

***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

OCTOBER 2, 2007

2:30 P.M.

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

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

1. INDEPENDENT FACILITATOR FOR APPOINTED OFFICIAL EVALUATIONS

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Yvonne Knaack, Councilmember, Barrel District.

This is a request for the City Council to review further information and details regarding the process, expectations, and costs to establish an independent facilitator for appointed official evaluations.

Implementation of this process will result in a mutually acceptable process between the Council and appointed officials that clearly communicates goals and expectations, encourages mutual responsiveness, and reflects a specific timeframe for accomplishing the review. This process includes the City Manager, City Attorney and City Clerk. The Presiding City Judge, while appointed, is reviewed under a procedure established by the Arizona Supreme Court and was, therefore, excluded from consideration in this process.

The use of an independent facilitator for appointed official evaluations addresses each of the Council Strategic goals that are relevant to the individual appointed official.

At the May 1, 2007 Council workshop, Councilmember Knaack asked that the special interest item of establishing independent facilitation of appointed official evaluations in local municipalities be researched. At the August 21, 2007 Council workshop, Councilmember Knaack presented the findings of the research. At this time the Council indicated their interest in pursuing the opportunity of having an independent facilitator oversee the annual evaluations of the city's appointed officials. Additionally, the Mayor and Council requested that further information from staff be presented at a future workshop to include details regarding the process, expectations, and costs to establish an independent facilitator for appointed official evaluations.

A memorandum dated August 7, 2007 to the Mayor and Council titled Council Item of Interest: Independent Facilitator for Appointed Officials Evaluations was presented at the August 21, 2007 Workshop.

The process of independent facilitation of appointed official evaluations offers a system that provides for a non-subjective review, with a broad range perspective of pertinent issues and goals set by Council. This allows for objectivity in evaluating each appointed official independently; standardization of process and measurements; effective review and evaluation of accomplishments; development of future goals and objectives; and, advisory compensation information.

The approximate range of costs for the entire process would be \$5,000 to \$10,000 for each appointed official. Dependent upon the facilitator selected, much of the information gathering could be conducted via telephone interviews or other surveying methods. If the facilitator were required to attend more than one session, the costs would likely increase accordingly. This fee would include development of the process; preparation of information; evaluation mechanism and standards; and, an established timeline of activities to conduct the review.

Staff is seeking guidance from the Council on the implementation of a process for independent facilitation of appointed official evaluations.

Councilmember Knaack provided a brief introduction on the request of the Mayor and Council, that further information from staff be presented at a future workshop to include details regarding the process, expectations, and costs to establish an independent facilitator for appointed official evaluations. She added that it was agreed that this was an important issue for consideration that could result in mutually acceptable process between Council and appointed officials that will clearly communicate goals and expectations, encourage mutual responsiveness and reflect a specific time frame for accomplishing this review.

Councilmember Knaack summarized the process of the independent facilitator, stating that this would allow for objectivity in evaluating each appointed official independently; standardization of process and measurements; effective review and evaluation of accomplishments; development of future goals and objectives; and, advisory compensation information. She added that she believes the appointed officials are the top professionals and deserve this process.

Councilmember Clark inquired as to how setting goals with a facilitator would differ from other goal setting sessions the Council has had in the past.

Mr. Beasley stated that the goals would vary with each person. He stated that his goals would be aligned with the Council's goals from an organizational stand point for budget, department and business plans. He noted that there would also be a strategy for implementation as well as a time frame being set.

Mr. Tindall stated that the process entails the Council and staff setting goals for the organization to be implemented with a precise plan and a facilitator. He noted that the goals would not change because of the use of a facilitator, however it would be more specific and detail oriented.

Councilmember Clark stated that what she understood was that the goals were not separate or different from any other goal setting session, but only differ in the implementation and performance of the goals being set.

Ms. Pam Hanna reiterated the sentiments of both Mr. Beasley and Mr. Tindall. She said her department would look to the goals the Council envisioned and tailor those goals to fit the department for an improved business plan. She added that with the help of the facilitator, they would be able to expand, narrow or add specific details.

Councilmember Frate inquired as to the cost and from where it would be funded. He asked if it would be something they would have to budget for the year.

Mr. Beasley stated that the cost would vary depending on whether the facilitator is local or not. He said the cost would probably be between \$5,000 to \$10,000 depending on the amount of meetings as well as other factors. Additionally, each department had discretionary funds that could be used to fund the process.

Councilmember Frate commented on possibly using a facilitator in the interim and later work on goal setting internally with the tools learned from the facilitator.

Councilmember Knaack stated that the facilitator would always need to be an independent contractor. Councilmember Frate expressed his support for a facilitator.

Mayor Scruggs added that every year the Council should discuss and determine the use of a facilitator. She said the majority would then vote whether to have an independent facilitator. Additionally, she said she viewed this as a test project and not for the long term.

Vice Mayor Martinez commented that the process that was in place now had, in his view, worked fairly well; however he was willing to try something new in hopes that the process could be improved. He said he was willing to try it for one year and view the outcome. He added that he believes this to be a good experience for all.

Councilmember Lieberman commented that he foresees possibly having two different kinds of goals. One of the meetings would be for goals concerning the city, while the other would be to sit down with the facilitator and discuss managing different departments. He stated that ultimately, it was one goal that could be worked on two ways.

Councilmember Goulet stated that he appreciated Councilmember Knaack's request to bring this project to the table. He said in the past they struggled with several concerns regarding this issue. He inquired as to how the goal setting session would incorporate each individual performance measures as well as discipline principles. He noted that the attorneys had professional responsibilities to meet legally and asked if that would carry over to other offices or individual performance measures that would be looked at or would they chose certain things based on what the goals and objectives were.

Mr. Tindall explained that each individual had specific goals that have been set for their department and would vary for each person. He added that the facilitator would probably look to each individual and their goal setting, in keeping with the overall encompassing goals of the Council. He also explained that the cost would probably be higher the first time around since they were still in the learning stages; however the cost should be much lower the second time around if the Council so chooses to continue the process.

Councilmember Goulet asked Mr. Tindall if when meeting the goals for his department, would he discuss the individual characteristics he would utilize to meet those goals. Mr. Tindall stated that he was correct.

Mr. Beasley reiterated Mr. Tindall's views. He stated that each individual's job was different, with different challenges and goals to meet. He explained that his job was both external and internal with Council goals, staff and city needs. He added that his goals would meet the values, standards, performance and ethics of all individuals.

Ms. Pam Hanna stated that the city clerk's office was a very service oriented department with service to the public, City Council and staff. She explained that her goals would center on specific functions to continue to offer and expand excellent service for the public, staff and all city organizations.

Councilmember Goulet stated that it was very important for the public to acknowledge that the city had the same goal with each department's goals structured and tailored to reach the same goal in different ways.

Mayor Scruggs commented that the goals for the city's attorney and city's clerk offices would be different from the goals set at the retreat. She added that as for the city manager's goals, there would probably be some over lap, however there would be some refinement as well. She noted that there would be times when some services would be better met and reviewed internally rather than dealt with independently. She related an example of attorneys reviewing old and out dated ordinances. She explained that the city clerk's office would have different goals than Mr. Beasley's goals; however each goal would work to better serve the city. She added that Mr. Beasley's goals would probably be tied directly with goals set by the Council.

Mayor Scruggs noted that this was what she had envisioned when utilizing the help of a facilitator.

Councilmember Frate commented that having another set of eyes looking over their goals could give a new and different perspective.

Mayor Scruggs had a question based on a process stated in the memo. In the memo there was mention of a priority list of goals and input from each person independently. She inquired how that list of goals would be developed and how and when they would be presented. She asked Councilmember Knaack if she had spoken to other cities that had gone through this process.

Councilmember Knaack explained that she had not discussed this process with other Cities who had utilized facilitators. Mayor Scruggs stated that it would be a good idea to talk with other elected officials and ask how this process actually occurs.

Mr. Beasley stated that it was his understanding that the process would start with individual goal setting and then find the commonality and consensus regarding those goals. The consensus would then be brought in for discussion in a group setting for implementation, strategy and a time frame.

Mayor Scruggs inquired as to the process to select the facilitator, which needed to be fairly quick, because evaluations started in January. Councilmember Knaack stated that it had not been set up thus far.

Mayor Scruggs commented that she thought the facilitator would probably come from the Human Resources discipline. Mr. Beasley stated that the facilitator would be an individual that would identify with each person and be familiar with each individual's evaluation models and would not necessarily come from HR.

Mayor Scruggs reiterated that most of the Council believed the facilitator would be someone whose work was in the profession of Human Resources. She asked how they would begin the process of finding a facilitator. Councilmember Knaack commented that they should all have input in finding and identifying a facilitator.

Mayor Scruggs asked to begin the process of finding a facilitator. She stated that she would like to begin now because there would be veto power, therefore they needed to have more than one name.

Vice Mayor Martinez suggested possibly having Human Resources research and compile a list of names and backgrounds of who other cities were using. He noted that they could bring it to a workshop for discussion.

Mayor Scruggs stated that it would have to be in a workshop setting because it dealt with evaluations. Mr. Tindall stated that she was correct. He added that they could follow it up with an executive session and continue the discussion to agree on a facilitator.

Mayor Scruggs stressed the fact that they needed to all agree with a procedure to begin the process selection.

Councilmember Clark commented that her view of a facilitator was someone to bring points of view together and form a consensus. She stated that she was not specifically interested in it being a facilitator from Human Resources, but rather someone who could bring the diverse views of many people to commonality. She said she agreed with bringing this to a workshop and/or an executive session. She added that she personally did not know of any facilitators, however was confident in the names from Human Resources, staff and any Council members who had submitted names. She would like to see a short biography or background on any facilitator nominated.

Councilmember Goulet suggested possibly needing two facilitators because of the two very different areas. He said there would be one facilitator for individual performance and possibly another for city goals. He noted that he believes it would be difficult for one facilitator to focus on both goals.

Mayor Scruggs commented that she agreed with Councilmember Goulet's assertion that two facilitators might be needed because of the expertise needed in very different areas. She added that hopefully they could agree on one independent facilitator that could evaluate and help achieve everyone's goals.

Councilmember Lieberman commented that this was a learning process for all. He stated that they could possibly like this process or not at all. He said that overall he believes this to be a unique learning experience and would like to move forward with it.

Vice Mayor Martinez commented that he was not suggesting the facilitator be a Human Resources person, but rather have them research, contact and have background information on suitable facilitators.

Mayor Scruggs proceeded to summarize the discussion thus far. She stated that everyone would be permitted to submit names of facilitators, including Human Resources. The list would be researched by Human Resources and biographies and background checks done and submitted to the Council for a meeting set in executive session to discuss and decide on a choice or choices. The next step would be to obtain the cost of the individual facilitator. After the cost is determined, there would be another session to then discuss and select the facilitator. Mr. Tindall stated that they could possibly budget a cost today and avoid the second meeting.

Mayor Scruggs and Mr. Tindall suggested advising the participants in advance of the budget range and time frame. Mr. Tindall stated that they would only select from that pool.

Councilmember Frate commented that an availability factor may become an issue.

Mayor Scruggs continued and said that after the discussion and selection at the executive session, Human Resources would finalize the contract.

Mr. Tindall stated that a simple contract could be developed and be ready when the selection was made.

Councilmember Lieberman suggested possibly interviewing the facilitator. The consensus from the Council was not to interview.

Councilmember Clark stated that this process was new to everyone and interviewing the participants could possibly stretch and complicate the process.

Mayor Scruggs discussed the time frame of when the facilitator would be needed. Mr. Beasley said that it would largely depend on the availability of the facilitator. He said that the timing of implementation was a different topic. Mayor Scruggs commented that evaluations began in January and would like to keep to that time frame.

Councilmember Knaack commented that she would like to start much sooner than January and believes it not to be such a complicated issue.

Mayor Scruggs suggested starting in December if at all possible.

Councilmember Clark commented that since this was already October, it would be extremely difficult to find a facilitator for November or December. She stated that they should come to an agreement with appointed officials and needed more time.

Councilmember Goulet agreed with Councilmember Clark and suggested starting in January. Councilmember Knaack suggested still trying to obtain someone for December and, if feasible, to postpone until the next availability.

Mayor Scruggs suggested obtaining the list of names within a one week time frame. The names are due to Human Resources by October 12, 2007.

Councilmember Knaack suggested the cost for each facilitator not to exceed more than \$10,000 per appointed official. Mr. Tindall stated that it was common for a consultant to have a "do not exceed clause" in their contract.

Vice Mayor Martinez suggested leaving the cost open so as not to encourage consultants coming in at just under the \$10,000 dollar range.

Mr. Tindall stated that what he was trying to avoid was subsequent meetings to evaluate cost ranges. He added that the consultants would have a standard rate and ideas on the time frame needed to complete the process.

Mayor Scruggs inquired as to an average cost of a facilitator. Mr. Beasley stated that he believes that the cost to be close to \$5,000 dollars. He added that they were not only paying for their time, but also their expertise.

Councilmember Clark stated that Mr. Beasley had a valid point and could approve of the

\$5,000 to \$10,000 dollar range. She noted that as Mr. Beasley had mentioned, the cost could go up depending if the person selected was from out of state.

Mayor Scruggs called for everyone to agree on a range. Everyone agreed on the limit not to exceed \$10,000. She asked for this to possibly be ready for the October 16, 2007 meeting. She stated that the deadline for turning in the names was October 9, 2007 to Human Resources. Human Resources will contact each person or firm and explain what the City of Glendale was looking for. Additionally, Human Resources would start biographies and contact the individuals to find out availability in December, April or May time frame. The facilitator would submit their hourly rate and be made aware of the \$10,000 range limit per evaluation. In addition, all information would be discussed at the October 16 meeting. At that meeting, a selection of the facilitator would be made.

Councilmember Knaack commented that part of her vision was to remove this process somewhat away from the Human Resources department and to have an outside point of view. Mayor Scruggs stated that she wished she had a different term to use other than Human Resources for people that do this as a profession and knows both the legal aspects and the performance of evaluations.

Vice Mayor Martinez commented that other cities who use this process have found these individuals and that could be a good place to start. Mayor Scruggs agreed with Vice Mayor Martinez and stated that she would be looking into the names used by other cities.

Mayor Scruggs asked for a consensus to first start with names that had been used by the cities of Peoria, Scottsdale and Chandler. Everyone was in agreement.

2. Regional PARATRANSIT study conducted by the REGIONAL public transportation authority

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Cathy Colbath, Transit Administrator, Ms. Jessica Blazine, Intergovernmental Program Director.

This is a request for the City Council to provide guidance on the Regional Paratransit Study being conducted by the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA). This study was initiated by the RPTA to examine issues involving paratransit service in the valley. The study reviewed existing local paratransit services such as Dial-A-Ride and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transit service, and presents a plan for regionalizing paratransit services.

One of the Council's goals is to provide high-quality services for citizens. Providing transportation options within the city will assist in achieving this goal.

Glendale Transit offers several transportation options. The combination of services offered provided rides to nearly 2.5 million people in Glendale last year. These services include:

- Fixed route and express bus services
- Glendale Urban Shuttle (GUS)
- Taxi-subsidy for certain medical trips
- Maricopa County Special Transportation Services (STS)
- Dial-A-Ride (DAR)
- Transportation services required under the ADA

The ADA is a federally mandated paratransit service required to be provided within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of fixed route bus service to persons with a disability which prevents them from using a fixed route bus.

In October of 2006, the RPTA contracted with TranSystems to conduct a study of existing paratransit programs in the region and to identify potential benefits and challenges to implementing a regional paratransit program. The study was to address issues, including aging population needs, increasing ADA demands, transfers, and the possibility of regionalizing certain facets of service to contain costs.

The paratransit services offered by Glendale were assessed by the consultant. In summary of the system review, the consultant reported "The Glendale DAR and ADA services appear to be well managed, high-quality, and operated efficiently. On-time performance and ride times are exemplary. Accident rates and complaint rates are very low. No ADA trip requests are denied and about 98.6% of non-ADA DAR trips requests are accommodated."

As part of the process, input was gathered from staff and the public throughout the region. Several meetings were held, which resulted in a regional paratransit model being selected which proposes creating a regional call center and divides the valley into three sub-sections: east, central and west. In this proposed system model some passengers may have to transfer; however, most would not.

The item was presented at the September 2007 RTPA Board meeting for discussion. As part of a separate item (RPTA Strategic Plan), an action was taken authorizing the RPTA to become the lead agency to regionalize ADA paratransit, dependent upon approval of local city councils.

The RPTA Board will be asked in October of 2007 to accept the consultant's recommendation for regional paratransit service.

Participating in a regional service may provide residents using a regional ADA service the ability to travel outside Glendale without needing to transfer, and will provide consistent service policies. However, regional service could limit the ability of residents to travel on

the day of service requested as same day service will not be guaranteed. Additionally, ADA fares will increase.

Participating in a regional system will result in loss of direct service control. The RPTA will administer and operate the program through separate contracts with private providers. Therefore citizen complaints will not be handled at the local level.

The study information was presented to the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee on September 6, 2007 for information only. Comments included concern for difficulty experienced by residents needing to transfer and concerns about potential loss of quality of service and costs impacts by participating in a regional system.

The cost estimates provided to date are based on a cost allocation method different from the method proposed to be used once a regional system is implemented. The consultant states estimates using the preferred cost allocation method have not been provided since the process to determine those estimates would be difficult and time consuming.

Additionally, current cost estimates presume ADA eligible riders will use the regional service. However, ADA eligible riders may prefer to use Glendale's non-ADA service due to lower cost, high-customer service and responsiveness. In that case, the cost of providing non-ADA service in Glendale could be impacted. These cost impacts have not been addressed by the study.

Valley cities receive financial reimbursement for ADA service through the RPTA. While this reimbursement falls short of current ADA costs incurred in Glendale, other cities receive funding amounts over their actual expenses. Glendale and any city whose ADA allocations fall short of actual service costs would be responsible for the cost overages, but would have limited control of the regional service.

Staff is requesting guidance from the Council to continue working with the RPTA to refine the study prior to considering the cost and service delivery impacts of participation in a regional paratransit system.

Mayor Scruggs commented that the City of Glendale has the highest level of quality regarding DAR and ADA services. The consultants stated that they had a well managed, high-quality operation that ran very efficiently. She added that the consultants had found on-time performances and ride times that were exemplary.

Councilmember Frate stated that he understood they were still in the study process of participating in the regional paratransit system, however asked at which point in time could they vote whether to participate or not. He explained that Glendale had an efficient, high quality system and should they participate regionally, as the cost could rise and they would no longer have any control over the quality of service.

Ms. Cathy Colbath, Transit Administrator stated that one of the components of the regional paratransit plan requires that non-ADA services, which most residents have, do

not guarantee same day service and any requests would have to be made in advance. Currently ADA service was required to be made a day in advance.

Councilmember Clark stated that she sees this as a possible deterrent to the level of exceptional service that Glendale delivers to its most vulnerable residents. She noted that she does not support moving in this direction, especially if it means that as a minority vote against it, they are co-opted into the system.

Councilmember Goulet congratulated Ms. Colbath for the success in the transit system. He asked if there had been any discussion on there possibly being three regions with each region having to pay accordingly. Ms. Colbath stated that the method of cost allocation proposed in the plan was that each jurisdiction would be accountable for their residents' travel and there would be a trip distance component incorporated into the cost.

Councilmember Goulet asked what the yearly ADA increase was for Glendale. Ms. Colbath stated that they actually experienced a decrease last year because they had expanded the guest system with greater options. She added that typically there was an increase in ridership and a yearly increase of 3% is incorporated. Councilmember Goulet noted that he would like to continue discussions and further study this matter and would hope they would want to raise the level of performance to Glendale's standards and not lower the standards to accommodate everyone as a whole.

Mayor Scruggs commented that a lot of communities did not have ADA services, therefore how would the cost be addressed. Ms. Colbath stated that each community could choose to use this regional system to provide their non-ADA service and acquire the cost.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if dial-a-ride still stopped at the city boundaries. Ms. Colbath stated that the service was provided only within the Glendale boundaries. Councilmember Lieberman also inquired as to how much was paid to RPTA. Ms. Colbath said they did not pay anything to RPTA for service; however they do pay the City of Phoenix for some of the fixed route services. She added that RPTA does pay on behalf of Glendale for some of the fixed route services. Councilmember Lieberman asked how much was paid to the City of Phoenix. Ms. Colbath stated that Phoenix was paid approximately \$3 million a year. Councilmember Lieberman asked if there were any routes that were exclusive to Glendale without using Phoenix transit. Ms. Colbath stated that there were none. She said that they shared the regional system. Councilmember Lieberman commented that they were already regional whether they wanted to admit it or not. He stated that it would be difficult to be independent regarding the fixed route system.

Councilmember Lieberman commended Ms. Colbath for a wonderful job extending the times, hours and frequency of the routes.

Mayor Scruggs stated that the fixed bus route system should be regional; however Glendale does have two totally independent services at the moment which were dial-a-ride and ADA. She explained that the question being addressed was, should they give up those two independent services and become part of the regional fleet.

Vice Mayor Martinez commented that he did not want to give up the independent systems. He said they were doing an excellent job and would like to keep it that way. He added that they should continue exploring the regional issue, however would like to keep everything as is for now. He asked if there were any free passes for students on fixed routes. Ms. Colbath stated that they followed the same guidelines that the region utilizes regarding discount fares for students. She added that Tempe does have free fares for their students.

Mayor Scruggs relayed a lively discussion at a meeting where the free fare for students was discussed. She stated that ultimately it was decided that one group of riders should not be singled out for free passes and not others. She noted that there had not been any money allocated for this subsidized service and Tempe was paying it out of their own funds. She explained that any new project that someone tries to insert into the regional transportation plan hoping to use Prop 400 funding, could not be included because the funds were simply not there.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the taxi service used for medical emergencies went out of the city limits. Ms. Colbath stated that it was used for only Glendale boundaries.

Mayor Scruggs gave direction to continue working with the RPTA to refine the study. She would like to see the study consider the cost and service delivery impacts before considering participation in a regional paratransit system. She added that on October 18, 2007, she would be voting on the RPTA board developing a single regional transit agency. She explained that she was not in agreement with RPTA's direction in this matter because of the impact it could have on Glendale. She said that the assumption that was driving this change was that everyone assumed people wanted to travel beyond the city limits. She explained that with long distance travel, there would be a price to pay for a different type of service.

Mayor Scruggs stated that her vote of "no" would probably be interpreted as Glendale does not want people to move around the valley. A "yes" vote would mean that Glendale went along with the status quo. She said she could possibly abstain because of insufficient information on the impact on the City of Glendale.

Vice Mayor Martinez recommended a "yes" vote to continue working with the RPTA to refine the study and a "no" vote on the October 18th meeting. He said that he believes the Council had enough information to warrant not becoming part of the regional system at this time.

Councilmember Frate recommended a "no" vote on the October 18th meeting. He added that they all believed in working together, however in this case he didn't see a benefit to Glendale.

Councilmember Clark recommended a "no" vote for the October 18th meeting. She stated that she sees no advantage for the City of Glendale's residents. She further added that she sees no benefit in continuing to work with the RPTA since they have already decided

that it was not in Glendale's best interest.

Mayor Scruggs said that in continuing to work with RPTA, it could turn out to be something that Glendale could support. Ms. Colbath stated that they would like the opportunity to go back and look at options that had not been explored. She said she would like the opportunity to explore the possibility of improving the transfer system which would in turn improve the quality of service for all residents.

Mayor Scruggs commented that this was only the first stage in the process and any resolution on a regional paratransit system was premature. Vice Mayor Martinez asked if there was a time frame for the study. Mayor Scruggs stated that there was really no time frame; however they were pushing for sometime in December.

Councilmember Knaack commented that she was bothered with just recommending a "no" vote without further review and study. She said she was thinking of the people that had to go to the Mayo Clinic in Scottsdale. She said that the area had become regional and they should possibly look to the future.

Mayor Scruggs discussed the government's role in meeting everyone's needs and how to recognize when it becomes the individuals responsibility.

Councilmember Clark stated that she believes that they had met their mandate when they delivered excellent service to the residents of Glendale. She said that the watering down of a regional system might put Glendale at a disadvantage to travel regionally. She noted that a regional system was something that everyone aspired to achieve; however, if it was not the right kind of service and did not meet the needs of the population it was intended to serve, it would be an exercise in futility.

Vice Mayor Martinez reiterated his stand to recommend a "no" vote, however voted to continue to work with RPTA to refine the study.

Councilmember Goulet stated that it seemed that people were motivated not to give up something that was clearly a success and head and shoulders over everyone else. His recommendation would be to continue the study, however vote "no" on October 18th.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she would be voting "no" on the October 18th meeting for the resolution to develop a single transit agency for all modes of transportation. She said that her vote of "no" was on the basis that the vote was premature and there had not been sufficient time to determine what the cost would be or that the service delivery would not be diminished from the standards that Glendale had established.

Councilmember Clark agreed with Mayor Scruggs on this resolution being premature and needing additional information on the study of cost and delivery.

Councilmember Knaack stated that she was in agreement with needing further information.

Mayor Scruggs noted that this was a complicated issue. She added that most communities see this as a free service when it clearly was not. She asked if there was a way to assess the riders' needs for traveling outside the city. Ms. Colbath stated that there had not been a study done, however the need was there for outside travel. She noted that she would like to continue to work to develop something that would provide some mobility and options to riders.

Mayor Scruggs commented that it was important to know the percentage of riders that needed to travel outside of Glendale. She would also like to know if the users would sacrifice the level of service they had now, for additional options. She asked Ms. Colbath if there was anyway of finding out. Ms. Colbath stated that they had not done any studies that would support that question.

Councilmember Clark suggested possibly giving out a survey card to obtain information from the riders. She suggested passing them out while the riders were in transit. She stated that the survey would give the Council insight on what the average rider considers a priority. Ms. Colbath stated that she would look into putting together a survey. She added that most riders do like having additional options.

Councilmember Clark commented that she did not want to give false expectations should this become regional and people expect the same level of service given by Glendale.

Mayor Scruggs commented that at some point they would need to know were the rider stands.

Councilmember Frate commented that the citizens of Glendale were extremely satisfied with the Glendale system today.

Vice Mayor Martinez stated that he had used the dial-a-ride in the past and probably will use it in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.