

# COUNCIL MINUTES

February 9, 2006

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in a Study Session in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on February 9, 2006 at 7:33 a.m.

## COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker  
Rex Griswold  
Kyle Jones  
Tom Rawles  
Janie Thom  
Claudia Walters  
Mike Whalen

## COUNCIL ABSENT

None

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady  
Debbie Spinner  
Barbara Jones

(Items on the agenda were discussed out of order, but for purposes of clarity will remain as listed on the agenda.)

### 1. Hear a report and discuss the results of the Council's Service Prioritization Process.

Financial Services Manager Bryan Raines distributed copies of the "Results of the City Council Service Category Rankings" (see Attachment 1), which is based on the Council's input at the February 3<sup>rd</sup> Strategic Budget Planning Session. He reviewed the ranking of each major category and the process utilized for weighting the services within each category. Mr. Raines advised that staff would utilize this information as a basis for proposing budget alternatives, and he added that staff was present to answer any questions regarding the ranking of priorities and the results of the process.

Mayor Hawker noted that "animal control" received a higher overall ranking as a result of being included in the "Public Safety" category. He suggested that the lowest ranking activities in each of the "Major Service Category Rankings" be addressed relative to budget reductions.

Vice Mayor Walters expressed concern regarding the process due to the fact that "cost-neutral" areas were included in the analysis, and she stated the opinion that several "neighborhood-related" activities should be ranked higher due to the fact that these areas impact Public Safety.

Mr. Raines advised that the ranking process was a first effort to identify budget priorities, and he added that staff anticipated that the approach would be refined in the future.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the system provides a starting point for reviewing programs; that some categories, such as "environmental," may require additional clarification due to the possible impact of Federal compliance regulations; that the operations of revenue-neutral entities, such as the cemetery or the golf courses, should be reviewed to ensure that adequate reserves are in place; and that this process is designed to provide a general direction for addressing the budget deficit.

City Manager Christopher Brady advised that the list is a starting point, and he noted that eliminating the lowest-ranked items would not be sufficient to address the budget deficit and that budget reductions would be required in many other areas.

Mayor Hawker noted that although E-Streets received a low ranking, this area could serve as a revenue source at build out. He suggested that staff provide an update on E-Streets, and he stated the opinion that it would not be prudent to abandon a program that is two-thirds completed.

Vice Mayor Walters noted that several areas with a low ranking, such as Engineering Services, Planning and Zoning, and Building Inspections, could not be eliminated. She added that the Council would be confronted with many difficult decisions.

Mr. Brady concurred that the activities mentioned by Vice Mayor Walters cannot be eliminated, but he added that the Council could choose to implement reductions that would lengthen the processing time for projects. He advised that in early March staff would provide the Council with a proposed list of reductions totaling approximately \$30 million.

Mayor Hawker said that the Streets Department formulated a progressive reduction at various dollar levels, and he suggested that other departments utilize a similar approach.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that the Council is currently addressing only the 2006/2007 fiscal year; that a two-year City budget is prepared every other year; that citizens would have an opportunity to rank City services at the District Town Meetings; that the proposed budget alternatives would reflect the City's potential revenue scenarios; and that the Council's budget alternatives should be available to the public when Early Voting for the May 16<sup>th</sup> General Election begins on April 13<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Jones commented that recent publicity indicating that the City's budget deficit was reduced to \$25 million was misleading. He explained that although the shortfall remains in the range of \$30 to \$40 million, the Council is considering a \$12 million sale of Pinal County Water Farm property in order to address a portion of the deficit.

In response to a question from Councilmember Whalen, City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised that the City is allowed to provide factual information regarding the issues, and she explained that voter approval of the proposed property tax would establish a cap of \$30 million that by State Law is limited to a two percent per year increase for inflation.

Councilmember Rawles stated the opinion that the sale of property in the amount of \$12 million does provide additional revenue for the next fiscal year, which reduces the City's budget deficit.

Vice Mayor Walters noted that solving the deficit for the next fiscal year does not address future budget deficits. She said that previous Council discussions suggested selling thirty percent of the Pinal County Water Farm property over a period of ten years, and that revenues would initially be directed to paying bond debt. Vice Mayor Walters explained that revenue projections based on future land sales are unpredictable due to the possible impact of variable market conditions on property values. She expressed the opinion that although the sale proceeds may generate revenue to address existing service levels, the revenue is insufficient to meet the demands of future growth.

Councilmember Thom stated the opinion that the proceeds from the first sale of Pinal County Water Farm property would not have to address bond debt. She also noted that General Obligation and Revenue bond ballot issues identify the purpose of the expenditures, and that a property tax proposal would not include similar information.

In response to a question from Mayor Hawker, City Clerk Barbara Jones advised that the ballot language for the May 16<sup>th</sup> General Election was provided to Maricopa County on February 8<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Spinner explained that a change to the ballot language would require Council adoption of a resolution.

Ms. Jones said that she could investigate the possibility of including informational language in the Publicity Pamphlet.

Mayor Hawker expressed an interest in providing an explanation to voters that would not encourage approval or disapproval of the ballot issues.

Councilmember Rawles cautioned that listing potential funding areas could be interpreted as an attempt to skew the vote.

Ms. Spinner noted that due to the fact that ballot language has been submitted to Maricopa County, changes might not be possible. She also suggested that Council discussion of this subject could be agendaized for a future meeting.

Mayor Hawker requested that staff prepare a timetable so that additional Study Sessions could be scheduled as needed to discuss budget alternatives.

## 2. Appointments to boards and committees.

Mayor Hawker recommended the following appointments to Boards and Committees (the term of office will range from one to three years, and the term length for each member will be determined at the first meeting of the Housing Advisory Board in March of 2006):

### HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD

Conrad Morin  
Diana Yazzie Devine  
Paul Dugas  
Trudy Licano  
Siri Amrit Kaur Khalsa  
Jon Scott Williams  
Mary Turley  
Bob Hisserich  
Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo

It was moved by Councilmember Jones, seconded by Vice Mayor Walters, that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendations and the appointments be confirmed.

Carried unanimously.

3. Hear reports on meetings and/or conferences attended.

Mayor Hawker: Arizona Department of Transportation meeting regarding the development of the State Trust Land (Superstition Vistas) and the freeway alignment with Williams Gateway Airport.

Vice Mayor Walters: Mesa Community College's (MCC) Commission on Excellence meeting.  
Meeting of females serving as elected officials in the Valley.

Councilmember Thom: District 6 Town Meeting.

Councilmember Griswold: MCC's Commission on Excellence meeting.  
MCC meeting regarding the future downtown campus.

4. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

City Manager Christopher Brady stated that the meeting schedule is as follows:

Thursday, February 9, 2006, 6:00 p.m. – District 3 Town Hall, Dobson Ranch Library

Monday, February 13, 2006, 6:00 p.m. – District 5 Town Hall, Bush Elementary School

Wednesday, February 15, 2006, 6:00 p.m. – District 2 Town Hall, Field Elementary School

Thursday, February 16, 2006, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, February 16, 2006, 6:00 p.m. – District 4 Town Hall, Rendezvous Center

Tuesday, February 21, 2006, TBA – Study Session

Tuesday, February 21, 2006, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting.

Thursday, February 23, 2006, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

5. Prescheduled public opinion appearances.

There were no prescheduled public opinion appearances.

6. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

7. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 8:24 a.m.

---

KENO HAWKER, MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Study Session of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 9th day of February 2006. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

baa

Attachment (1)

Results of City Council Service Category Rankings  
Strategic Budget Planning Session  
February 3, 2006

<b><u>Service Category Position</u></b>	<b><u>Major Service Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Service Category Weight</u></b>
1	Public Safety	88.6%
2	Utility Services	80.0%
3	Transportation Services	60.0%
4	Community Services	40.0%
5	Development Services	20.0%
6	Neighborhood Services	11.4%

<b><u>Rank Position</u></b>	<b><u>Service Description</u></b>	<b><u>Service Category Weight</u></b>	<b><u>Category Average Response</u></b>	<b><u>Overall Weighted Value</u></b>
1	Police Patrol	88.6%	94.6	83.8
2	Water Service	80.0%	92.9	74.3
3	Fire Emergency Response	88.6%	82.0	72.7
4	Judicial Services	88.6%	80.1	71.0
5	Criminal Investigations	88.6%	74.1	65.7
6	Public Safety Dispatch	88.6%	71.9	63.7
7	Crime & ID Labs	88.6%	68.0	60.2
8	Wastewater Service	80.0%	75.0	60.0
9	Street Repair & Maintenance	60.0%	94.4	56.6
10	Traffic Control (Signals, Signs & Markings)	60.0%	81.9	49.1
11	Police Air Patrol	88.6%	50.6	44.8
12	Police Records, Training & Support	88.6%	46.6	41.3
13	Storm Sewer System O & M	60.0%	66.0	39.6
14	Libraries	40.0%	98.0	39.2
15	Solid Waste Collection	80.0%	46.4	37.1
16	Fire Special Operations (i.e. HazMat)	88.6%	40.3	35.7
17	Aquatics	40.0%	80.7	32.3
18	Fire Records, Training & Support	88.6%	36.4	32.3
19	Recreation- Programs & Team Sports	40.0%	78.1	31.2
20	Parks Maintenance	40.0%	74.9	30.0
21	Street Lighting	60.0%	49.9	29.9
22	Emerg Mgmt/Homeland Security Coord.	88.6%	32.1	28.4
23	RPTA Bus Transit Service	60.0%	40.9	24.5
24	Broadcast Communications (Mesa Ch 11)	40.0%	55.7	22.3
25	Spring Training Baseball	40.0%	49.7	19.9
26	Conv & Visitors Bureau/Tourism Support	40.0%	48.9	19.6
27	Fire Prevention & Public Education	88.6%	22.0	19.5
28	Museums	40.0%	48.6	19.4
29	Street Cleaning	60.0%	31.9	19.1
30	Ride Choice	60.0%	31.9	19.1
31	Police Community Relations/Public Ed	88.6%	20.0	17.7
32	Public Info (Marketing & Communication)	40.0%	44.3	17.7
33	Electric Service	80.0%	21.4	17.1
34	Mesa Convention Center/Amphitheatre	40.0%	40.6	16.2
35	Dial-A-Ride	60.0%	26.6	16.0
36	Park Ranger Program	40.0%	39.9	16.0
37	Special Community Events	40.0%	39.7	15.9

Results of City Council Service Category Rankings  
Strategic Budget Planning Session  
February 3, 2006

<b><u>Rank Position</u></b>	<b><u>Service Description</u></b>	<b><u>Service Category Weight</u></b>	<b><u>Category Average Response</u></b>	<b><u>Overall Weighted Value</u></b>
38	Building Permitting & On-site Inspections	20.0%	78.6	15.7
39	Cemetery	40.0%	38.0	15.2
40	Building Plans Review	20.0%	76.0	15.2
41	Light Rail	60.0%	24.9	14.9
42	Transportation Planning	20.0%	69.4	13.9
43	Planning & Zoning Services	20.0%	68.1	13.6
44	Golf Courses	40.0%	33.7	13.5
45	Theatres	40.0%	33.6	13.4
46	Williams Gateway	20.0%	64.4.	12.9
47	Municipal Security	88.6%	13.0	11.5
48	Natural Gas Service	80.0%	14.3	11.4
49	Engineering Services	20.0%	55.3	11.1
50	Animal Control	88.6%	12.0	10.6
51	Zoning Administration	20.0%	47.6	9.5
52	Code Compliance	11.4%	83.4	9.5
53	Galleries & Classes	40.0%	21.1	8.4
54	Falcon Field Airport	20.0%	41.1	8.2
55	Economic Development Program	20.0%	37.3	7.5
56	Community Arts Grants	40.0%	18.6	7.4
57	Long Range Planning	20.0%	36.0	7.2
58	Mesa Senior Center Support	11.4%.	60.7	6.9
59	Environmental Compliance	11.4%	58.7	6.7
60	Neighborhood Support & Outreach	11.4%	56.6	6.5
61	Neighborhood Revitalization	11.4%	54.6	6.2
62	Historic Preservation	11.4%	34.4	3.9
63	Human Services Grants	11.4%	32.4	3.7
64	E-Streets (Fiber Optic) Infrastructure	20.0%	12.9	2.6
65	Housing (Escobedo) Program	11.4%	16.1	1.8



Major Service Category Rankings  
Strategic Budget Planning Session  
February 3, 2006

	<b>Service Category Weight</b>	<b>Category Average Response</b>	<b>Overall Weighted Value</b>
<b>Public Safety - Results of Paired Comparisons -</b>			
Police Patrol	88.6%	94.6	83.8
Fire Emergency Response	88.6%	82.0	72.7
Judicial Services	88.6%	80.1	71.0
Criminal Investigations	88.6%	74.1	65.7
Public Safety Dispatch	88.6%	71.9	63.7
Crime & ID Labs	88.6%	68.0	60.2
Police Air Patrol	88.6%	50.6	44.8
Police Records, Training & Support	88.6%	46.6	41.3
Fire Special Operations (i.e. HazMat)	88.6%	40.3	35.7
Fire Records, Training & Support	88.6%	36.4	32.3
Emergency Management/Homeland Security Coord.	88.6%	32.1	28.4
Fire Prevention & Public Education	88.6%	22.0	19.5
Police Community Relations/Public Education	88.6%	20.0	17.7
Municipal Security	88.6%	13.0	11.5
Animal Control	88.6%	12.0	10.6

**Utility Services - Results of Paired Comparisons - Sorted**

Water Service	80.0%	92.9	74.3
Wastewater Service	80.0%	75.0	60.0
Solid Waste Collection	80.0%	46.4	37.1
Electric Service	80.0%	21.4	17.1
Natural Gas Service	80.0%	14.3	11.4

**Transportation Services - Results of Paired Comparisons -**

Street Repair & Maintenance	60.0%	94.4	56.6
Traffic Control (Signals, Signs & Markings)	60.0%	81.9	49.1
Storm Sewer System O & M	60.0%	66.0	39.6
Street Lighting	60.0%	49.9	29.9
RPTA Bus Transit Service	60.0%	40.9	24.5
Street Cleaning	60.0%	31.9	19.1
Ride Choice	60.0%	31.9	19.1
Dial-A-Ride	60.0%	26.6	16.0
Light Rail	60.0%	24.9	14.9

Major Service Category Rankings  
Strategic Budget Planning Session  
February 3, 2006

	<b><u>Service Category Weight</u></b>	<b><u>Category Average Response</u></b>	<b><u>Overall Weighted Value</u></b>
<b><u>Community Services - Results of Paired Comparisons - Sorted</u></b>			
Libraries	40.0%	98.0	39.2
Aquatics	40.0%	80.7	32.3
Recreation Programs & Team Sports	40.0%	78.1	31.2
Parks Maintenance	40.0%	74.9	30.0
Broadcast Communications (Mesa Channel 11)	40.0%	55.7	22.3
Spring Training Baseball	40.0%	49.7	19.9
Convention & Visitors Bureau/Tourism Support	40.0%	48.9	19.6
Museums	40.0%	48.6	19.4
Public Information (Marketing & Communication)	40.0%	44.3	17.7
Mesa Convention Center/Amphitheatre	40.0%	40.6	16.2
Park Ranger Program	40.0%	39.9	16.0
Special Community Events	40.0%	39.7	15.9
Cemetery	40.0%	38.0	15.2
Golf Courses	40.0%	33.7	13.5
Theatres	40.0%	33.6	13.4
Galleries & Classes	40.0%	21.1	8.4
Community Arts Grants	40.0%	18.6	7.4

**Development Services - Results of Paired Comparisons - Sorted**

Building Permitting & On-site Inspections	20.0%	78.6	15.7
Building Plans Review	20.0%	76.0	15.2
Transportation Planning	20.0%	69.4	13.9
Planning & Zoning Services	20.0%	68.1	13.6
Williams Gateway	20.0%	64.4	12.9
Engineering Services	.20.0%	55.3	11.1
Zoning Administration	20.0%	47.6	9.5
Falcon Field Airport	20.0%	41.1	8.2
Economic Development Program	20.0%	37.3	7.5
Long Range Planning	20.0%	36.0	7.2
E-Streets (Fiber Optic) Infrastructure	20.0%	12.9	2.6
Town Center Development	20.0%	7.7	1.5

**Neighborhood Services - Results of Paired Comparisons - Sorted**

Code Compliance	11.4%	83.4	9.5
Mesa Senior Center Support	11.4%	60.7	6.9
Environmental Compliance	11.4%	58.7	6.7
Neighborhood Support & Outreach	11.4%	56.6	6.5
Neighborhood Revitalization	11.4%	54.6	6.2
Historic Preservation	11.4%	34.4	3.9
Human Services Grants	11.4%	32.4	3.7
Housing (Escobedo) Program	11.4%	16.1	1.8