards and Commissions. He expressed his opinion subcommittees extend the process rather than create more efficiency and should be created only when the need arises.

Councilmember Clark said the other cities who responded must see some value in having Council subcommittees, noting all but Phoenix have part-time Council members.

Mayor Scruggs pointed out the subcommittees only meet when the department or Council determines there is a need for them to meet. Ms. Whittle said she asked each city how often their subcommittees meet, noting some were very vague in their response. Mayor Scruggs said she has served under both formats and believes the most in-depth work has been done as the full Council because those who serve on the Council are not comfortable making decisions without full information. She explained dissolution of the city's committees came about when the Budget committee forwarded their recommended budget to the full Council and the people who were not on the committee were completely opposed to the recommendation of the three that were. She stated significant staff resources were invested to staff the committees and they were often asked to repeat everything in front of the full Council. She pointed out the Council meetings are televised, stating that is one of the best learning tools for citizens. She said the composition of the current Council does not necessarily reflect that of future Councils, pointing out only one member currently has other employment. She expressed concern that requiring future Council members to serve on subcommittees will hinder their ability to run for office.

Vice Mayor Eggleston said he served on different subcommittees when he first came on the Council years ago. He stated he found the committees to be an extravagant use of staff's time and talent. He pointed out the Council now has workshop sessions which allow it to discuss items in great detail.

Councilmember Clark said she too served under both formats and enjoyed serving on Council subcommittees. She noted the subcommittee meetings were televised as well. She expressed her opinion there is a place for Council subcommittees.

Councilmember Frate stated the city establishes subcommittees when they are needed. He expressed his opinion the Council is doing an exceptional job, stating he prefers to discuss issues in full Council.

Nuisance Ordinance

Mayor Scruggs referenced an article in the Arizona Republic which said Paradise Valley is having problems with noise and is considering banning motorcycles and restricting the use of lawnmowers.

Councilmember Goulet said he would like the issue sent to subcommittee to categorize what might be considered a nuisance in each of the various departments.

Councilmember Clark commented on the irony of sending the issue to subcommittee given Council's decision not to reinstate Council subcommittees.

Mayor Scruggs pointed out the Council has historically established subcommittees when problems arise. She expressed her opinion Council should discuss the issue at a workshop session.

Councilmembers Frate, Goulet and Eggleston indicated they would prefer the issue go to subcommittee.

Councilmember Clark agreed the issue should be discussed by the full Council.

Mayor Scruggs expressed her opinion sending the issue to subcommittee will create a lot of needless work for staff.

5. COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

This is the quarterly opportunity for City Councilmembers to identify topics of interest that they would like the City Manager to research and assess for placement on a future workshop agenda.

In the Fall of 2002, the Council approved a procedural guideline allowing for topics of special interest to be identified quarterly.

The initial assessment of each item requires staff time.

The recommendation was to identify items of special interest that the Council wants the City Manager to assess.

Councilmember Martinez asked staff to research having Board of Adjustment appeals go directly to the Supreme Court rather than to Council.

Councilmember Frate asked staff to look into replacing the city's entry signage.

Mayor Scruggs noted the Marketing Department has already indicated they will address signage once they update the city's logo and colors.

Councilmember Frate withdrew his request.

Councilmember Clark said the cost of redoing all signage throughout the city would be in the millions, noting Ms. Frisoni and Ms. Pearson indicated they were looking at an interim resolution that would address at least some of the signs.

Ms. Gorham offered to talk to Ms. Frisoni and Ms. Pearson and send a memo to Council outlining some of the background information. Mr. Beasley stated a change in the city's logo and colors could not be phased in over time because it would send mixed messages to those visiting Glendale.

Councilmember Clark mentioned an email she received from Councilmember Lieberman wherein he asked staff to investigate reinstating Memigen as a sister city.

Mayor Scruggs asked for a report on where the city stands with replacing the yellow streetlights and what it will take to finish the job.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.