

**\*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  
FEBRUARY 20, 2007  
1:30 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

Mayor Scruggs took a moment to remember Officer Anthony Holly.

**1. ARIZONA SUPER BOWL HOST COMMITTEE BID REQUEST**

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Cathy Gorham, Director of City Manager Relations and Mr. Mike Kennedy, Chairman of the Super Bowl Host Committee.

This is a request for the City Council to provide direction on a request from the Arizona Super Bowl Host Committee to support a bid to host Super Bowl XLV in 2011.

The deadline for the City to participate in developing a preliminary bid document for Super Bowl XLV in 2011 is April 2, 2007.

At the "Mayors' of Arizona Super Bowl XLII Lunch," hosted by the Arizona Super Bowl Host Committee on November 14, 2006, Glendale staff first learned of the intent of the Cardinals and Arizona Super Bowl Host Committee (ASBHC) to submit a bid for the 2011 Super Bowl during a public announcement at the event.

On Friday February 9, 2007, staff received materials from the ASBHC with regard to the City of Glendale's requirements for the NFL Bid for Super Bowl XLV in 2011.

Below is a listing of some of the conceptual significant areas in which the NFL, through the Host Committee, is considering for government guarantees and commitments:

1. Public safety, emergency medical and emergency management services at no cost for 10 days of Super Bowl activities including the NFL Experience and the game.

2. Prioritization of NFL projects and streamlined permitting for all NFL related facilities at the stadium and NFL party venues at no cost.
3. A commitment to work with the Host Committee to secure exclusive, cost-free use of 30,000 paved and lighted parking spaces outside of the secure stadium perimeter on game day.
4. City sales tax and other local tax exemptions for the NFL and its 11 non-profit charitable organizations.

Since the city's participation in the development of the 2003 bid package and the ultimate award of the game to Arizona and the stadium in Glendale on February 3, 2008, the City Council and city staff have been fiscally responsible and diligent in planning and preparing for this national event. However, until the game and related activities actually occur in 2008, the city's expenses are projections only based on what staff currently understands the NFL and Host Committee expectations to be and what similar events have cost in other host cities.

The bid document is merely the starting point for negotiations related to planning for an event of this magnitude with multiple agencies and partners involved. For example, the 2003 bid included the following clause: "These bid specifications shall not be construed to convey any rights to its readers or designated host committees. The NFL reserves the rights to modify, amend, delete from, or add to these Bid Specifications. The Arizona Host Committee shall be notified of any such changes in accordance with the Host Committee Agreement. These Bid Specifications do not specify all of the local assistance necessary to successful staging of Super Bowl XLII. Additional assistance may be requested from or proposed to the Arizona Host Committee from time to time."

Over the last year several changes to what was originally presented in the 2003 bid have occurred as a result of discussions between the NFL and the Host Committee. These changes were directly related to the only NFL events and projects recommended to occur in Glendale. Based on staff's research with other host cities, additional changes and requests related to services provided for the 2008 Super Bowl can be expected from the NFL and/or the Host Committee.

If the Council decides they would like city staff to negotiate and participate in the development of the 2011 bid, it is recommended that Glendale be fully represented on the Bid and Host Committees and included in its operational subcommittees from beginning to end. The Committee has requested a representative who is well versed in Glendale's events, venues, and other city service operations.

Also, if the Council should decide to move forward, staff recommends that the city work with the Host Committee and the NFL to explore revenue sources to assist in offsetting the costs of the Super Bowl events to the city.

Based on the tight timetable for the Host Committee to complete a preliminary bid presentation by April 2, 2007, staff would need to return to Council Workshop in March with results of the discussions with the Host Committee and as complete an assessment of the city-related requirements, as well as recommendations about how to proceed.

After that workshop presentation, it is anticipated that, if the Council agrees to participate in the 2011 bid, resolutions would have to be approved at the evening meeting on March 27, 2007.

Should the 2011 Super Bowl bid be awarded to Arizona, it should be noted that the city/arena might also potentially be host to the National Hockey League All-Star Game in January of that year and the BCS Championship in addition to the annual Fiesta Bowl game.

Hosting an event of the magnitude of the Super Bowl brings great prestige and promotion to Arizona, the Valley and Glendale. Once Super Bowl XLII is held next year, a comprehensive assessment of both the expenses and revenues to Glendale will be completed. Since all of the 2008 events, with the exception of the NFL Experience and the game itself, are currently planned in other parts of the Valley and the state, it will be important for the Council to have more complete information related to the economic impact that directly benefits Glendale.

Staff is requesting that the Council provide policy direction related to the Arizona Super Bowl Host Committee's request to support the Super Bowl Bid for 2011 and whether staff should enter into discussions/negotiations with the Host Committee regarding Glendale bid expectations and proposed requirements.

Staff is recommending that, if advised to move forward with discussions pertaining to the Super Bowl Bid for 2011, city staff be fully represented on the Bid and Host committees from beginning to end in the process.

In addition, staff also recommends that, if advised to move forward, they will work with the Host Committee and the NFL to assist in offsetting costs to the city for Super Bowl events.

Mr. Kennedy offered to answer Council's questions. He congratulated the city on the successes they had with the BCS and Fiesta Bowl. He stated that he has visited Glendale often and always witnesses something positive. He explained that preparations are on track and he foresees a very successful Super Bowl. His objective today is to propose a bid for Super Bowl 2011. He stated that the sense of the Host Committee was that Glendale has the best facility in the world. The Fiesta Bowl and BCS games were evidence of what a superb job the city can do.

Mayor Scruggs said the request is Council to give direction as to whether they would support staff with the Host Committee on the bid for Super Bowl 2011

Vice Mayor Martinez asked if the City would be bound to move forward if they were to give their approval or would they receive further information. Mr. Beasley stated that there were many resolutions that had to take place before commitments were made. He explained that the decision before them today would only start the process under the two criteria stated. He added that this would be before them again in March.

Vice Mayor Martinez asked if it was known how much the event would cost the city. Mr. Kennedy answered that the cost to the city is difficult to estimate; however hosting the Super Bowl in the community presents a wealth of major opportunities. He said holding an event such as this could represent a half million dollar impact.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if the \$15 million collected by the Host Committee to date included Glendale's funds. Mr. Kennedy answered affirmatively. Mayor Scruggs clarified that Mr. Kennedy was talking about the funds in Prop 302 not Glendale's City funds.

In response to a question by Councilmember Goulet, Mr. Kennedy confirmed that they would be securing endorsements from all major cities in the Valley.

Councilmember Goulet had concerns with citizens asking about the cost of such a significant venture, without knowing how 2008 Super Bowl will unfold first. Mr. Kennedy stated that most of the money would come from the private sector. He stated that the cost for 2011 could be in the area of \$18 million; however, the Host Committee will be the one raising the money, not Glendale. He stated that he sees this as a great opportunity for the community.

Mayor Scruggs stated for clarification purposes that the City of Glendale is not required to fund the Host Committee other than a nominal fee based on the number of Glendale hotel rooms.

Mr. Beasley stated that the City of Glendale has set aside seven million dollars for all mega events, including the Super Bowl. Ms. Cathy Gorham, City Manager's Relations Director, stated that the city has already spent \$1.2 million on infrastructure improvements in high impact areas. She said what was left was for the costs associated with other events. She said it was important to note that this fund was not intended to fund the Host Committee. Mayor Scruggs restated that none of the city's seven million dollar fund was included in the Host Committee's fund raising project.

Councilmember Clark asked why they were looking at 2011 as opposed to 2012 or any other year. Mr. Kennedy stated that the NFL issued an invitation to bid on 2011. He stated that he believes this is a good opportunity but not a guarantee. He said that this was a work in progress, but for this to become a reality many issues have to be addressed. He reiterated that this was the first step in the process.

Councilmember Clark commented that she did not want this to become a burden on the citizens. She stated that she was appreciative that Mayor Scruggs had been granted a seat on the Host Committee. She added that she would like the Host Committee to work towards having the City of Glendale as a partner in the decision making process with regards to the Super Bowl. Mr. Kennedy stated that they have expanded the Committee and wanted Mayor Scruggs to provide her expertise and knowledge to the Committee.

Councilmember Clark stated that her position was that the site where the event would take place should carry more weight than other cities. She thanked Mr. Kennedy for his understanding and support. She stated that she was willing to move forward with this and looks forward to hearing further information presented in March.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she would like all bids in the future to come through the Council for review first, but is aware that it does not always happen.

Councilmember Knaack had concerns with the investment the City of Glendale makes and its return on investment. She stated that Glendale will be taking on most of the responsibility. Mr. Kennedy agreed, however he reiterated that this would be a great opportunity for Glendale. He stated that he believes that hosting this event is a benefit to the community.

Councilmember Frate stated his belief this will benefit the community. He said he would like to move forward with dialog and hear the presentation in March. He added that they need to show people that they do care about the event and that it is important to the entire state. He said that they should put in a bid to show that they are interested and excited to be part of Super Bowl 2011. He thanked Mr. Kennedy for his hard work and monumental fund raising efforts. Mr. Kennedy commented that this event was incredibly coveted and they really do need to show how important it is to the city.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if information is available as to the financial impact of past Super Bowls on host cities. Mr. Kennedy stated that there are assumptions made; however, no real numbers exist.

Mayor Scruggs stated that what she is hearing from most Council members is a need to quantify the return on investment. She requested an analysis of how much of the \$3.4 million left from the \$7 million is needed to meet those requirements set by the NFL for the City of Glendale. She would also like to see what is spent for special events and tourism and how they quantify the financial return for those events as well as media references to Glendale based on the Super Bowl. She stated that they could use this data as a benchmark to calculate a return on the investment.

Mr. Kennedy commented that the City of Glendale was recognized in *Business Week* as having one of the top ten facilities. He stated that the NFL is a tough partner, but they are fair and there was no one more capable than Glendale to host Super Bowl 2011. He said that they should be very proud of the city's success due, in part because of the vision of the City Council. Mayor Scruggs thanked him for speaking today.

## **2. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FEE SCHEDULE UPDATE**

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Mr. Horatio Skeete, Deputy City Manager and Ms. Susan Matousek, Senior Management Assistant.

This is a request for the City Council to review and discuss the proposed fee changes to the Community Development Fee Schedule that includes development-related permit and service fees collected for the Building Safety, Engineering, Planning, Transportation, Fire, and Utilities Departments.

In keeping with the Council's goal of a city that is fiscally sound and its key objective to "continue honesty in the budget process with true costs and realistic analyses," the

Community Development Group, Fire and Utilities Departments have developed a fee schedule designed to achieve this goal and key objective.

The city's financial policy, as published in the city's annual budget document, states that, "Revenues from growth or development should be targeted to development, or invested in improvements that will benefit future residents or make future service provision efficient".

At the April 16, 2002 Workshop, staff brought the Community Development Fee Schedule before the Council for review and discussion. Staff received guidance from the Council to proceed for formal adoption of the proposed Community Development Fee Schedule with specific direction to continue providing reduced fees for infill housing; crediting the pre-application fee towards the actual application; and to allow for all projects submitted prior to adoption of the fee structure to be grandfathered under the former fee schedule.

At the June 11, 2002 meeting, Ordinance No. 2260 was adopted approving the current community development fees with an annual fee adjustment in accordance with the Consumer Price Index Urban Users (CPIUU) inflationary index. At this meeting, Councilmembers stated that the city needs to begin to recover the costs of development business and keep up with consumer price index and to raise our fees to be consistent with other valley cities.

Representatives from the Budget, Building Safety, Engineering, Fire, Planning, Transportation, and Utilities Departments performed a comprehensive review and analysis of the development-related permit and service fees. While reviewing the fees, staff took into consideration the Council's guidance to ensure that development/growth was paying for itself whenever possible. Staff developed a fee schedule to present to the Council that recovered 100 percent of the cost of doing business because the Council should know the true and complete cost of conducting development services. This fee schedule includes both current fees and the implementation of new fees for services currently not being recovered through a fee program.

There are exceptions to the proposed fee schedule's 100 percent cost recovery for the residential single purpose life/health safety permit fees, such as irrigation/sprinkler, water heater, and gas piping installations. These fees will remain low to encourage citizens to obtain the permits and to participate in the inspection process to ensure that their projects are in compliance with the health and safety codes.

It is the Council's prerogative to request a lower or higher cost recovery percentage for the proposed fee structure.

On February 22, 1994, the Council passed a resolution amending the Utilities Customer Service Fees to include a \$1 "Notice of Intent to Disconnect Service" fee.

At the June 11, 2002 Council meeting, the Council adopted an ordinance, allowing an annual adjustment of the Community Development fees in accordance with the CPIUU inflationary index. In addition, the Council passed a resolution stating, "...reviewing and adjusting the development related permit and service fees on a periodic basis is consistent with the city business plan approach".

By having growth pay for growth, the city is able to maintain the existing level of service for current residents.

User-based fees are those fees that only the user would pay. If a resident needs to have a specific service provided by staff, that resident would pay a fee to cover the increased cost of providing that specific service. In addition to being "a fee for service", these fees are usually one-time fees paid during the construction phase of the project.

In addition, the fees will help to minimize harm or disruption to other citizens by ensuring that projects are completed after having complied with all applicable health, safety, and building laws that the city requires of development in Glendale.

Staff provided the proposed fee changes, through the postal service and electronic mail service to the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona, the Arizona Multihousing Association, Valley Forward Association, and Valley Partnership twice in 2006 and once in 2007.

Representatives from the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona, the Arizona Multihousing Association, Valley Forward Association, and Valley Partnership were invited to attend a meeting on May 25, 2006 regarding the fee changes. Representatives from the Arizona Multihousing Association, Valley Partnership, and Nutrition For Children were in attendance. Staff responded to questions regarding the increases and how the fee changes compared to other valley cities. Additional information was requested and has since been sent to the Arizona Multihousing Association regarding how the direct and indirect costs were calculated.

If the Council provides guidance to implement the proposed fee schedule, staff is recommending a July 2007 implementation date for the entire fee schedule and will ensure that the required public notification will occur prior to July 2007.

Staff requested guidance from the Council on implementing the proposed fee changes to the Community Development Fee Schedule.

Councilmember Clark inquired why Glendale's building safety fee is much more than other cities. She cited Scottsdale's cost of \$67 versus Glendale's \$130. She said that she understands the city wanting to recover cost but questions what other cities are doing. Mr. Skeete stated that he has researched the matter and it seems cities have different ways of conducting their operations. He believes other cities recoup cost in other ways. He said that the City of Phoenix was the closest in comparison.

Councilmember Frate informed everyone that City Council had directed staff to review this item every five years because the cost was not always being recovered. He added

that this was not to make a profit but to make the builders accountable and to recoup some cost.

Councilmember Goulet stated that he does not disagree with recovering some cost but questions when increased cost expectations change for the consumer. Mr. Skeete stated that they went through an extensive review of the way services were delivered. He said the city has seen a tremendous amount of improvement in service delivery, which equates to additional cost.

Councilmember Goulet inquired about a way to quantify the time for processing and making people aware of the changes in procedures. Mr. Skeete stated Building Safety went through an extensive review of the review process and made improvements which reduced the processing time. Mr. Skeete outlined the changes made and estimated that the new procedures had cut the time to process in half.

Vice Mayor Martinez commented that time is valuable for both the applicant and staff. He said he had spent some time in the Development Services Department and witnessed first hand things running smoothly. He is grateful for the improvements being made and appreciated the effort. He asked if there were any comments made from builders or developers on the fee proposal. Staff noted that there had been mixed comments on this issue.

Councilmember Clark commented on the delinquent accounts. She stated that she had felt that recouping 100% for these accounts only added to the problem; however, she feels differently now. Staff had given her information on 620 accounts in 2006 that had problems with delinquency and those were repeat offenders. She agreed with staff to recoup 100% of the cost on those accounts. She added that staff also provided her with information on several resources for people that are truly in need of assistance and face real problems with their accounts. She read a list of agencies that offer their services.

Councilmember Clark asked if it was ever considered to have a reduction in the rezoning fees as an incentive to encourage the old zoning to be rezoned for today's Glendale rather than using the cost recovery method. Mr. Skeete stated that they had not considered that aspect; however, they will review the variance application fee, which has remained constant. Councilmember Clark suggested possibly still looking into the rezoning fees in special circumstances as an incentive to change the older zoning in Glendale.

Mayor Scruggs stated that there was support for this item from Council to move forward.

### **3. 2007 STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND 2007 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA**

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Dana Tranberg, Intergovernmental Programs Director; Ms. Jessica Blazina, Deputy Intergovernmental Programs Director; and Mr. Brent Stoddard, Legislative Coordinator

This is a request for the City Council to provide direction on proposed state legislation, consistent with the approved 2007 state legislative agenda; and provide direction on the 2007 federal legislative agenda.

The purpose of the federal and state legislative agendas is to affect federal and state legislation and regulations as they relate to the interests of the city and its residents.

The 2007 state and federal legislative agendas provide the policy framework by which Intergovernmental Programs staff engages on state and federal legislative issues.

Throughout the 2007 legislative sessions, policy direction will be sought on proposed statutory changes which fall under the adopted council policy statements relating to the financial stability of the city, public safety issues, promoting economic development, managing growth and preserving neighborhoods.

The Intergovernmental Programs staff recommends prioritizing the state legislative agenda to a few key issues to allow the city to have a stronger, more consistent message on the items of greatest priority. The proposed key priority issues for consideration are described in the reports that were submitted to the Council.

The legislative agenda defines the city's priorities for the upcoming session and will guide the city's lobbying activities at the Arizona State Legislature. The Intergovernmental Programs staff will come before the Council on a regular basis throughout the session for direction on bills and amendments that may be introduced. The city's legislative agenda is a flexible document and may change, based on activities at the Legislature and Council direction.

The Intergovernmental Programs Department has conducted a citywide assessment of potential federal funding opportunities to be included in the 2007 federal legislative agenda. Based on this assessment, staff recommends pursuing federal funding opportunities, including grant opportunities, line-item appropriations, earmarks and regulation revisions in the areas of: transportation, public safety, homeland security, historic preservation, libraries, youth workforce development and economic development initiative projects.

The Intergovernmental Programs Department will return at the February 20, 2007 workshop to present the comprehensive 2007 federal legislative agenda inclusive of funding requests and policy areas for engagement.

On December 19, 2006, the Council approved the 2007 State Legislative Agenda, which included policy statements on municipal legislative priorities and principles.

On January 16, 2007, the Intergovernmental Programs staff presented legislative issues to the Council.

On January 30, 2007, the Intergovernmental Programs staff presented state legislative and federal issues to the Council.

The priorities and principles of Glendale's 2007 state legislative agenda provide the venue for the city to identify and engage on state legislative issues. The key principles

of the state legislative agenda are: to preserve and enhance the city's ability to deliver quality and cost-effective services to citizens and visitors; to address quality of life issues for Glendale residents, and to enhance the City Council's ability to serve the community by retaining local decision making authority and maintain state legislative and voter commitments for revenue sources.

Development of a 2006 federal legislative agenda provides the venue for the city to identify and engage on federal issues of concern to the community, which will enhance the ability of the city to deliver superior services and to address quality of life issues for the residents of Glendale.

Staff requested that the Council provide policy direction on the proposed state legislative issues and federal legislative program development.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she had spoken with the director of the League of Cities and Towns regarding the mandatory service to county islands. She explained that if a municipality issues mandatory service it means degradation in services to the citizens who have chosen to live in the municipality. Providing services to people who do not want to be part of the city would impact everyone else that lives in the city. She stated that she has asked for this bill to include language that requires mandatory audits of the service provisions in the municipality that is being force to provide service to areas not in the city. She said that she feels very strongly about this matter.

Ms. Tranberg provided information on temporary sign regulation. She stated that the bill is vaguely drafted and unclear whether it applies to both private property and public right of ways. It states that every municipality should have a regulation and ordinance regarding the posting of temporary signs; however, the ordinance cannot restrict temporary signs that are a size less than four feet by eight feet. It also does not restrict sign walkers and does not limit the total number of signs. Cities will be able to provide for mandatory removal of the signs after reasonable written notice. She continued to say they could establish a fee up to \$35 for a permit. Staff does not recommend support of this legislation but does anticipate further amendments.

Councilmember Frate commented that he was not in support of this legislation. Ms. Tranberg stated they would move to not support this item.

Ms. Tranberg provided information on SCR 1016 which stated that no public funds would be used for lobbying a member of the legislature. She said that it would apply to public personnel, staff and public officials. She said that this legislation was somewhat concerning. Mayor Scruggs asked if they preferred only to hear from private lobbyists. Ms. Tranberg stated that it was voiced as part of the discussion but some people were also against it.

Vice Mayor Martinez stated that it seems that there have been many strike everything amendments recently. Ms. Tranberg noted that last week they had seen more strike everything amendments than they can recall in past legislative sessions.

Ms. Tranberg provided information on the federal legislative agenda. She showed a slide presentation on this item. She recommends emphasis on areas of transportation, air quality, water issues, housing issues and public safety/homeland security.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the viability of Luke Air Force Base should be a priority. Ms. Tranberg said that it was already a part of the guiding principals in the agenda. She noted that a firm has been hired to solely focus on the Luke Air Force issues.

Ms. Tranberg provided information on the federal funding opportunities. The areas that have been identified for funding opportunities are transportation, public safety, homeland security, historic preservation and economic development initiative grants. the one area that was recommended to not move forward was the Arrowhead Towne Center transit facility.

Councilmember Clark asked why eight areas have been identified for the city but only three are being pursued as federal funding opportunities. Ms. Tranberg stated that they meet with staff and looked at current needs. There were no others that would fit with the opportunities available; however, they will be revising it for 2008. She asked Council for approval of the policy statements and the funding opportunities. She added that they would be providing an update after the consultants meet with the various members. She noted that the consultants had been very impressed with the Emergency Operation Center and the Public Safety Training Facility.

Mayor Scruggs discussed the deletion of the Arrowhead Towne Center Transit Facility to give preference to the Regional aspect. She asked if staff felt comfortable with the regional benefits. Ms. Tranberg answered that yes, they had verified and were satisfied with the outcome.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.