



MESA 2025: FINANCING THE FUTURE CITIZEN COMMITTEE

March 23, 2005

The Mesa 2025: Financing the Future Citizen Committee met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on March 23, 2005 at 5:33 p.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT

Kyle Jones, Chairman
Kirk Adams
Jill Benza
Pat Esparza
Don Grant
Rex Griswold
Greg Holtz
Eric Jackson
Dennis Kavanaugh
Mark Killian
Robert McNichols
Scott Rhodes
Pat Schroeder
Robin White

COMMITTEE ABSENT

Pat Esparza
Aaron Huber

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Mayor Keno Hawker

STAFF PRESENT

Various Members

1. Additional information and discussion of issues discussed at last meeting.

- a. Summary report of committee's suggestions
- b. Review of committee timeline and remaining meeting topics
- c. Potential next steps

Chairman Jones welcomed everyone to the meeting and excused Committeemembers Huber and Esparza from the meeting. He added that Ex-Officio Member Keno Hawker was attending a Maricopa Association of Government's meeting and would join them later on if time permits.

Chairman Jones stated that the reason behind the formation of the Committee was to look at trends and the situation that they are in as a City. He said that the Council and management were aware of the fact that the City could not survive if it continued on the path it was following and decided that the situation could no longer remain status quo. He stressed the importance of building the publics' confidence (assuring the citizens that their tax dollars are being spent wisely). The Chairman stated that that is why he insisted that the Committee's meetings be televised and that information

be placed on the City's website as soon as it becomes available. He commented on the importance of evaluating the City's revenue sources and noted that the Committee is a recommending body and the Council and possibly the voters (if Charter changes are required) will make the ultimate determinations.

Committeemember Rhodes commented on the fact that copies of a document that he and Committeemembers Adams and Kavanaugh on worked had been distributed but noted that there were actually two documents, one where Committeemember Adams proposed an additional section in the beginning of the document. He expressed the opinion that it would be helpful if the Committeemembers had copies of that as well.

Chairman Jones agreed and requested that Ms. Bleyle make and distribute copies of the document reflecting Committeemember Adams' revisions.

In the interim period, Chairman Jones discussed the Committee's timeline for the benefit of the viewing audience and provided a brief overview of what has taken place to date, including a public input session that took place on February 9th. He stressed the importance of moving forward so that if there are any items that the Committee decides to recommend be placed on the March 2006 ballot, there will be sufficient time to meet all of the required deadlines.

Committeemember Rhodes stated that during the latter part of the previous meeting, the Committee discussed the importance of developing a budget process that would emphasize the objectives that are meant to be achieved, that are intended to be achieved for any governmental program. He discussed the creation of an "umbrella structural process," which would outline how the City Council and staff approach the budget on a year-to-year basis, how they communicate to the citizens what they intend to accomplish as a City government and whether they are expending money wisely to achieve the desired results.

Committeemember Rhodes added that the three members appeared to embrace that idea and following the meeting they made a "loose determination" that they would try to put something into writing. He said that this is the document that he and Committeemembers Adams and Kavanaugh worked on. He noted that what they currently have in front of them is part of that process. He stated that the written document entitled "*Mesa 2025 Proposed Statement of Budget Process*" was the original draft that he proposed. He added that he requested input from Committeemembers Adams and Kavanaugh and stated the opinion that they have reached a consensus that this is a good starting point. He emphasized that the document does not "say it all" and added that they are sure that the Committee will make additions and deletions, but at least it is a starting point for discussion purposes. He pointed out that the document is divided into sections on "*Outcome Orientation and Program Accountability*" and "*Council Budget Process*."

Committeemember Rhodes advised that Committeemember Adams then proposed in an introductory section (which Ms. Bleyle was copying for distribution) composed of several paragraphs that go a little bit farther into the process and some procedures that he believes should be added and become a part of the document. He noted that they did not reach consensus on that part but emphasized that time did not permit a full discussion of that issue. Committeemember Rhodes added that Committeemember Adams wants to accomplish certain things that he does not object to, however, he also wants to put some of them into the Charter and Committeemember Rhodes does have a problem with that. He asked Chairman Jones how he would like them to proceed.

Chairman Jones requested that the authors review the document they have outlined and he encouraged members of the Committee to provide input. He stressed the importance of hearing from everyone and said he wants to make sure that all of the members are comfortable with the direction in which they are heading. Chairman Jones expressed appreciation to Committeemembers Rhodes, Adams and Kavanaugh for giving the Committee a "starting point."

Committeemember Rhodes stated that the first section starts with a quotation from a report of the 83rd Arizona Town Hall, which was on a State level (*"Fiscal Processing & Fiscal Planning"*) but noted that the overall theme is that fiscal analysis should include annual reports with financial information comparing proposed objectives and budgets with actual results. He said that one of the points that was made last week is that it is not sufficient to look at the budget alone and compare this year's budget numbers to actual numbers and the same kinds of analysis of previous years because they cannot, from that document alone, get a reminder of where they're supposed to be going on a particular program or in a particular area of government (what you are trying to achieve). He said that the quotation went on to state *"Measurement of efficiency and cost effectiveness of government programs is important but must be sure to provide an accurate picture of which programs are succeeding and which are not."* He added that he thought there was a theme at the last meeting relative to the fact that they have to use fiscal planning as a measurement of success and not beg the question. He said that if a program is not working, they have to determine what to do with it, whether to "throw more money" at it or eliminate it and look to the private sector or for an alternative.

Committeemember Rhodes reiterated that the first section of the actual document is called *"Outcome Orientation and Program Accountability,"* which, in essence, states that each section of City government and every department, agency, office, program, etc. must have clearly articulated specific long-term and short-term goals. He added that the goals must be accompanied by performance standards and benchmarks so that they know how to measure the success. He said that the objectives, the standards and the benchmarks all should be reviewed and approved by the City Council so that they become the official policy of the City and it should be published on the Internet so that it is available to the citizens. He noted that the goals and objectives should include a section detailing the history of the department. He stated that Committeemember Killian previously commented on the importance of knowing why a program is implemented in the first place and he concurred with this premise. He emphasized the importance of deciding and measuring programs' successes based on why they are in place and added that this can play an important role later on in determining whether to continue the program in the same manner.

Committeemember Rhodes emphasized that the objectives should also include a report on available non-governmental providers of the same and similar services. He said that they must insist that City government evaluate possible competitive providers of services as part of their job, not simply promote themselves as providers of the service, but to inform the ultimate policy maker, the City Council, as to whether there might be alternatives available. He stated that that should be part of their job. He also discussed the importance of having a recurring reporting process in place and said that the next section states, *"Each department, either directly or through the City Manager, must periodically report to the City Council."* He added that when they report to the City Council, they will require them to organize their reports to reflect and respond to the programs, Council approved goals and objectives. He stated that if they are putting out a program in the beginning that says, *"Here is what we are going to accomplish when you get a periodic report back,"* then the report should be in the same format to remind everyone of what the goals and objectives were in the first place and to outline the progress that has been made. He said it is important to make sure that the "reports don't drift" and added that they need to be able to look back at where they were

when they were first looking at the program and analyze under the same terms and benchmarks for success that were originally identified to determine how the program is doing. He stated that if the benchmarks are no longer valid, then the Council, through the report, should receive that information, which explains what has happened and allows the Council to decide whether it is valid to start shifting the rules of the game with respect to whatever the process is. He said that by making staff responsible for ensuring that the reports reflect the original goals and objectives based on the original benchmarks (or an explanation if a change has occurred) then they will have a historical perspective that allows the Council to judge success or failure.

Committeemember Rhodes stated that wherever possible the goals and objectives should refer to the long-term objectives or whatever decisions might come out of the Committee as well as the prior work of City committees that have gone before them in the Mesa 2025 Visioning process. He added that Item 3 states that should staff suggest and/or defend modifications and amendments to their goals and objectives for success benchmarks, they would be subject to Council approval. He emphasized that they would not simply be open for the staff to make the changes, the decision making and the measuring of success would stay in the hands of the policy makers, the Council. He advised that the report should describe what efforts the staff has made to improve efficiency and handling their own job as well as efforts to reduce costs. He added that it should describe efforts to engage in possible public/private partnerships.

Committeemember Rhodes read the following statement of philosophy contained in the report, *"The goal of each City program should be to reduce, not expand, its existence whether in terms of the time necessary to achieve a goal or the number of employees and/or equipment needed to accomplish a goal."* He said that to state it another way, *"The role of City government should be to provide the best possible service for the least amount of money and the City Council should review, critique and approve all proposals and periodic reports based on those two criteria."*

Committeemember Rhodes further stated that the report contains some directive language for the Council that states, *"The Council should not review or approve the budget without inquiring into the success measures of each City department and program."* He emphasized that Council is responsible for ensuring that programs and business practices are not repeated or continued in perpetuity. He added that both staff and Council should look for reasonable opportunities to transfer non-essential services to the private sector and public/private partnerships. He said that the budget should not be seen as the City's report card for public consumption because it is too complicated. He stated that the City's goals, objectives and benchmarks, on a program-by-program basis along with the periodic reports previously described, are the best way for the public to know what the City is trying to achieve and to gauge how well the City is doing its job. He said that at this time he would like to yield the floor to Committeemember Adams so that he can present his proposed additions to the document.

Committeemember Adams thanked Committeemember Rhodes for his hard work and said that he almost entirely agrees with the draft document authored by him. He stated that he simply does not believe that it "quite finishes the job" and said he is attempting, through the addition, to bring some weight to bear upon the principles that they have already agreed upon. He referred to the handout distributed by Ms. Bleyle entitled *"Prioritization and Revitalization of City Services"* and said that the premise behind requiring the City Council to prioritize spending is that across the board budget cuts are a poor man's method of budgeting. He added that it is really not good fiscal management to simply cut across the board, but they know from time-to-time, with the economic cycles that they experience, that they sometimes have more money and they sometimes have less money and when they are on the down side, cuts typically take place. He explained that the purpose behind

prioritizing spending is to identify the most important core functions that the City provides. He added that he would propose identifying 1 through 10 and said that there should be an explanation of each specific proposal and it would require the Council, by a specific date each budget cycle, to identify a list of outcome based spending priorities. He said that accompanying each priority would be specific indicators of success. He stressed the importance of prioritizing and pointed out that not all government services are created equal. He added that he is sure the Committee would agree that a police officer on a beat is of higher importance than a code compliance officer. He clarified that prioritizing does not mean that non-priority items would not be funded, it simply means that they "get their shot at the pie" after all the priority needs are first met. He advised that he is recommending that the Charter contain a mandate that requires the City Council by a certain date to issue a set of spending priorities.

Committeemember Adams advised that the other main point to consider is how to get the City to transform itself from within to identify areas where outside providers could possibly provide a better and/or more economical and effective level of service. He discussed difficulties associated with getting staff to look to non-profits that might provide current in-house services more efficiently. He commented that it is against human nature to expect current City staff to recommend outsourcing their own departments or their own jobs/functions. He said that he researched this issue and quoted David Osborn, the author of *The Price of Government* who stated, "*when outsourcing or competitive sourcing initiatives have been driven from current staff, it has usually not worked and the reason why is because you have to have unusually entrepreneurial managers to make that work.*" He reiterated that it is against human nature for someone to say that someone else could do his/her job better or in a more efficient manner.

Committeemember Adams stated that he is proposing the creation of a permanent commission and suggested that the Committee consider naming it "The Mesa Commission for Efficiency in Government," that would be created by a Charter change. He explained that the members would be responsible for identifying competitive outsourcing targets, identifying programs that may be or already are obsolete or not working as intended for either reform, elimination or contract management oversight. He added that the Commission would forward their recommendations to the City Council, which would have final approval. He suggested that the Commission be comprised of citizen appointees, one appointed by each Councilmember and that appropriate staffing and funding be provided to the Commission to carry out their responsibilities.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that a model exists for this type of process in the City of Indianapolis; the fact that according to material he has read, this particular commission was successful in outsourcing City services up to \$400 million over the course of the 1990's; data reflecting the fact that the average upfront savings for first year competitive sourcing is typically 25% to 35%; the fact that not all City services can be outsourced; his opinion that there are business-to-business transactions that occur from department to department (payroll, procurement, etc.) and all types of internal business practices that could potentially be targets for competitive sourcing; Committeemember Adams' opinion that if the Committee does not adopt the section he is recommending, they will be heavy on reports and light on actions; the "Discipline of Bankruptcy;" the importance of having an independent commission set up that conducts a thorough analysis that is insulated from the day-to-day politics of City Council and the fact that the members would provide reason, evidence and recommendations of positions/programs targeted for competitive sourcing and the Council would have the final say on whether or not to proceed with the recommendations.

Committeemember Adams commented that they are trying to move towards the City of Mesa being a purchaser of services and sometimes they purchase those services internally from existing

departments and staff, other times they purchase the services from non-profits that do a great job; and other times they purchase them from the private sector. He referred to material distributed to the members, which discussed the importance of uncoupling the purchaser of the services from the provider of the services and the benefits that result. He thanked the members for the opportunity to present his views on this matter.

Committeemember Kavanaugh complimented Committeemembers Rhodes and Adams for their “word-smithing” and stated the opinion that what they have seen here this evening represents an excellent encapsulation of the Committee’s discussion at the last meeting. He added that it is a reasonable approach to a budget process, which is key to the total package of recommendations for the City Council and the residents of the City. He concurred with Committeemember Rhodes’ comment regarding the first section and the fact that they simply did not have enough time to discuss the pros and cons. He added the opinion that much of what Committeemember Adams has presented is logical and reasonable and provides good enforcement for executing framework for the budgeting principles. He added, however, that there might be some differences of opinion as far as where it goes. He said that amending the Charter is something one should always approach very carefully and added that everything that is recommended here is something that can certainly be done by resolution or by ordinance that would create some binding effect on future Councils while retaining flexibility should circumstances or politics change. He commented that the reality of it is that most of the policy changes that the City Council considers come from a blend of recommendations from staff and citizens and they have a very successful track record with citizen commissions in advising the Council on how and where to set priorities, spend money, identify what programs are good and which ones are bad. He stated that he believes that the idea of having an ongoing advisory body, such as the one suggested by Committeemember Adams, is a very positive one to ensure that the institutional memory isn’t lost from the work that is done here. He said that he is very comfortable with what has been proposed by Committeemembers Rhodes and Adams. He added that he believes there will be discussion on the best way to implement it and whether a Charter approach is wise rather than simply a recommendation to the Council that they consider adopting an ordinance or resolution. He stated that the latter is his preferred option but he believes the substance of what was presented is very positive and represents an excellent summary of the direction in which the Committee would like to head.

Chairman Jones concurred with Committeemember Kavanaugh’s remarks and said that he is leery of Charter changes simply because should something prove not to be or do what it was intended to, in order to change it, there has to be another City-wide vote and that becomes very challenging, expensive and time consuming. He said that he would like to move to the “*Outcome Orientation and Program Accountability*” section and requested that all of the members provide input regarding this issue.

Committeemember Killian asked Mr. Hutchinson whether the Mayor and/or Council can hire people aside from the people hired by the Town Manager. Mr. Hutchinson responded that there are officers outlined in the City Charter who they can hire, namely the City Attorney, City Clerk, City Manager and City Magistrates. He stated that a Charter change would be required to expand upon those positions.

In response to an additional question from Committeemember Killian, Mr. Hutchinson advised that the City does have internal financial auditors. He said they work for him, although not directly – as part of the City Manager’s office – and they look at the financial audits and periodically conduct other types of audits. He added that although they look at some of the problematic issues, they then have a Quality Organizational Development Office that looks at process changes and looks at

the way the City does business. He said that the reports are public as is everything that the City does. He confirmed that legislation enacted by the City is referred to as ordinances and noted that periodically there are sunset dates attached to the ordinances. He stated the opinion that nothing in the Charter would prevent sunseting certain programs. He commented that the City does not have an independent auditor who reports to the City Council.

Committeemember Killian recommended that they look into creating an "Auditor General" type position, with staff, to carry out the responsibility of independently looking at every single program and reviewing those programs in a very clinical setting so that the analysis are given to the Council for their review. He stressed the importance of setting up some type of review process. He noted that the City has a lot of programs in place that have been operating for a long, long time and said that somebody needs to do a very thorough analysis of where the programs came from, why they came forward, where they are headed and whether or not they met their targeted goals. He said that his concern about having an independent commission do that is just the amount of time it would take the individuals to carry out the task. He pointed out that it would almost be a full-time job and said he is not sure they should give that kind of responsibility to a commission. He added that the Council should hire an independent auditor to ask the questions, do the reports and present them to the City Council for their review and consideration.

Committeemember Killian stated that he believes there should be a sunset date on every single ordinance passed by the Council that creates a program from this time on. He said he is not sure whether this would require a Charter change but added that there should be a review date set up to determine whether the program is working the way it was intended to. He expressed the opinion that by combining that with the commission focusing more on the competitive nature of using the private sector and with what Committeemember Rhodes has outlined, he believes they would get the type of process that is required. He summarized that he would like to take the Auditor General model and figure out how they can mold that into this process so that independent reviews occur that provide the information they need for the City Council and others to set policy. He confirmed that the commission would focus solely on potential targets for competitive sourcing and then the Auditor General would focus on reviewing existing programs throughout for obsolescence or ineffectiveness.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the importance of creating a system that allows for flexibility; requiring the Council to abide by a system of prioritization of the budget while refraining from dictating to them what is important; the fact that Mesa has a Council/Manager form of government as opposed to a strong Mayor form of government; and the fact that an ordinance is law while a resolution is intent and less binding.

Mr. Hutchinson informed the Committee that the City of Scottsdale has an independent auditor hired by the Council. He said that this is the only city he is aware of that has done so and added that the Auditor General looks at the reports as well. He recommended that they talk with Scottsdale's independent auditor, learn what he/she does and review their reports.

Committeemember Rhodes commented that the Council can act by simple motion, which is not subject to review by citizens and has no "teeth" to it. He added that Council can act by resolution, which is subject to referendum and petitions and in essence can be presented, debated and approved or changed by the Council during the same meeting. He noted that an ordinance requires two readings, two meetings, so that the public has an additional opportunity to become aware of what is happening and to provide input. He explained that this is one of the main reasons why municipalities use ordinances for zoning issues because often times citizens are not really aware of

the issue and this provides the public ample opportunity to become aware and participate in the debate before it is finally acted upon.

Committeemember Rhodes said that based on a year of observation, he believes that City staff does a very good job and knows what they are doing, what the budgets are, and what their goals and objectives are. He added that program reviews, however, are conducted on an ad-hoc basis. He commented that he agrees with Committeemember Adams' remarks in terms of the fact that there are advantages associated with taking certain considerations out of politics for a while, obtaining a review of them, and then putting them back into the political process. He said that he is sure than on an ad-hoc basis the City does a fantastic job but he is trying to inject some kind of regularity into the program as much as possible.

Mr. Hutchinson said that he believes that is a good idea and one that he would support.

Committeemember Rhodes discussed the concept of an independent auditor and said he was trying to avoid the creation of a new position. He said that an independent auditor could be hired by the Council on an ad-hoc basis as needed, and this would avoid the expense associated with the creation of an additional permanent position.

Committeemember Kavanaugh commented on his past experience regarding the issue of Auditor Generals, performance audits and sunset reviews at the State level and said that although there is value in proceeding with such a process, there are also costs associated with doing so. He agreed that it may serve as a very useful tool and noted that Scottsdale Councilmembers have found it to be just that.

Committeemember Griswold said that it is his understanding than an Auditor General would look at what programs are trying to accomplish, and, in the case of the Park Ranger Program, they would look at whether the parks are safe, the gates are closed at night, etc. He noted than an independent commission on competition would say that the ranger duties could be outsourced to a private agency. He pointed out that none of the reports on the Rangers touched on this issue and he agreed with Committeemember Adams' comment that it is not human nature to suggest that someone else take over a person's job, even if it would in the end be more efficient and effective. He added that activity based budgeting would look at the goals they are trying to accomplish and whether the goals are still appropriate. He discussed difficulties associated with "shrinking" organizations and emphasized that the tendency is to grow.

Committeemember Benza advised that she has served on the Parks Board for several years and the Park Ranger Program came up several times and cuts were made. She noted that at one point in time they did away with them and their responsibilities were shifted to the Police Department. She reported that when that didn't work, they re-instituted the Park Ranger Program once again. She said that there is no "easy solution." She added that she would like to see them form a commission similar to the one suggested by Committeemember Adams. She advised that she does not support the creation of an Auditor General position and questioned whether the City could actually find someone with the type of credentials necessary to carry out the proposed responsibilities of that position. She noted that many people are not aware of how many years it takes to obtain a degree in Municipal Administration in order to do what the City Manager is doing. She added that he probably worked his way up through the ranks over a period of many years, he did not just get where he is overnight.

Chairman Jones stated that he would like to focus the discussion on the first part of the original draft where there was more of a general consensus and asked for input regarding program accountability.

Discussion ensued regarding this issue and input was provided by all of the members of the Committee relative to possible revisions to the draft document.

Chairman Jones said he believes he is hearing that the Committee would like to have a statement of City goals to be accomplished, a statement that everybody can "tie into" as a department. He added that each department will be asked to articulate their goals and what they plan to do, but they need to "tie together as a City."

Additional "word-smithing" took place including, but not limited to, the following changes/additions:

"Under the direction of the City Council and in accordance with the goals and objectives set by the Council, each City department, agency, office and program shall actually or shall have clearly articulated and specified long-term goals (related to long-term City objectives)."

"The role of City government shall be to provide the best possible service for the least amount of money."

"The Council shall annually approve the budget only after inquiring into the success measures of each City department and program."

Throughout the text, the words "will and/or must" will be replaced by the word "shall."

Chairman Jones asked Mr. Hutchinson whether during the budgeting process, staff could provide a review of the previous years' activities. Mr. Hutchinson said that they could do that during budget review week and stated the opinion that staff would be happy to have the opportunity to discuss their achievements.

Committeemember Killian expressed the opinion that there is no way that a systematic review of every single department could take place, time simply would not permit it. He spoke in support of having an independent person in a clinical fashion (someone who does not have a political agenda or axe to grind) review the various programs and determine what is working and what is not.

Committeemember Grant said that what he has noticed through all of the presentations is that staff has done a good job and added that lots of good work is being carried on. He stated the opinion that they are not talking about someone not doing his or her job, it's more about the fact that there is a job that no one is plugged into. He said he agrees with Committeemember Adams' that this should be addressed and there needs to be a separate auditor.

Committeemember Adams said that he casts no dispersions on the City Council or the City Manager on how well they do their jobs. He added that there is simply no one identifying each City service to determine whether the City can do it better than the private sector, non-profit agencies or private businesses. He reiterated that competitive sourcing produces savings and estimated that on average, a 25% to 35% reduction in cost (with no drop off in savings) would occur the first year as a result of this process. He added the opinion that the various committees are already overburdened and should not be involved in identifying competitive sourcing opportunities. He added that a dedicated committee or commission made up of citizens would not add another layer of

government. He said that his recommendation to appoint a permanent committee/commission is based on a successful model that has been used in other cities.

Committeemember Adams expressed the opinion that the City does need an independent body and added that it would be a wise idea to have an independent committee appointed by the City Council for a set period of time that works in conjunction with the independent auditor. He noted that the independent auditor could serve as the liaison to the City government.

Committeemember Griswold referred to a comprehensive report that contained all of the programs that the Council has looked at and rated lower than other programs. He said that the members will receive copies of the document and urged them to review the informative data contained in the report.

Committeemember Killian commented that if there are issues that the various members of the Committee do not agree on, minority reports and/or various suggestions can be included in the final list of recommendations provided to the Council. He added the opinion that the City is managing by objectives and said he believes they are talking about offering the City some additional tools to accomplish what they need to do. He said that the bottom line is that there is not enough money to do everything they need to do and the tool they are going to design is going to assist the City over the long term. He stated that they will need to do expense reductions as well as figure out how to find some money to do what the City needs to do.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that if a member of the Committee wanted to look at, for example, the operations of the payroll program, a member of internal staff could be assigned to do that or they could hire someone from the outside, one of the major accounting firms. He noted that they have the capability of doing that and said he would welcome it. He emphasized that "another set of eyes" does not make staff nervous and hopefully some good recommendations would come out of it. He suggested that the Committee invite someone from Indianapolis to talk to them about their process or visit there. He commented on the positive benefits of learning what other cities do and how successful they are.

Chairman Jones agreed that it might be good to bring in some people from Indianapolis as well as Scottsdale's Auditor General.

Committeemember Griswold commented on the importance of how the City reports and interprets numbers. He said that sometimes they do it right and sometimes there are better ways to do it.

Chairman Jones thanked everyone for their comments.

2. Approval of minutes from January 12, 2005 meetings.

It was moved by Committeemember Esparza, seconded by Committeemember Rhodes, that the minutes of the January 12, 2005 meeting be approved.

Carried unanimously.

3. Continued discussion on budget processes, structure and priorities.

Committeemember McNichols asked whether the Committee was going to have the opportunity to further discuss Committeemember Adams' draft and the Outcome Orientation Program

Accountability section. Chairman Jones stated that this discussion will continue at the next meeting and in the interim, everyone will have the opportunity to review the document and gain a better understanding of the proposal.

4. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

Wednesday, April 13, 2005, 5:30 p.m.
Wednesday, April 27, 2005, 5:30 p.m.

5. Items from citizens present.

Sheila Mitton addressed the members of the Council and spoke in support of the Riverview at Dobson project. She expressed the opinion that the project will have a significantly positive impact on the entire community.

Chairman Jones thanked Ms. Mitton for her comments.

6. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Mesa 2025: Financing the Future Citizen Committee adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Mesa 2025: Financing the Future Citizen Committee meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 23rd day of March 2005. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

lgc