

Sierra Vista City Council  
Work Session Minutes  
December 8, 2015

1. Call to order – 4:30 p.m. in the City Hall, Council Chambers, 1011 N. Coronado Drive, Sierra Vista, Arizona.

Roll Call

Mayor Rick Mueller – present  
Mayor Pro Tem Bob Blanchard – present  
Council Member Alesia Ash – absent  
Council Member Gwen Calhoun – present  
Council Member Rachel Gray – present  
Council Member Hank Huisiking – present  
Council Member Craig Mount – present

Others Present:

Chuck Potucek, City Manager  
Mary Jacobs, Assistant City Manager  
Ron York, Fire Chief  
Matt McLachlan, Community Development Director  
David Felix, Finance Manager  
Pam Weir, Management Analyst  
Simone McFarland, Economic Development Manager  
Victoria Yarbrough, Library and Leisure Services Director  
Jill Adams, City Clerk  
Southeast Arizona Hospitality Association Board Members

2. Presentation and discussion:

- A. December 10, 2015 Council Meeting Agenda Items (agenda attached)

Item 2 Consent Agenda - No change

Item 3 Resolution 2015-110, Request for Development Code Amendments to Section 151.22.029, FH, Flood Hazard and declaring a 30-day comment period

Mr. McLachlan stated that the item relates to the Floodplain Management Ordinance to bring it into compliance with State National requirements. Staff coordinated with the Arizona Department of Water Resources on the proposed amendments, which need to be adopted prior to the new flood insurance rate maps taking effect February 3, 2016. The resolution went before the Planning and Zoning Commission and passed with no public comment or objection. The proposed changes primarily deal with relocating and adding definitions, amending references and reinforcing certain standards to be in accordance with the State model ordinance.

Council Member Mount asked if this will go out with a 30-day comment period and where has it has been posted for the public to go in and view it. Mr. McLachlan stated yes and that there

has been a legal ad placed in the Sierra Vista Herald and the resolution can be viewed on the City's website on the agenda backup material as well as Community Development's website.

Council Member Huisking asked if this is the same as the Surface Water Plan. Mr. McLachlan stated that it is not and explained that this is an ordinance that regulates development affected within the floodplains areas of the City. The Surface Water Plan is a document that looks at the drainage and recommends improvements to deal with flood control issues within the City. One is a planning document and this is a regulatory ordinance that is in place to implement the National Flood Insurance Program and affects flood insurance rates.

Item 4 Resolution 2015-111, naming the Pilot's Lounge at the Sierra Vista Municipal Airport

Mr. Potucek stated that this is a recommendation by the Airport Commission to honor former Commission Member Dick McColley by naming the Pilot's Lounge at the airport after him. There is a specific procedure in terms of naming items, which includes the recommendation of the Commission or some group to the Council for further consideration. This is a little ahead in that the resolution has already been prepared. The Council's responsibility here is to either say with consensus to go ahead and proceed with having the item on the agenda or to direct staff to wait and do more work and bring it back at a later time.

Council Member Calhoun asked if it was a unanimous decision by the Commission. Mr. Potucek stated that it was a unanimous recommendation.

Council Member Huisking stated that she fully supports it as she worked with Mr. McColley for a long time and he did almost single-handedly hold up the Airport Commission for a long time to try and get things done. Plus he was an excellent pilot and was the resident expert on what needed to be done at the airport.

Council Member Huisking stated that she read the policy on naming things and it states that Council can name somebody that is either deceased or living; but have to wait until they are gone six months. Mayor Mueller stated that he thought that had been addressed in a change. Mr. Potucek stated that the change can be made because either you are deceased or living.

Mayor Pro Tem Blanchard stated that he supports leaving the item on the agenda. Council agreed to leave the item on the agenda.

Item 5 Resolution 2015-112, Appointment of Ron Faulkner to the Environmental Affairs Commission, said term to expire August 26, 2017

Council Member Huisking stated that he has lots of experience and is happy to serve.

#### B. Presentation by Southeast Arizona Hospitality Association (SEAHA)

Jena Alexander, President, SEAHA Board and Director of Sales for the Holiday Inn Express and Candlewood Suites, presented the Association's mission and what SEAHA has done:

- December 2014 officially decided to form a hotel association;
- January 2015 voted for officers;
- May 2015 decided on Southeast Arizona Hospitality Association so that they could have a broader reach, not just Sierra Vista; but appeal to Southeast Arizona;

- July 2015 Paperwork was filed to be an Arizona Nonprofit as well as finalizing membership applications and Bylaws, bank account opened, and dues collected for new members;
- August 2015 hosted the first Southeast Arizona Tourism Invitational (going to be an annual event);
- October 2015 SEAHA negotiated and won the bid for the 2016 Arizona HOG Rally which will hopefully bring in up to 1,000 people for 3-4 nights in October 2016; and
- December 2015 signed 20 members, including hotels, restaurants, and two city council members, the Chamber of Commerce, and the City of Sierra Vista.

Ms. Alexander stated that the current members are comprised of mostly hotels, a few restaurants and associate members and displayed a list of SEAHA's partners. SEAHA's goal is not only to increase hotel occupancy. SEAHA wants to work closely with Sierra Vista and Cochise County entities to help increase Tourism and Economic Development. SEAHA is currently working with:

- Sierra Vista Area Chamber;
- Retire Sierra Vista Program (RSVP (guest speaker at SEAHA's upcoming event));
- Sierra Vista Tourism Commission;
- Cochise County Chamber; and
- West End Commission and the Sierra Vista Herald.

Tom Reardon, Board Member, stated that SEAHA needs from Council a system where the City would send SEAHA leads for hotel business to keep them informed of what is happening and about people that may need accommodations. SEAHA is recommending:

- Focus on Sports Tourism and to look into upgrading city sports facilities as part of the strategic planning process; and
- City look at the combination of the accommodation, restaurant and bar tax to reallocate that perhaps in the General Fund and Capital Improvements Fund to Tourism.

SEAHA would like to create a closer bond with the City of Sierra Vista Marketing office to research companies and attractions that Sierra Vista could bring in to keep residents here on the weekend and attract other audiences to Sierra Vista; but not nature and birding related, which is great for Sierra Vista. However, SEAHA's research indicates that the younger generation is not into nature and birding.

They are recommending an event coordinator, a one-stop shop for this within the City and looking at events that may become an annual event like Bisbee's One Hundred Stair Climb and the replacement of the "Welcome to Sierra Vista" sign as people come into town.

Mr. Reardon stated that SEAHA has tremendous amount of private sector expertise on its board in the accommodation business and SEAHA would like to be able to work with the City to create a system, a standard operating procedure, where the City would send SEAHA leads for hotel business, i.e., new companies in town, construction, and etc. They would work with the Economic Development Department to increase awareness to the hotels on:

- Event leads;
- Construction Projects;
- Employees relocating to the area; and
- Company relocations.

Mr. Reardon stated that Sports Tourism is something that he would like to put emphasis on. SEAHA is going to recommend that the City in its planning process, not abandon, municipal fields and venues for community sports, i.e., football, soccer, baseball and things along those

lines; but going a step further and creating venues and field upgrades to attract regional tournaments. Attracting not only participants but spectators as far away as Western New Mexico, southern California and across the entire state. Sierra Vista has some of the best sports weather in the nation. SEAHA recommends upgrading fields at the college level and being able to attract a game or two from the Cochise College baseball and basketball programs. Also look to outside sources and not just tax dollars but the Arizona Diamondbacks Foundation that is interested in providing grants to cities and towns to promote baseball. The Major League Baseball Players' Association also has a fund called the Baseball Tomorrow Fund for upgrades for youth baseball and softball. There are whole a lot of ideas if the City moves away from strictly a municipal recreational concept to one involving sports tourism.

Mr. Reardon stated that there is an accommodation tax, a restaurant and bar tax and the revenues in the last budget was projected to be \$2,570,996. At the present time that revenue is coming mostly into to General Fund and a little into Capital Improvements. SEAHA is recommending consideration of turning that revenue into investment revenue. To take about 40 percent of those revenues and turning toward tourism development in whatever shape or form that Council might think that is necessary. The Council can do this without a changing of the City Ordinance.

Mr. Reardon noted that the City's altitude makes Sierra Vista a great place to train for sports as the City is almost a mile high.

Mr. Reardon added that these are some ideas to think about during the Strategic Planning Process just like the Plan for Prosperity states, "to diversify the economy, move away from reliance on the Fort and getting into things that will bring people to the City".

Mayor Mueller stated that he is intrigued by a number of things that Mr. Reardon talked about and he is trying to look for where the hitches in the system might be. With regard to the leads for SEAHA, understand and hopefully SEAHA will grow to represent all hoteliers in events, hospitality issues and businesses in the area; but right now it does not.

Mayor Mueller asked how does Council meet SEAHA's objectives, which he believes are good and still be fair so that even the nonSEAHA members have a shot at being aware that there is a company coming in that may be building and need rooms, and etc. This is a discussion worth having rather than just having the Economic Development or the Community Development talk directly to SEAHA. There has to be another way to do that so that Council does not appear to be favoring one group up until the time that Council knows that SEAHA has all of the hotels and restaurants in their organization, which he believes need to join.

Mr. Reardon stated that it is SEAHA's goal and they could eliminate the problem with everybody involved.

Council Member Mount stated that the easiest way to make that happen is to expose the data to everybody and then SEAHA and other organizations can compete. Mayor Mueller agreed to have the data available on the website so that interested parties can gather the data.

Mayor Mueller stated that he is intrigued by the regional tournaments portion and after he discussed this awhile ago with Mr. Reardon, he does not think that the City would be able to attract a minor league team and do not have the population to support that effectively. However, regional tournaments are something that the City could do; but again, talking significant other investment in fields and Council can look at that.

Mayor Mueller stated that on the tax suggestion, he is curious as the City currently pulls .5 percent from both of those taxes for capital improvements and asked if SEAHA would consider capital improvements, which actually goes into roads, facilities and etc. a good use of a dedicated tax. That is something for future discussion and SEAHA might want to go back and look at what constitutes the \$828,000 that SEAHA is looking at dedicating to the project.

Mr. Reardon stated that infrastructure and roads will be a part and he believes that when the time comes and SEAHA gets to that point will be a discussion item to figure out how to balance out all of that and how SEAHA wants to make improvements.

Mayor Mueller noted that he is looking for recommendations because the Council is going to have to discuss this. The City already spends \$214,000 in marketing and it is not necessarily dedicated to hotel and the hospitality. If personnel costs are included, the total of that is \$609,000 and part of economic development will deal with this as well. Right now O&M is \$731,000 and with personnel costs it is \$925,000 and so if one looks at just O&M, the City is already at the \$828,000 that they are already doing so it needs to be defined.

Council Member Calhoun stated that baseball might attract people from Mexico. Mr. Reardon stated that it is presented different in the market for Mexico; but it is still baseball.

Vivek Patel, Board Member, stated that SEAHA would like to work closely with the City's marketing office to learn what they are currently doing and what they are spending marketing and tourism dollars on. SEAHA members are all stakeholders in the hospitality field in Sierra Vista and they would like to stay up-to-date on marketing and tourism efforts in Sierra Vista, be informed and provide input on what tourism and marketing dollars are being spent on. With regard to the Sierra Vista Branding, SEAHA can help facilitate roll out of branding, specifically community signage.

Mr. Patel stated talked about new attractions, i.e., research companies and attractions that Sierra Vista could bring in to keep residents here on the weekends and attract other audiences to Sierra Vista. Sierra Vista is full of nature and birding attractions and events and the City needs to look into other attractions to bring in new audiences. Sierra Vista hotels are empty on the weekends and the City needs things to do for residents, hotel guests and the younger audiences, i.e., soldiers and families.

The City needs to designate an event coordinator/facilitator to oversee all current events in terms of city services and help facilitate new events coming to town. The event coordinator/facilitator would send event leads to SEAHA to bring the event to Sierra Vista. SEAHA will then help facilitate the hospitality aspect and the City will then organize the City services needed. SEAHA and event planners and organizers will need one point of contact that is designated to coordinate city services for events.

City events – SEAHA would support events that become a Sierra Vista Annual Event that will pull others to visit and stay overnight. A better community/county events calendar needs to be built so that each city is aware of what is happening in neighboring towns.

Building on current events would entail creating awareness to other cities and states to bring in out-of-towners to create spending and awareness of Sierra Vista, i.e., Art in the Park because this event will not bring in out-of-towners that will stay in our hotels and eat in our restaurants (with the exception of the vendors). The City needs to increase the scope of the event:

- Charge an admission fee;
- Create an atmosphere that out-of-towners will travel to;
- Music;
- Wine and beer garden;
- Entertainment; and
- Games and contests.

Mr. Patel stated that the “Welcome to Sierra Vista” sign on Buffalo Soldier needs to be replaced as soon as possible. This sign is old and outdated and this sign is the first thing that is seen when entering Sierra Vista. This old and outdated sign sets the tone for the visit to Sierra Vista and a new sign needs to be erected that will incorporate the new branding and set a new tone for visitors.

Mayor Mueller thanked SEAHA for working with the City for the Hogs’ event and noted that the City is piloting a program where there is one point of contact for event through Ms. Yarbrough, a good step forward.

Andrew Abernathy, Board member, talked about SEAHA’s future and noted that the Arizona HOG Rally is officially planned to be a three to four day event for 2016. SEAHA has been working with the organizers to expand that to start with some special commemorative rides beginning on Tuesday and Wednesday. Those rides are set up so that people who have specific bucket list items that they really want to ride of which there are several in southern Arizona. One of them is riding to the top of Sabino Canyon that all Harley riders love to make. SEAHA is going to take that and make it into special revenue making piece for the HOG Chapter, for the rally and for SEAHA to get exposure in Pima County as well as Cochise County. Another one of those rides will accent the wine festivals and the wineries in Cochise County as Cochise County is the wine capital of Arizona and SEAHA wants to play that up.

There are several other events of folks that have contacted SEAHA, one of a bicycle ride which they would like to do over two days and some other events that are culturally oriented, which would like to come to Sierra Vista. Some are small events which will grow over time and others are more ambitious.

The Buffalo Soldier Troop Event is one of the events that SEAHA has been discussing and they will have more definitive information as time goes along in 2016.

Mr. Abernathy stated that all of the chambers in Cochise County have decided to go together and form a countywide Chamber of Commerce and SEAHA is working with them to help them strengthen their organization and SEAHA’s as well.

Mr. Abernathy stated that he had an event planner that puts on music festivals come and look at Cochise County in May and the one place that impressed him was Veterans’ Park in Sierra Vista. Every city in Graham, Greenlee and Cochise County were looked at and although he saw lots of possibilities in other areas, he stated that he wanted to come to Sierra Vista first. He is thinking of a festival that lasts a week and supports an attendance of over 5,000 people who will spend over the week over \$1,000 per person.

SEAHA is becoming that organization that outsiders are beginning to understand makes sense to work with. All of these pieces would work in synch with the City’s plan and the Strategic Leadership Plan that has been established.

SEAHA likes a lot of what Council is thinking about from a strategic point of view about how to diversify the economy and how to get the word out that Sierra Vista is a great place to come to and not only for Sierra Vista; but for the County as everyone benefits from this.

The 20-year vision component states that visitors will choose to come to the area's many attraction, natural beauty and rich Western and military history. Note that all of those who come have a place to eat and sleep. The one major goal is economy and education. The narrative to this goal states in part that SEAHA will actively promote the growth and expansion of a strong and diverse economic base. SEAHA was founded on the objective of enabling the economy to meet this goal.

SEAHA would like to be a part in helping the City achieve their Strategic Leadership Plan. SEAHA has talked about:

- Establishing a lead system for hoteliers and others who would be interested in providing services to those that come for scouting events, movie shooting as well as economic development and possibly moving businesses to Sierra Vista;
- Sports tourism;
- Change in tax allocation to support these activities;
- Work more closely with the City's marketing office so that SEAHA can act as an object arm for advertising through the contacts that SEAHA is making and looking to be a partner to expand the City's voice as well as the City expanding SEAHA's voice;
- Designate an event coordinator/facilitator for events that want to come to the City.

Mr. Abernathy thanked the Mayor and Council for Ms. Yarbrough's assistance with the HOG event and they know that she will be a great asset in the planning of the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Arizona Harley Owners Group rally in October 2016.

SEAHA would also like to work with the City to replace the "Welcome to Sierra Vista" sign on Buffalo Soldier sooner rather than later.

Mr. Abernathy stated that SEAHA has a number of members that have asked about the branding and what it takes to put up the signs at their hotels and businesses as SEAHA would like to participate with that and help the City get that word out and act as a facilitation.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Ms. Jacobs explained that staff is in the process of finalizing that. One of the most important things that they need to have is a structure on ensuring that when the brand is implemented by the local businesses that it is done within the confines of some rules. The City did not get the final report from North Starr until six weeks ago so staff is finalizing that and it will be up on the website, the Chamber and everyone so that they know.

Mayor Mueller asked what the timeframe is in having that up on the net. Ms. Jacobs stated that it would be early next year. Staff is working on those rules to make sure that the brand stays consistent, which is the most important thing. The signs will not cost anything for anybody to do it. The City will be providing the graphic art, how it can be used, and all of the costs to do that will be borne by the City. It also has to do with the color, the font and the City needs to make sure that they have their own house in order before it is done. Staff is busy rolling out the brand internally as well as how they are going to make those rules for everyone else - just not there yet.

Council Member Calhoun stated that she is sensitive to Mr. Patel's issue with his hotel and asked Ms. Jacobs to sit with him and work with him.

Council Member Mount stated that he purposely asked to be left out of the creation of the briefing so that there would not be any undo bias. This is all coming from the core members of SEAHA and added that he believes that the event coordinator pilot that is being used for the HOG Rally is absolutely essential to doing business for these types of events that come forward and he appreciates the City's management support.

Council Member Mount added that he sits on the SEAHA Board and has had the chance to talk with quite a few of the members over the last couple of months. The thing that Council needs to consider is that SEAHA wasn't born out of an environment where tourism was succeeding in Sierra Vista. It was born out of the opposite and he believes that the City owes them at least some courtesy and acknowledgment that it is the truth. They have utilized the City very well and their own resources to put together at least some very big victories in a very short amount of time. Council can re-enforce that success and still achieve a lot of the strategic goals, especially with the outdoor sports and some other things. Last year during the budget session, the idea of reallocating funds from the hotel tax to pay for the tourism piece was brought up.

Council Member Mount stated that he thinks that this makes sense because it provides incentives for success between the private community as well as the government. It allows businesses to do business; but it also for there to be this win win coming out of it. Tourism is funded by the businesses through tax revenues and that in turn is put back in to promote more tourism for the businesses. However much Council can allocate to go in is the beautiful business sense and it builds goodwill. Shortly after some of the metrics that he did for the Mayor and Council, ties directly into the facilities that may be needed to go into construction.

Council Member Mount added that he does not think that the City can pay to build new stadiums; but some of the metrics that Council could be looking at are private dollar versus public dollar, economic development investments and infrastructure and what that ratio looks like and if that ration is coming out favorable either way, then it means that the City may be able to afford construction of some of these things to promote more sports tourism.

Council Member Calhoun stated that groups have been involved in bringing things to the City; but for this current time and the changes that are going on in communities around the country; this is exactly what the City needs. A community is not just municipal government and citizens, it is everybody coming together and that was exemplified in the presentation.

Council Member Calhoun added that she sees it as completely possible and doable in working together to make the City even more successful. What is highlighted is the importance of open communication, information and it also ties right in with the workshop that she attended during the National League of Cities Conference.

Council Member Huisking stated that she is excited because a lot of the things that SEAHA brought up would be on her list if she was a part of that working group. They are practical and a great start.

Mr. Abernathy stated that they are all business owners and they all have a payroll to meet, they all pay taxes, purchase food for their family and they all realize that work with SEAHA benefits the community.

Mayor Mueller thanked the board for coming and stated that the lead system is doable; but need to figure out a way to be fair. Sport tourism is going to be about promotion and the fields will take some time. The tax allocation suggestion is timely because Council will start on next year's budget shortly.

Mayor Mueller asked Mr. Potucek that he would like to see as part of the budget discussion, from the staff's perspective, where he thinks the City is spending money in the current budget and how much dealing specifically with marketing to attract people to the community.

Mayor Mueller noted that he would change verbiage about SEAHA working closely, SEAHA needs to become a partner with the marketing office in the City and on attractions there are some attractions now, one was mentioned already; but the City also has the Cowboy Poets and a few others and he would hope that members of the SEAHA board get involved with those organizations so that SEAHA is working on the inside.

Council Member Calhoun mentioned two other events in the community, the West End Fair and the Heritage Fair. Mr. Abernathy stated that the West End Group has contacted them and they are beginning a dialogue.

#### C. Presentation regarding City's participation in National Citizen Survey (NCS)

Pam Weir stated that this is the first time that the City has ever participated in the National Citizen Survey (NCS) and it is going to take some great strides in the Performance Management Plan.

Ms. Weir noted that she will be providing the following information during the presentation:

- Background on the Citizen Survey and organization that the City is working with;
- Process of what is going to happen over the next few months;
- Survey Tool;

Ms. Weir stated that she will be looking for feedback from Council on custom questions within the survey on the City's specific issues as well as identifying what characteristics from other communities that the City wants to compare itself to.

The organization that the City is contracting with to conduct the citizen survey is the National Research Center and they pretty much invented the national benchmarking for cities across the country in the early 90's and have been conducting surveys for over 500 cities ever since. They ask questions up to 260 different municipal services and have the largest database of information of anyone in the industry. Their citizen survey tool working with the City and the community's specific information as well, will allow the City for the first time to have scientifically valid information about the perceptions, demographics and etc. of Sierra Vista's citizens.

Ms. Weir stated that there are many reasons to conduct the citizen survey and she has presented some big ones and added that having that statistically valid information is very important. The City is engaged constantly in citizen outreach in many different ways; but there is tendency to hear from the same people or only when they have a specific issue. This is a way for the City to randomly sample everyone across the City to garner information from them about the how life is in the City. The survey tool will also be used to compare apples to apples with communities around the country.

Currently one of the problems in performance measurements is the way that a question is framed than the way that it would be framed in another community and so the information is not comparable; but because the City will be using a national tool, it will allow us to do that and have those benchmarks. It will also set the tone for the future. When the City does the survey this year and if the City continues to do it in the future, the City will have established a baseline and then as strategic plans change and the City looks at the way the resources are allocated going forward the City will start to see trends in terms of whether or not what the City is doing and the direction that the City is headed is having a measurable impact among the residents in the future.

The major highlights of the process:

- 1,400 households will be randomly selected from within City limits evenly distributed across for major quadrants of the City;
- Surveys will be mailed; but they will have the option to either fill out the survey and return it by mail or they can go on line;
- Staff will be looking for a response rate of over 25 percent in order to have a statistically valid number, which equate to roughly 380 people out of those 1,400 and NRC reports that they generally get between 25 and 40 percent of respondents returning those surveys;
- Results will be analyzed through the NRC and one of their staff members will come out in March at the conclusion of the study to present the information to Council and respond to specific questions about the trends and what they see nationally and how the City is doing.

Ms. Weir stated that the information will then belong to the City to share as widely as needed and to dig into that raw data as needed and consider it in the budget process as well.

Ms. Weir stated that the City has been working since November with NRC on the survey tool, put together a staff team to start coming up with recommendations for custom questions and now during the work session with Council will seek to finalize survey questions and benchmark profile. Over the course of the next month, once staff has established the questions and the benchmark profile will move forward and surveys will be mailed out starting in January. The City will also work to help promote that by making sure that people are aware through social media and they can expect that they might see one of these surveys coming in the mail and encouraged to respond to help with the future of the City. Also by March, the results should be finalized.

The survey is about 75 percent complete and included in Council's packet. The survey includes all of the standard questions that NRC uses across the country. The only changes to that and seen are a couple of things like snow removal service because the City is not in the business of snow removal like other communities across the country. Roughly 25 percent or page four is relatively blank and that space can be used to fill in as many custom questions as the City can fit. These questions are structured to capture everything from perceptions on the quality of services currently being provided, priorities about things that the City should be working on in the future, and certain behaviors like engaging in recycling or water conservation, which will inform the City about services moving forward in terms of what kind of education outreach or additional services need to be provided.

The City survey results will be used in a variety of ways and for Council informing budget strategic plan and policy and project priorities. Priorities based budget is something that has come up a lot in budget discussions and having citizen input like this is one major component in moving in the direction of a priority based budgeting situation. This will inform City Departments as well with accurate representation of how the citizens feel and it is also another

arm of civic engagement and reaching out to learn where the City may need to up its own education efforts.

The City had the opportunity for some custom survey questions to deal with issues that the City may be facing in the next couple of years. The only constraint is that there is a limit to the space on the survey document. Staff will work with the NRC on the final language of the questions because the City wants to maintain its legitimacy as a scientific survey. They are the experts in terms of ensuring that the questions are reliable, valid and free from bias so that the City is not unintentionally swaying people. Staff has come up with four recommended questions, which is about what would fit in the page. Two different alternatives are provided for a question about communicating with citizens.

Ms. Weir stated that as she goes over the questions, staff is looking for feedback from Council in general whether they like the recommended questions and if that information is useful to them. In the event that all of the questions cannot be included, staff would be looking for a priority to the type of information that Council would be looking for and are there additional questions that staff did not recommend. With a consensus from Council, then she can draft language with NRC to address those issues.

The first staff question recommendation deals with specific project priorities over the next five years. The six options listed were generated by department heads and division heads in terms of things that they thought would be on Council's horizon.

First Question:

- Asking about a city center;
- Asking about a community/recreation center;
- Improvements to West Fry Boulevard;
- Additional sports fields;
- Additional multi-use paths; and
- New or expanded neighborhood parks.

Council Member Calhoun asked Ms. Weir if she is asking for a response today. Ms. Weir stated that is her hope because the timeline with the survey process is that if the City is going to get mailings out and have the process concluded in a timely fashion to help with the budget, then the questions need to be finalized in the next couple of weeks.

Council Member Gray stated that she believes that the questions are fine and noted that they had talked about keeping them so that they can compare them to other cities; but her only concern is with the first question about the city center and asked if it could be changed to a more general term rather than city center, i.e., a place to shop, entertain and dine.

Ms. Weir explained that the City's custom questions will not necessarily compare or be benchmarked. These are things that are intentionally unique to the City to inform Council and that regard, staff was not concerned with that when they were developing the questions. However, they did talk about the language about that particular question and went back and forth about cities and their downtown and how is it described to make it the most reliable and NRC will be able to give feedback. The kicker was through the "Dream Your City" process because that was a term that was used and so staff thought that in general with how much the city center idea has been in the Strategic Plan over the years that it would be recognizable.

Council Member Gray stated that recognizable is not what she is concerned about. It is about people seeing that and automatically being drawn to that as important because they have heard it so much. She would like for people to actually think about the questions and answer them.

Council Member Huisking stated that she likes it and thinks that it covers a lot of the things that people have talked about for a long time and that the Council was working toward and it certainly does seem to apply specifically to Sierra Vista.

Mayor Mueller suggested that with regard to the question about West Fry Boulevard that it be changed to West Fry Boulevard/North Garden and that way it is specific.

There was consensus regarding questions one pending slight language changes.

The second staff question recommendation deals with the Strategic Plan and this is one that cities have used and a recommended question from NRC in a commonly asked question in terms of priorities in the budget.

Second question: How important is each of the following strategic planning areas to the overall quality of life in the city? This gives residents an opportunity to indicate whether they would prioritize for example economic development versus environmental leadership and etc.; but given the scale, they are not forced to choose one at the exclusion of another.

Council Member Mount noted that there are five possible answers that are going to be weighed, which he is sure is part of the methodology, three are in the affirmative and two in the negative; but there is nothing saying, "I don't want it." It is either I don't know, it is not all that important and then it gets into very affirmative and that worries him.

Council Member Mount asked if the City has the data from the actual methodology, calculations that are used behind these numbers that mean something. Ms. Weir stated that it was one of the first questions that she asked NRC and she got a lengthy response from them; but generally people speak positive especially when they are talking about new things for their city. NRC found that surveys having a balanced strongly agree and strongly disagree are more appropriate in something like this since people tend to skew affirmatively anyway. This then delineates their degree of positivity more acutely than if it were spread the other direction.

Council Member Mount stated that he has a deep background with this kind of thing at Fort Huachuca and noted that he has looked up some of the other cities, i.e., Lynchburg, Tennessee, which all echoes his concern with the correlation of those answers to the budget process. The sample size is going to have to be significant enough in order to at least compel him to make a decision. The other thing that he is worried about is the cost to the City.

Council Member Mount asked if the City is paying per response received back or for the number of surveys sent out. Ms. Weir stated that the City is paying a flat cost for the entire process.

In response to Council Member Mount, Ms. Weir stated that it is \$17,900.

Council Member Mount stated that his other concern is that the City is essentially paying \$12.83 for a response and that seems significant just for some questions without knowing the

real methodology especially if the City is going to tie something as important as the budget to it.

Council Member Mount recommended that unless someone can show Council how these are weighed, the impact is too great and in his opinion, to base something like a budget on. Also not comfortable with comparing the City of Sierra Vista to other cities using something as a straight line benchmark because Sierra Vista is unique and different to another city that is unique and different and there are different needs.

Council Member Mount stated that he is not necessarily against this yet; but he would not like to vote on this until there is more information, especially with questions that were just given to Council and asked if this can be pushed back a year before spending any money.

Ms. Jacobs stated that this is not intended to be anything delineating to the Council in terms of what Council decides to do in the budget. It is simply additional information that Council can use during the deliberation process. The contract was already, an administrative item included in the City Manager's budget and called out in the budget process so staff is moving forward with the survey and they are hoping to get some input from Council on the questions that are not part of the base survey in order to make it into something that would be more useful to Council in the process.

Council Member Mount stated that when the decision was made to do the survey, the data would have been better during the CAC process when the decision to raise taxes was made because that where all of the deliberations took place from the community to do this an so once again, the City is behind. The City is going to get the survey in; but the City has already made a decision and allocated funding and raised taxes for that funding.

Mayor Mueller stated that he agrees with Council Member in that this should not be used solely to base the budget. This is another tool and he shares some of his concerns with the metrics and a valid sample survey, which he already expressed that to staff.

Mayor Mueller stated that he has many questions as well and he is not in favor of spending money on surveys and he hopes that this does not become a feel good survey that says that the City is good as wherever because that is not its purpose. The City needs to have a valid survey, if Council is going to do this, and it has to address the concerns that Council has and provide guidance and Council is going to have to take one consideration when thinking through the budget process and what programs they want to support. It is not all be all and end all.

Council Member Mount asked about the selection process of the 1,400 people who are going to be picked to do the survey. Ms. Weirs stated that staff has provided to NRC the GIS boundaries of the community and also used zip codes for household mailing addresses and not PO boxes. The 1,400 people picked to do the survey are a random selection.

Council Member Calhoun commented on having some amount of faith in staff's ability and management to make some of these decisions and complimented Ms. Weir on the detail that she presented on why the City is doing this and what it will accomplish.

Council Member Calhoun added that Ms. Weir was very upfront about what is expected to be accomplished. She also added that she gets the impression that Ms. Weir has a very good background in this kind of work and that she is knowledgeable on what she is doing and

appears to have the information that she needs. Although, she does not have the background in doing surveys that Mr. Mount has, it appears to her that this is going to do what the City needs to do for the reasons that were expressed. These things cost money and Council cannot run a community on what seems to be the right thing to do and what Council used to do to run a community. There is a place here, in her opinion, to trust that staff does have some knowledge in what they are doing and she is very much leaning towards that this is going to do what it is expected to do and she would personally not base decisions that she makes on the budget on strictly this one item.

Council Member Calhoun stated that she thinks that the City is going to get the input that is needed from the community and from Council's knowledge to make decisions when Council gets to the budget; but for a baseline a bit of information about the community she believes that this is something that the City has needed for a very long time.

Council Member Mount noted that the base line that is being talked about is not just a baseline about the community and now that is established because it is the first time that the City has done the survey; but what they are talking about is a national survey because it is a data bank of similar surveys given out to other cities. Ms. Weir added that it is a component of the program.

Council Member Mount stated that it is going to be certain questions that will match up to other key questions that were given to other cities and all of those questions are going to be weighted differently than others. That is why they are not just doing a basic average and his concern with this is that none of the Council Members what those weights are and Council does not know what they are getting, and don't know how that affects the questions.

Council Member Mount added that his other more deeper concern is that the City already went through a process where the City went out to the community through the CAC and did all of this stuff in order to establish new taxation rates and a survey was not utilized and asked why this survey is being brought in and its purpose. However, he understands the answers that he is receiving; but he is just not buying it.

Council Member Calhoun noted that last year, Council did the best they could; but this will give them more information to make decisions that need to be made for the future.

Council Member Huisking stated that she is looking at this as another tool in the tool box; but is concerned with this question because this to her is like asking if they want a house, car, job and she would put a one for all of it and noted that she is not sure if this is a great question for getting the information that staff wants.

Council Member Huisking suggested forming the question some other way and use different kind of information that would be particular to the City because the question would apply to anybody.

Council Member Gray stated that she sees where Council Member Huisking is coming from and she was also thinking about that and asked if there is anyway, not the answers, to restructure priority and their particular lives. If the survey is being sent out to random sample families, how many of the citizens know what the City means when stating strategic planning.

Council Member Gray asked if there is a way to making it more personal as to what they feel is important. Ms. Weir stated that there are many different formats to structure the various

questions. If it is a question more of choosing a single most important versus a scale on each one. That is an opportunity.

Council Member Huisking asked if there is no filling in the blank. Ms. Weir stated that there are no open ended questions so that they can all be coded.

Council Member Huisking asked how old is the information that the City will be compared to. Ms. Weir stated that the City would be comparing itself to the same years worth of information and the bench mark profile, which she has not gotten to yet, will dictate. The benchmarking is an additional component to the survey structure. There is the survey, which the City will get the data for the straight percentages of how people filled out the survey for every single question. The City will have all of that raw information at its fingertips to draw its own conclusions, to ignore it and to dig into further. The bench marking then allows the City to see how the city is doing in the region. Is the City a city that citizens say that there is a 92 percent quality of life and that in the region is a standard bearer and is that falling short of citizen perception, other parts of the state and that sort of thing. It is not just taking a single piece of information and comparing the City to the entire data base that is out there. It is going to be an averaged bench mark of communities that meet a particular profile.

Council Member Mount noted that is why he disagrees with this because it is not an average, it going to be a weighted metric, a weighted calculation that is going to get pulled up and if it was something simple as an average, there is no need to pay \$17,000.

Council Member Mount stated that his concern with this is when bench mark comparisons are done there are very few variables within that comparison. It sounds like a great idea; but when the City starts to look at all of the variables that come into it that makes this an experiment, which is exactly what this is. It is very hard to validate, especially with only 300 people that are going to come back on the sample size.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Council Member Mount stated that the people going back are 1,400 and staff is expecting to get only 25 percent back. Lynchburg only got back 391. The sample size that is coming back is only 300.

Mr. Weir stated that staff's goal is 380 because for a 95 percent confidence level with a five percent margin of error, that is the required sample size for the City to have significant information.

Council Member Mount noted that the City is then paying \$60 per response if the City gets back that number of people that to him it is just not worth it and he wished that Council would have addressed this more.

Council Member Calhoun asked Council Member Mount what he would use in order to get this kind of baseline information. Council Member Mount stated maybe fine one that is cheaper; two, discussion about what are some of the real metrics that Council think that is needed in order to come back in and make decisions. Those are things that can be decided as a group and Council saw the participation from people that came out for the CAC process. The City got data back. The branding campaign was done and the City has data. That data is the same kind of data that can be used. Not year over year; but is the City now planning on doing \$17,000 per year for more data.

Ms. Weir stated that for the City it is the distinction and conducting a survey like this is the best practice across communities because it is the difference between getting voluntary information and soliciting responses from a random sample across the City. The City is hearing from a representative sample of the community rather than the people who have the time of day to show up at the meeting and to get this other piece to contribute. It does not discount the other information that the City gets through other sources; it is an additional tool that can contribute.

Council Member Mount asked if it is \$17,000 per a survey every year. Ms. Weir stated that depending on the specifics of add ons that is going to be the rough ball park.

Council Member Mount asked that in order to get statistically viable data, year after year, the City is going to be paying \$17,000 a year. Ms. Weir stated that staff would be recommending doing it every other year and if the City continues to go with the NRC, those would generally be there fees.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Ms. Adams stated that Council passed an ordinance that allows Council upon consensus to extend the meeting to one hour. The work session was not double-booked.

Mayor Mueller asked Council Members if they had any objection to continuing the meeting for an additional hour. There were no objections.

Mr. Potucek stated that ten years ago Council started the strategic planning process, which is a Council process designed to help establish goals and objectives for staff to carry out on Council's behalf in order to move the community forward. That was a big step at that time and for staff to do that because they had not been doing anything prior to that. There was some trepidation about that. The City is now looking to take this another step further and the City is always looking for ways to get valid citizen input and engage the public in the City's processes.

Mr. Potucek stated that he does not necessarily look at this tool, which Council Member Huisking adequately described, that is going to immediately impact the budget process and some Council Members have stated that same. The tool will be thrown into the mix more in Council's strategic planning process, which then influences the budget. The bench marking was adequately described by Ms. Weir and staff is looking forward and trying to add another tool in the mix to take staff to another level where they can get more information from the public to help in the decision making processes. Staff is recommending proceeding as this is a national firm and they do most surveys around and the City should get fairly valid information out of it.

Council Member Gray stated that she is fine with the question; but she wants to make sure that the random households understand what is being asked. Ms. Weir stated that staff can add a sentence in it and say something along the line of, "the City Council has an adopted strategic plan focusing on the following six areas." There can be some leading information for the average person filling it out because that is a good point that someone who has not been paying attention to the City's processes may not respond to the buzz words.

Council Member Calhoun stated that is a good point and added that it is also an education piece so that the community begins to see that the Council does strategic planning and that word will be something that they will become familiar with.

Council Member Huisking stated that she is concerned on the kind of result that will be received because who wouldn't want everything on the list. Ms. Weir stated that Council is welcomed to tell her not to include it at all.

Council Member Mount recommended not including the question at all because Council Member Huisking is right. All of the questions need to be changed in order fit the ones that were mailed out. How often, if at all, do each of the following considering all of the times recycle at home: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Usually, Always. These questions to be used as models are not going to work very well because there is nothing in this to balance them.

In response to Council Member Calhoun, Council Member Mount stressed that it is not his job to make the recommendations.

Question Three had two options and this is the one that staff has a particular interest in hearing from folks and that is the best way for the City to be contacting people. This is something that has come up during Council discussion and there are two different structures to the questions.

The first one gets to the heart of the information more quickly, what is the single best way for the City to communicate with people on important issues? This will give representation of where are outreach dollars and effort being spent most effectively.

Council Member Gray asked if there will be another avenue to get the surveys out other than through the mail, especially if the person is someone who does not check their regular mail and they do everything on line because her concern is that the answers will come mostly from people who check their mail. Ms. Weir stated that unfortunately in order to conduct a perfectly random sampling, staff has to use a data base that is tried and true and so using the random samples of addresses is the only way to get at that information.

Council Member Mount suggested taking the survey to the mall and having a kiosk. Ms. Weir stated that it would not be random. It would be skewed to people who go to the mall. The methodology is that if one wants representative information like this, it has to be randomly sampled.

Council Member Huisking stated that she is having a hard time in only picking one because she goes to the website, reads the newspaper and will listen to the radio for certain information and suggested having the chance to do her top three.

Ms. Weir stated that the second alternative, how much information, if any, do you get from the following media sources would allow for people to say most, all, some and none from that same list. Council Members Huisking and Gray stated that they like this alternative a lot better. Mayor Mueller noted that this alternative is better.

Question 4 dealt with public facilities in the City and this one follows the model of the questions asked but is specific to the City's own facilities.

Council Member Huisking stated that it makes sense.

Mayor Mueller asked if anything was omitted. Council Member Calhoun suggested city parks. Council Member Huisking stated that it does not talk about streets. Ms. Weir stated that the

survey does not ask about streets; but can always add streets. However, she believes that streets are one of the standard questions and she can make sure that it is there.

Mayor Mueller stated that it is a good point because there is the Transit Center and other things and if that is already being addressed then it should not be on here.

Council Member Mount asked if they are limited to the number of questions that can be added. Ms. Weir stated that just by space.

Council Member Mount suggested that this is something that can be done now by throwing it in the Library to get the numbers and free up a spot for another question.

Mayor Mueller noted that there are two questions, the first one and third B where there is consent; but there is no consensus on two and four.

Mayor Mueller asked Council if there are other questions that they would like added.

Council Member Huisking stated that she agrees with question four. Council Member Gray stated that she is fine with question four; but suggests removing city hall as a facility because people do not come to city hall to hang out for fun. Mayor Mueller noted that the police station is not included.

Council Member Calhoun asked if multi-use paths are mentioned somewhere else. Ms. Weir stated that they are. Council Member Gray stated that this deals specifically with facilities.

Mr. Potucek stated that based on discussion, he is hearing that questions one, three and four are ok and question two not so well and staff would take that one out.

Mayor Mueller asked Council if they have a proposal for question two.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Ms. Weir stated that the staff team chose these questions because these rose to the top and given the space constraints they did not want to overwhelm Council with information and so they don't have any questions in the wings; but it can be a yes or no question to be added.

Mayor Mueller noted stated that they do not have to use all four. Ms. Weir stated that there is no rule stating that the City has to have custom questions.

Council Member Mount made the comment that Ms. Weir showed up with four questions for Council to provide their ideas of the questions, with the assumption that all four would be immediately taken, with no backups to offer.

Council Member Mount stated that is something that has to be overcome with future proposals because he is ok with being inundated with information from the staff.

Ms. Weir indicated that all four questions do not likely fit on the page and that was why she was looking for that priority feedback and why it is important. However, in the packet there is a four-page recommended question list from the NRC of questions that have been used and tested in other communities including things like asking about bond issues; but when the staff team got together and went through that list and concluded that based on the time and place

where the City is, these types of questions in defining the City's future investments seems to be the most relevant and that is why staff recommended them.

Mayor Mueller commented that the discussion about options has been held before and he agrees with Council Member Mount that there needs to be an overabundance than limiting information when doing future guidance.

Council Gray noted that Council was provided with options because the packet was sent out ahead of time and it was on Council to be prepared; however, if she had to prioritize and leave a question off it would be question two due to the wording but it can remain.

Council Member Huisking asked if there was a reason to leave off the tennis courts from the list of faculties. Mayor Mueller stated that the tennis courts are a City facility. Council Member Gray noted that it is a park. Ms. Weir stated that it can be added to the list.

Council Member Calhoun stated that she would like to see the options that were rejected and the logic behind the rejection.

Ms. Weir stated that there were things discussed, i.e., a bond issue and a question like that as it was discussed because the City is still paying off previous bond issues, now would not be the time to ask that question. In two or four year, Council may want to. This is an example of the questions that were not considered.

The custom benchmark profile is to give Council input in terms of having the ability to look at the responses and comparing them to communities around the country which she is hearing varying attitudes about the value of that. Bench mark does not inherently mean that the City is the best or the worst. It is another piece of information to consider as they look through the City's improvement measurement system.

The three profiles that NRC uses when they do bench marking tend to be medium income, geographic region and population size. These can be combined and they recommend 25 to 30 comparable cities be able to get a benchmark average. The City does not want to say that it will be compared to Casa Grande and be able to draw any sort of conclusions because that is not helpful; but if the City has 25 to 30 cities that they will then average their results for each question, then the City would examine against that and that starts to create a more holistic picture of cities as a whole.

Medium income as they do their research shows the strongest direct correlation because it is often the reflection of the general economy of the community. Geographic region is helpful if the City wants to know how it is doing compared to its neighbors and then population size if the City wants to really hone in on cities of a certain size.

The City can do cities within its own geographic region that also have a medium income range within \$10,000 annual salary of the City's and that would create a more niche group to compare against. Population size is great because there is a relative size; but they might have greatly varying economic characteristics. There are benefits in geographic regions; but the downfall is that there is a wider range of characteristics. This is why NRC recommends combining medium income and geographic region because that provides a set of about 65 cities that can be averaged and be compared to.

Council Member Calhoun stated that it is always important to her that the cities that Sierra Vista is compared to have medium income; but Sierra Vista has Fort Huachuca and that concerns her. Ms. Weir explained that because it is relative unique information, the number of communities that participate in the survey with military installations is small; however, the survey does ask on a demographics page if they work or live on Fort Huachuca or have in the past. Therefore, when NRC helps the City with their analysis of the data, they can also parse out using the demographics comparing people who live and work on Fort Huachuca versus people who don't. They had different opinions within the City.

In response to Council Member Mount, Ms. Weir stated that Council will have access to the raw data.

Council Member Huisking asked if the random samples will go out to the military base. Ms. Weir stated that the Fort is included.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Ms. Weir stated that she is asking for Council feedback and these are the three options as well as a hybrid of medium income and geographic region. Staff is recommending doing a combination of medium income and geographic region so that all cities within Arizona, Colorado, Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana with a medium income comparable to Sierra Vista would be in the pool.

Ms. Jacobs noted that Council can wait on the benchmarking until January. Ms. Weir stated that the benchmarking decision can be tabled for a few more weeks.

Council Member Mount asked what other options are available that they can benchmark against. Ms. Weir stated that these three were the examples that NRC provided. The potential is there. There was a question about comparing front ranges; but that does not apply to Sierra Vista.

Council Member Mount asked if homeownership was an option. Ms. Weir stated that one of the demographic questions is about rent versus owner occupied. NRC could probably develop something comparing the City's results to other similar cities. The difference is whereas medium income, region and populating size, the City has this information already. In order to benchmark from data that the City is just now collecting, she is not sure if NRC can do that all at once.

Council Member Mount stated that he would be interested in it; but he would not go with population size. Population density would be better because Sierra Vista is spread out as he does not want Sierra Vista to be compared to Avondale as an example and also distance away from large metropolitan areas. Mr. Potucek added that it would be rural versus urban.

Ms. Weir stated that if Council is in agreement, she would take these ideas back to the NRC and see what configurations they can put together.

Council Member Mount stated that he is not in favor; but he does not want this to fail either and noted that Sierra Vista should not be compared to a metropolitan area. Council Member Huisking agreed and added nor to a major roadway.

Mayor Mueller stated that there are three questions and asked Ms. Weir to come back to brief Council on custom benchmarking. Mr. Potucek added that it would be a discussion item on or about the 1<sup>st</sup> work session in January.

D. Presentation regarding rotating art display in City Council Chambers

Ms. Yarbrough stated that the excellent idea was proposed by Ms. McFarland to update the Council Chambers and she was tasked to carry out that project and so she went to Arts and Humanities Commission and asked them for their assistance. Ms. Horning and Mr. Rutherford volunteered for the subcommittee to take a look at Council Chambers and provide recommendations. They were assisted by members of the Huachuca Art Association. After some visits and discussion, Mr. Hurst of the Huachuca Art Association volunteered to be the lead person on the project with Mr. Lara assisting.

The plan for the gallery walls in Council Chambers is to start off small as it is a large undertaking on Tim and Robin's part to gain the cooperation and willingness of artists to display the art work and plan the art work. They will start with wall that is behind staff's seating area and then the back wall of Council Chambers. They would also like to do a sculpture corner with two pedestals behind Council Member Blanchard. The plan is for a six-month rotation, which would mean switching out the art twice a year and planning for a January installation. Tim and Robin are the folks connecting with the artists, they are advising staff on the best use of the space as far as how many works of art will be placed, the sizes of the art and then arrange for the display rotation in connection with the various artists. The artists will be able to place a price and contact information near their art work and staff will put together a segment with photos of the artwork and sculptures and artist information for artists that give permission to display their art.

The posters on the back wall and map will be removed along with touching up the paint. The pedestals will be ordered and Tim and Robin will be helping out with the hardware needed to hang the artwork and make sure that it is only done once so that staff is not putting multiple holes in the walls. Staff will see how the program goes from there as it is a lot of work on Tim and Robin's part. It will be kept small at first and see how it grows depending on how time allows and the interest of artists.

Council Member Gray stated that this is great. Council Member Calhoun stated that she likes that it will be local artists and thanked the volunteers. Council Member Huisking asked if it will include lighting. Ms. Yarbrough stated that it will, if it is needed to display the art similar to what is at the Library.

Ms. Jacobs thanked and acknowledged Ms. McFarland as it was her idea.

E. Briefing by Council Members Calhoun, Gray and Huisking regarding attendance at National League of Cities Conference (NLC)

Council Member Calhoun reported on the following workshops that she attended at the NLC: Age Friendly Communities Workshop, which she plans to suggest talking about this at the strategic planning; Public Private Partnership; Sharing, Showcasing and Presenting Data for a Health Community; and Start Ups.

Council Member Gray highlighted on the bigger workshops that she attended at the NLC: Community and Economic Development Policy and Advocacy Committee Meeting; Big Ideas for Small Cities; and Cutting Red Tape to Promote Business Growth.

Council Member Huisking reported on the following workshops that she attended while at the NLC: Let's Move Cities, Towns and Counties Award Ceremony, a part of the City's strategic plan for health and wellness; Global Economy-Local Growth; Community Champions providing people, processes, technology and funding; and the NLC 2015 Annual Business Meeting.

F. Discussion of City Manager Staff Meeting Minutes

Council Member Gray provided kudos to Ms. Yarbrough on the bicycle program which highlights the bike paths and asked if there will be safety courses provided. Ms. Yarbrough stated that staff has not discussed doing any training. The intent is that people already know how to ride; but she will consider the training.

Mr. Potucek talked about the final form of the staff minutes. There will be a monthly report that will be in depth that will follow the strategic plan. It will be much more informative.

G. Report on Recent Trips, Meetings and Future Meetings

Mayor Mueller reported that he and Mr. Potucek went to Phoenix and met with Senator Griffin to discuss passing an amendment that would take away platting and putting it on the County, running an amendment and continue to pursue this. In the next couple of weeks, he would appreciate visits from each Council Members to brief them as there are a series of meeting on Monday the 14th.

Council Member Calhoun asked about the water management meeting. Mayor Mueller explained that it was the ADWR meeting. Mr. Potucek stated that it is a meeting with the water management group on Tuesday the 15th.

Mr. Potucek noted that he plans on attending a meeting with a state-wide group; but Mr. McLachlan and he plan on attending the water management meeting. They are working at looking at washes for erosion control and expanding the scope, a Walton Family funded project.

H. Board and Commission Liaison Update

Council Member Gray announced that the Airport Commission has a vacancy and unfortunately the person that resigned was not a pilot member. The Commission would like to appoint another non-pilot member.

Council Member Calhoun announced the West End Commission's upcoming tour of the west end of town to look at what is new and what may need some work. The Commission will also look at the division.

Council Member Huisking reported that the Tourism Commission would like to go to Cananea, Sonora Mexico in January to discuss communication in order to work together.

Council Member Mount stated that the Library Advisory Commission has started working on different programs at the Library i.e. a tutoring program.

I. Future Discussion Items and Council Requests

Ms. Adams announced the December 17<sup>th</sup> special meeting at 3:00 p.m. with a work session following immediately after.

3. Adjourn

Mayor Mueller adjourned the work session at 6:53 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Frederick W. Mueller

Minutes prepared by:

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Maria G. Marsh, Deputy City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jill Adams, City Clerk