

Sierra Vista City Council
Work Session Minutes
May 24, 2016

1. Call to order – 3:23 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 – present
Council Member Gwen Calhoun – present
Council Member Rachel Gray – present
Council Member Hank Huisking – present
Council Member Craig Mount – absent (out of town on business)

Others Present:

Chuck Potucek, City Manager
Adam Thrasher, Police Chief
Ron York, Fire Chief
Sharon Flissar, Public Works Director
Victoria Yarbrough, Library and Leisure Services Director
Mat McLachlan, Community Development Director
Jill Adams, City Clerk
Judy Hector, PIO
Barbara Fleming, Human Resources Manager

2. Presentation and discussion:

- A. May 24, 2016 Council Meeting Agenda Items (agenda attached)

Item 2 City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of May 12, 2016. Council Member Gray noted that a correction needs to be made regarding Council Member Mount being absent as he was in attendance and made motions.

Item 3 Request to proceed with Fifth Street Annexation

Mr. McLachlan stated that the annexation petition encompasses eight tax parcels with six separate property owners located west of Fifth Avenue, north of Fry Boulevard in a commercial enclave designated as a proactive annexation area. The annexation area comprises approximately 1.8 acres and has an aggregate appraised value of \$529,173.

The request was initiated by Peterson Properties owner of Sierra Vista Tile. Following the public hearing scheduled for May 26th, staff will be requesting authorization to proceed with the petition. Based on a preliminary outreach staff believes that they have the requisites support the necessary to complete the process.

Council Member Calhoun asked if Peterson Properties requested the request. Mr. McLachlan stated that it was Peterson Properties. Council Member Huisking asked if that means that their properties are in the area to be annexed. Mr. McLachlan stated that there are two properties that they purchased across the street that are within the annexation area. Staff is continuing to

gather support to increase the annexation through a separate petition within that Fry commercial enclave. Right now the City has support for the eight parcels.

In response to Council Member Huisking, Mr. McLachlan stated that staff has been doing outreach over the past six months. Ms. Moore has been attempting to contact the individual property owners within the various enclaves within the City that are identified as proactive annexation areas as part of the Council's annexation policy. To-date staff has expressed support for the petition for Council; but there are other groupings of parcels that have potential interest in annexation but staff does not have the requisite number of property owners as 51 percent of the property owners are needed and 51 percent of the appraised value to be successful with the petition. There is a group that is doing the outreach spearheaded by Ms. Moore to garnish support in joining the City and once that staff has that indication of support, they will bring forward a petition for Council's authorization to proceed. After the hearing, the ballots will be mailed to the affected property owners for signature and staff will be doing follow-up for those owners that have not submitted a response. Following that, the City has one year to complete the process and staff anticipates it being done in short order based on indication of support received. This will be coming back to Council for final approval.

Mayor Mueller stated that the action for Thursday's meeting is to basically say to staff that yes, Council wants to proceed or they don't want to proceed. Mr. McLachlan agreed.

Mayor Mueller noted that once Council agrees to proceed, staff will actually go out. Mr. McLachlan stated that staff will mail out the ballots and if they don't get a response within 30 days, staff will follow-up and makes personal contact and gather the signatures that are necessary.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Mr. McLachlan stated that the process starts on Thursday and staff has up to a year for the City to secure 51 percent of the owners and 51 percent of the value.

Council Member Huisking stated that hopefully it will take less than a year. Mr. McLachlan stated that it will from the Department's preliminary indications.

Council Member Calhoun asked if staff has a plan to present to folks regarding what happens when they become a part of the City rather than what people say that could be misinformation, i.e., what occurred during the Ranchos Carmelo annexation. Mr. McLachlan stated that staff has not been making any commitments in terms of incentives with this grouping of property owners; but that is something that Council could consider for future annexations. Staff has basically been seeking preliminary interest and providing a sheet of tax value savings to those affected property owners.

Ms. Moore added that the Department has an annexation brochure that is passed out to people with all of the pros and cons by annexing into the City. Also, after the annexation passes, staff mails out a welcome packet to them regarding the services that are available to them.

Council Member Calhoun stated that by looking at the site, it looks largely commercial. Mr. McLachlan stated that there is one residential property and the rest is commercial. One space is being used by a church but it is a leased space.

Mr. Potucek stated that a lot depends on the size of the annexation. The City desires to have Fry Town site in the City and it is difficult because there are either recalcitrant owners or

owners that do not live in the area that sometimes makes it difficult. Here this is an opportunity to work directly with some property owners and the staff has been going out and speaking with them directly and it is a smaller annexation. Rancho Carmela annexation, a large scale, staff will not only hand out brochures and put out information, there are actual public meetings held in the neighborhoods to address things personally; but it is that sometimes folks just do not want annex regardless of what it shown to them.

Council Member Gray asked about the assessed value of all of the properties in the area. Mr. McLachlan stated \$529,173.

Council Member Huisking asked if there would be a liability on the City's part if the annexation goes through, i.e., street lights and sidewalks. Mr. McLachlan stated that there would not be any requirements. Mr. Potucek added that there are no commitments. Clearly, some people have now seen some of the benefits associated with annexation in the town site and the City has been able to make a number of improvements, primarily using Community Development Block Grants and an area like this would qualify for additional use of those types of funds for any improvements that may be needed; but there are no commitments on this one.

Council Member Gray asked if they are grandfathered as far as code enforcement. Mr. McLachlan stated that not in terms of property maintenance; but in terms of land use and building code requirements they are grandfathered in. Mayor Mueller added that if they are doing an action that is in accordance with the County's code and it is not allowed under the same zoning in the City, they can continue to do that because they will be grandfathered in. However, if they are doing something on their property that is not allowed in the County's code and they come into the City and it is not allowed under the City's code – it is not allowed.

Council Member Gray noted that in looking at the buildings, some of the roofs are half missing and asked if those are required to be fixed. Mr. McLachlan stated that if there is an unsafe structure, it would be dealt with through Building and Property Maintenance Code. If there is a land use that is currently allowed by the County under the General Business Zoning; but is not permitted under the General Commercial Zoning, a compatible zoning district, then it would be under a legal nonconforming status, which means that it cannot expand or if it ceases to exist for more than six months it cannot continue.

Council Member Calhoun asked if they can continue if the change owners. Mr. McLachlan stated that they can continue. It is the use itself and not the ownership.

Item 4 FY 2016 Classification and Compensation Plan

Mr. Potucek explained that annually by ordinance and as part of the budget process Council must adopt the annual Classification and Compensation Plan. Last year the City went through a whole new study, which Council adopted a new plan and it is up to the City to update that every year.

Ms. Fleming stated that last year after the Comprehensive Study, there was a recommendation the City do a two percent step increases for nonexempt employees and also a two percent salary increases for exempt and those have been included into the budget. Also in that Class and Comp was the recommendation that staff took to go through the Class and Comp positions and classified service each year and to re-evaluate and so a study on 1/3 of those positions each year. That resulted in the following changes:

- Title changes:

- Fleet Mechanic I and II to Fleet Technician I and II to bring it in more in line with the actual job duties that they do and those changes were due to a department request and in line with titles in other cities and similar organizations;
- Neighborhood Preservation Officer to become the Code Enforcement Officer due to a department request and in line with titles in other cities and similar organizations; and
- Communications and Police Records Administrator to Communications Administrator in anticipation of the Joint Communications Center.

Council Member Gray asked if the changes for the mechanic to technician due to standard practice. Mr. Potucek explained that one of the issues that the City had this year was that the City lost a number of mechanics to a private sector out of Tucson and when looking at dealers and what they call their fleet folks, they use the term technician more so than mechanic. It is a more modern title and can also help with recruitment. A couple of salary adjustments had to be made as well to get the City's employees back in line. Ms. Fleming added that the City's technicians are certified and the change to the title and grade descriptions put them more in line to where they should be.

Ms. Feminine stated that the following positions are being added:

- Contracts Administrator, a position that is coming back in the Procurement Department;
- General Maintenance Worker comprised of two part time employees that were averaging about 70 hours per week. It is a cost benefit to combine the two into one employee and it will also be easier to fill that position;
- Public Works Administrative Coordinator, not a new position it is a change to reclassify a department specialist because the department specialist in Public Works actually supervises staff of three to four secretaries;

Council Member Gray asked if there is a salary difference. Ms. Fleming stated that there is.

- Buyer II as currently the City has a senior buyer and by adding this position, the deletion of the senior buyer would be requested as in looking at other cities, senior buyers have been exempt positions because they are supervising staff and that does not mesh with Sierra Vista's plan. It was determined that buyer I and II would actually be more in line and better matches for the City. It is technically a title change and reclassification to get that in line with the job position is doing.

Council Member Gray asked if it is going from and exempt to a nonexempt. Ms. Fleming explained that it is currently nonexempt and it will stay nonexempt. When it was surveyed both years, senior buyers in other cities are exempt positions and not making them really comparable. It is being changed to buyer 1 to make it comparable. Exempt positions have certain threshold requirements under the Fair Labor Standards and the City's buyers do not supervise and it does not meet the senior buyer and this just puts it in line with others.

Mr. Potucek stated that very recently the administration has put out new threshold requirements for exempt and nonexempt employees and actually raising the minimum wage and putting more people into nonexempt status, which then requires the City to pay overtime. It does not generally affect the City because overtime is not being paid for most of the positions; but it can have an impact on the City down the road.

Council Member Gray noted that she believes that the new threshold is at \$50,000. Ms. Fleming stated that she would update Council at the end of her presentation on the issue.

- Police Records Supervisor because the title with the communications and police records administrator would go to the communications administrator with the joint communications center and it is being added in the event that the City needs to put that person in with joint use;
- Grade 212 on the nonexempt step plan because the City needs to expand the plan. When adding the two percent and new salaries that needed to be adjusted, one more level was needed.

In response to Mayor Mueller, Ms. Fleming stated that 211 is the last grade and they are looking at adding 212 at the end of it.

Council Member Gray asked Ms. Fleming to expand on her explanation. Ms. Fleming explained that there is a starting and ending on each one and 211 is the last one and the starting salary in that one does not mesh to where the City needs the starting salary to be for a group of categories classified in that.

Council Member Gray asked if Grade 212 is only for public safety. Ms. Fleming stated that it is just in the nonexempt. The City will have to do that periodically as wages shift forward and additions will have take place at the end of those and that has to do with the minimal starting that creates the new grade class.

- Grade P1 for a police recruit because one thing that was not taken into consideration last year was that the recruits are generally going to the academy and then once they come out of the academy and their field training and probationary period they get an increase and so it is pushed back one grade for the recruits that are not certified. The next column is certified officers, which corrects that technicality.

Council Member Gray asked if a step is being added at the bottom. Ms. Fleming stated that a step is being added at the bottom and then moving what is there one number up.

Council Member Gray asked what the salary would be for a P1. Ms. Fleming stated that it will be exactly what it is now and then the police officers will be moved to a P2 and the corporals to P3 and shifting everything up one. This will leave the noncertified and the recruits that are still going to the academy or under FTO in their separate category.

Mayor Mueller asked if positions are being added to the chart and not necessarily a warm body in that position. Ms. Fleming stated that no bodies are being added. This is just a category to categorize them separately from the certified officers.

In response to Council Member Calhoun, Ms. Fleming stated that these are positions being added as far as titles. These are not bodies being added. These are just reclassifications and in looking at the list, the only one she sees is the contractor administrator that is not a filled position. If the joint situation does come with the communications center, the police records supervisor change would happen and the City would then need that position back in place.

Mr. Potucek stated that the contractor officer is an added position that was previously frozen in years past. The Procurement Office is operating with three people and Ms. Wilson is working with Cochise College on a potential joint venture and with other entities. This position could potentially bring in revenue and it is not just a cost center.

Council Member Huisking asked what recruits were called before being called a P1 and P2. Ms. Fleming stated that they were an entry level officer and in the policy it states that after they

complete certification they receive a 5 percent increase; but if there is an officer that starts at Level 1 and a recruit at Level 1 and they get a 5 percent increase that would put them above existing officers that created an issue. This corrects that situation.

Council Member Gray asked if the Public Works administrator coordinator position exempt or nonexempt. Ms. Fleming stated that those are nonexempt position and subject to over time.

Ms. Fleming stated that being deleted off the Comp and Class Schedule are the following:

- Director of Transpiration and Environmental Services as Public Works is no longer going in that direction;
- Senior Buyer as it did not mesh and a buyer ii will be added;
- Fire Battalion Chief in Grade F5 in the nonexempt step plan only as that position is currently on both, the nonexempt and exempt. It will be deleted off the nonexempt and all those positions will be exempt.

Ms. Fleming stated that reclassifications include the Fleet technicians as many were lost to private industry offering higher wages. The Department went out and did salary surveys with other cities and found that many had made adjustments. The City was no longer in line and the Department is requesting to reclassify the fleet technician I to a Grade 206, which would be an increase, the fleet technician II to a Grade 207, which is also an increase. Other reclassifications being requested (all nonexempt positions and are all based upon the Class and Comp Study done this year that are out of line):

- Buyer II to Grade 208;
- IT Network Administrator I to Grade 211;
- IT Systems Administrator I to Grade 211;
- IT Network Administrator II Grade 212; and
- IT Systems Administrator II Grade 212.

Council Member Gray asked about the current grades. Ms. Fleming stated that fleet technicians are going up one grade, the buyer II is going up two grades, the IT administrators are going up to a grade 211 and the IT network administrators are going up to 212. Grade 212 is being added because the minimum was 211.

Mr. Potucek stated that he felt that the IT positions were not classified quite correctly last year under the study and the IT staff board that out. He also stated that he had told Mr. Rubio and staff that it would be corrected this year as a lot of IT professionals end up in situations where they have to work over time. Although they are professional positions they are not exempt because under the Fair Labor Standards Act it is not allowed to make them exempt.

Ms. Fleming stated that the City does not make the minimum requirements for a computer exemption and staff looked at the job descriptions and redid the job description questionnaires and job evaluation for management for all of the IT staff this year, which came back stating that undoubtedly these needed to be increased.

In response to Council Member Calhoun, Ms. Fleming explained how the job description questionnaires and job evaluation for management tools are utilized in not just comparing titles; but duties as well for the actual compensation.

Council Member Huisking asked what was done with all of the mechanics that left. Ms. Fleming stated that all have been hired but one. Mr. Potucek added that the City lost three mechanics to the private sector for higher pay and had to make some adjustments to the staff that remained behind and then recruited based on those adjustments, filled all except one. The

adjustments should help to retain the employees in the future and keep the City more in line with the market.

Ms. Fleming stated that she thinks that it will also help with attraction because the reclassification starts them at higher wage and it will help with recruitment.

Ms. Fleming stated that the following reclassifications are being requested due to the 2017 salary survey that was just done based off of the information on competitive wages:

- Wastewater Supervisor to Grade 101 on the exempt pay plan;
- IT Senior Network Administrator to Grade 103, exempt IT position versus a nonexempt;
- IT Senior Systems Administrator to Grade 103; and
- IT Database Administrator to Grade 103.

Ms. Fleming stated that the chief financial officer was on last year's plan per the study to be moved to a Grade II on the exempt pay plan, which was not implemented last year.

Ms. Fleming stated that recommended are increases to the exempt pay range for Grade F5 for the fire marshal and fire battalion chief, which are fairly new positions that have been looked at in the exempt and nonexempt categories because it varies under the Fair Labor Standards if they are doing shift work. These positions are comparable with other cities.

Council Member Gray asked if the positions were comparable to nonexempt. Ms. Fleming stated that the City had them as nonexempt and exempt; but when the study came back, it noted that the City's compare to the exempt market. At the same time the City needs to realign the pay to support that.

Council Member Gray asked if Grade 1 is the exempt and Grade 200 the nonexempt. Ms. Fleming stated that is correct.

Ms. Fleming stated that the last changes are the pay increases for the police officers in moving them to a Grade 2 as Grade 1 is being left for the noncertified; but for the police officers, it is recommended to shift that grade up \$2,000 from the starting grade to become market competitive. This was heavily surveyed and it was found that the City is \$2,000 annually under what the City needs to be. It would be the same thing with the corporals and they are being shifted from the starting \$47,000 to \$49,000. Also surveyed were the sergeants, which also require a change and it would be from the starting \$66,000 range to the \$72,000 range. The firefighter/EMTs also need to be moved up as it starts at \$40,192 to \$42,277. All of these would be necessary to remain market competitive.

Council Member Calhoun asked how often surveys and adjustments take place. Ms. Fleming stated that the City had the big comprehensive Class and Comp Plan done last year and in that it was recommended that the City do 1/3 every year and that every 6th year the City have a comprehensive. A minimum of 1/3 will go out for a minimum of 1/3 each year and those will be re-evaluated in the equivalence in the same classification. Each group should cycle through once every three years followed by a comprehensive and then it would come before Council.

Council Member Ash asked what happens to somebody that was hired at step one; but now the plan states that the person should have been at a P1 making less money. Mayor Mueller asked if she is talking about when the person gets promoted. Ms. Fleming stated that she does not believe that there will be anyone in that situation with the change to the P2. The Department does look at each one of those and adjust if necessary if someone were to fall into that.

Mayor Mueller stated that Ms. Fleming mentioned that when a recruit comes in and later gets his/her five percent has been solved so that the recruit is not making more than the person that was a P1. Ms. Fleming stated that it was removed.

Mayor Mueller asked if the person that used to be a P1 and is now a P2 get any back pay. Ms. Fleming stated that no because there was no one that fell into that situation during the recruit time. The ones that were recruited prior to the change being made were taken care of and readjusted and it will be looked at again. There should not have been anybody falling into that situation because the new recruits that came in after the Class and Comp Plan was approved did not get the five percent. It seemed to make sense and it is a common thing that they don't make as much as a certified officer when going through the Academy and doing their FTO. Once they finish with that process, they would move into the next category as a certified officer.

Mr. Potucek stated that if they had not done this, it could have created that situation where there would have been compression at the lower end of the pay scale.

Council Member Huisking asked how departments are selected for review. Ms. Fleming explained that this past year the Department had a list derived from changes that were not made from the original, the first year to move forward to be re-evaluated this year. The second list became the ones that there were some concerns with and have the Department look at the jobs and responsibilities, i.e., IT employees. The next areas were the areas with turnovers and recruitment issues and clearly see movement within the State and that is most of the public safety officers. There was seen in the State large movement with public safety wages. The Department looked at anything that had significant job description change or duties that needed to be re-evaluated. The Department makes sure to hit one or more in every classification grade.

Council Member Gray asked about the budget appropriation. Ms. Fleming stated that it is under \$30 Million and it is the full amount, which includes salaries in full and the burden that goes with those salaries.

Council Member Calhoun asked if that figure includes the add on positions. Ms. Fleming stated that it does and it is budgeted with the recommendations.

Council Member Calhoun asked if some of those positions are expected to be filled. Mayor Mueller stated that some of those positions are already filled. Ms. Fleming stated that the adds are generally positions that are being changed the title to; but the contractor administrator has been frozen for many years and when the comprehensive was done, that position did not exist. It is now being added it back in and it has been budgeted.

Council Member Calhoun asked if these are bodies or names. Mr. Potucek explained that some positions, i.e., contractor administrator does not exist and has been added and budgeted in full. There are other positions, i.e., the two fire fighters that did not make the budget last year and were cut that have been restored and there are no people in those positions; but they are in the budget and budgeted in full. There is also the add of the records, split of the records and police communications and it is also budgeted.

Mayor Mueller stated that Council needs to understand that for the class comp study, it is actually a list of authorized positions and their associated costs. That is all that is being changed through the proposed action. The rest of the budget will tell whether the two fire

fighters, contract, officer and ect. that will actually put a person next to that authorization. Mr. Potucek stated that it has to be funded and the only way that it can be funded is if Council approves them in the budget process. If Council disagrees with some of those positions and the consensus of Council is to remove or add, then staff will need to change the budget accordingly.

Council Member Calhoun stated that what she is trying to clarify is if those added positions are a part of the \$30 Million and a part of the budget. Mr. Potucek stated that they are part of the \$30 Million currently.

Council Member Calhoun asked if it is expected to fill those seven positions. Mr. Potucek stated that yes at some point during the course of the year; but the larger issue is how personnel is budgeted. Personnel cost is budgeted at 100 percent for all positions every year and that gives them more flexibility in the budget. It is not anticipated that all positions will be filled during the year; but this covers at the highest level of contingency and gives flexibility. This year many positions were not filled in the course of the year and most of the fund balance that is being generated this year, revenues in excess of expenditures, is coming as a result of unfilled positions and have always had that philosophy.

Council Member Gray stated that there is a lot of talk about health benefits and noted that it would be helpful for Council to hear that presentation. Ms. Fleming stated that the Department had their Employee Health Trust Meeting and went over that with the Board; but the presentation can be made to Council. Mr. Potucek added that there were some eight or nine presentations to the employees.

Ms. Fleming announced that on May 18th the long, anticipated and unknown Fair Labor Standards Act was passed and it is the most significant development in wage law that she has ever seen in her career. The minimum salary for exempt employees is currently at \$23,660. All employers have to comply on December 1, 2016 with the new wage, which is now \$47,476. This is more than a 100 percent increase and it will increase every three years.

When the City did the Class and Comp last year, the Department fully anticipated that there was going to be a change and anticipated that it was going to hit somewhere in the mid 40's. It hit higher; but the City is good. The exempt pay plan, which is what this would affect starts with Grade 100 for a minimum of \$51,446; therefore the City does not anticipate any issues. The Department will do a 100 percent audit between now and December 1st to make sure that the City is in full compliance.

The \$47,476 exceeds the minimum in both New York and California, which are the two highest states for minimum wage. New York is at approximately \$35,000 and California is at \$42,000. The federal jumped up to \$47,476. Effective December 1st it will move from \$100,000 to \$134,000, another significant jump. The Fair Labor Standards Act is the largest piece of legislation that exists in the federal government.

Council Member Calhoun asked if the City's minimum for exempt is at \$51,000. Ms. Fleming stated that is correct. Council Member Calhoun also asked about the \$47,476. Ms. Fleming stated that \$47,476 is the minimum federal law will allow. Council Member Calhoun asked if the City is still underpaying. Mr. Potucek stated that he thinks that those are two different subjects. The Fair Labor Standards Act is setting a new minimum wage for employees that are subject to overtime. The class and comp compares wages with the market and then it can be determined which positions are below market using the survey. The City's class and comp is covered under the new Fair Labor Standards Act requirements.

Ms. Fleming stated that this was discussed heavily last year with regard to the City's Grade 100 as to whether it would be in compliance. The Department was not sure until this happened or when this was going to pass; but the good news is that the City is in good shape and changes will not need to be made.

Council Member Ash asked if the City is fair. Ms. Fleming stated that absolutely. Mayor Mueller stated that according to California and New York. Mr. Potucek added that the City is legal.

Item 5 Joint Memorandum Of Understanding with Cochise County for a joint communications center

Police Chief Thrasher stated that the memorandum of understanding was discussed during a joint work session with the Board of Supervisors regarding the joint communications. This basically outlines the process that will be gone through as the City moves forward with that center. Mr. Potucek added that there were no changes.

Item 6 Appoints to the Arts & Humanities Commission – not discussed.

Item 7 Federal Transportation Administration document

Ms. Flissar stated that this is the first step in the annual process required for the City to secure grant funding for the transit system through the Federal Transit Administration 5307 Program. The city attorney is required to file certifications and assurances with the Federal Transit Administration stating that the City has and will continue to comply with the requirements of the 5307 Program. The certifications are required prior to the next grant award and the proposed agenda item will give the city attorney the authority to file those certifications and assurances on behalf of the City.

Council Member Huisking asked if this has to go on every year. Ms. Flissar stated that yes; this must go on every year.

Item 8 Property at 366 McAbee

Mr. MacLauchlan stated that the property was subject to code enforcement for a number of years. The former owner is deceased and he bequeaths the property to an Indian Tribe. The Department made contact with the Attorney General's Office who represents that Indian Tribe and informed them of the violations, i.e., the burnt out trailer that has existed for a number of years. The Department secured the property with fencing and over the course of that period; the Department has incurred \$3,600 in expense to secure the property. The Department propositioned the attorney to quit claim the lot to the City where the City can process ownership and cure the violation. There is a contractor lined up to abate, demolish and remove the existing trailer. It is an 80' x 70' lot zoned General Commercial. The Department does not have definitive plans for whoever thinks that it is conducive for housing or some other commercial use. The proposed action is for Council to accept the property and the Department would record the quit claim deed.

Mr. Potucek added that it would be a zero cost proposition in terms of getting the deed and then the City would work with IDA or nonprofit in the community to see how that property could be best used in the future.

Mayor Mueller stated that he drove by the property the other day and it is a burned out property and it is fenced off so that kids can't get in there; but based on the piles of stuff, it is an attraction for vermin and the sooner it can be cleaned up the better. He also believes that the City can probably recoup the cost whether the City donates it or sells the property to an organization and this is a good step to get a problem property taken care of.

Council Member Huisking asked if the Tribe did not know that they owned the property. Mr. McLachlan stated that they do and they held a hearing and passed a resolution that went along with the quit claim deed expressly conveying the property to the City. Mr. Potucek stated that there has been number of meetings between staff and the Tribe to negotiate this and the Tribe came to the realization that this was in their best interest to work on it this way. There has been a lot of effort put into it.

Council Member Huisking asked about the cleanup cost. Mr. McLachlan stated that a bid from RDI has been received for \$5,600 and there will also be an abatement test at \$350. Council Member Huisking stated that it sounds reasonable. Mr. McLachlan stated that it is in line with others. Mayor Mueller added that if she were to see what is on the lot, then it is reasonable.

B. Discussion of Council Executive Report (attached)

Council Member Huisking commented that she was reading on the top five violations in the Police Department and those are ones that the City will have forever more; but she was wondering about the process that the Department has to educate the public so that they understand and be more mindful. Police Chief Thrasher stated that a part of that are public service announcements, articles, announcement in the paper and a lot of it is during enforcement – talking to the individual while they are pulled over for particular violations and explaining to them why they are being given a ticket or warning. Most of it is through the paper and announcement about what are causes of accidents. The majority of these are inattention and following too close. Rear-end accidents are the highest and that is the failure to control speed.

Council Member Huisking asked about the methods. Police Chief Thrasher stated that in the past since he has been with the Police Department, there has always been a performance goal for police officers to make 22 traffic stops in a month and what happened during those stops was up to the officer as to whether they gave a verbal, written warning or a citation. It was discovered during that time that towards the end of the month, guys would sit in what is called watering holes to try and get their numbers. The department no longer requires those 22 traffic stops during the month and the stops are now evaluated based on the quality of the stops; but they still have their own discretion to decide whether or not they issue a citation. The Department wants them to work in the locations where the accidents are occurring and for those particular violations that are causing the most accidents.

Council Member Huisking stated that she appreciates that move and it would make a lot of sense to citizens and it feels like a fairer situation.

Council Member Calhoun asked how the quality of the stops will be measured. Police Chief Thrasher stated that the supervisors evaluate what they are stopping people for based on the call cards. The sergeants are evaluating where they are stopping people and what they are being cited for, even if they just give a verbal warning.

Council Member Calhoun asked if education is a part of a verbal warning. Police Chief Thrasher stated that they are instructed to use their judgment and provided an example of a situation.

Council Member Huisking asked for an update on the CARE Program. Fire Chief York stated that the Department had visions of the program working out immediately; but education has to take place in the medical community. Staff has had to get into doctors' office due to turnover at the hospital and it is all an educational process. Out of the patients that they have seen, two were readmitted and that is a tremendous success for the hospital - baby steps. The hospital is starting to see the value. It started slowly with the hospital and so the Department started doing field inspections. The numbers are not huge and the Department is doing this with staff that is on duty and when there are patients, the Department has to pay for over time.

Council Member Calhoun made the comment that the explanation is helpful and the Department is spot on regarding education. She will continue to talk about it in the community. Fire Chief York added that they have gone out to service groups and done presentations.

Council Member Huisking stated that she is impressed with Community Development Department and its 13-day average for compliance. Mr. McLachlan attributed it to direct communication. Council Member Calhoun stated that she has spoken to folks and the public is responding to that.

Council Member Huisking stated that she would be unable to attend the Business Walk Event on June 16th and asked if other Council Member(s) would attend. Council Member Gray stated that she would be able to attend.

Council Member Huisking asked about the west end and the millennium engagement. Mayor Muller explained that it is being headed by Ms. McFarland.

C. Discussion of Tasking to Review Boards and Commissions

Mayor Mueller stated that Ms. Jacobs provided parameters in the packets; but there are no deliverables.

Council Member Calhoun stated that she would like guidelines to be followed by each commission, i.e. fund raising as not everyone knows about it. It is important that all commissions know what they can and cannot do.

Mayor Mueller indicated that it is not about what the Citizens Advisory Commission (CAC) says, it is about current policy and that is a staff function. He also stated that he does not have a problem with Item A; but Item B is something that was discussed and Council needs to figure out. This may be something that is considered during deliberations and it is up to Council.

Mayor Mueller stated that a number of years Council discussed having the commissions review applications and make recommendations; but it looks like the commissions are appointing their own members and that is a procedural manner that Council needs to discuss. Written material and training are things that Council should be dictating, i.e., open meeting law and fund raising. The CAC does not take care of that.

Mayor Mueller added that he would really like to see recommendations by the CAC that say:

- Commission needs to remain;
- Commission needs to change their mission;

- Commission needs to blend with another commission;
- Commission needs to become an advisory committee to a particular staff department, i.e., Public Works or the Library (those should be like the Transportation Advisory Committee); and
- Commission needs be terminated if there is no need for it.

Council Member Calhoun concurred and added that the CAC folks should attend one or two of the meetings and look at the last annual reports before talking with commission members and analyzing the paperwork.

Mayor Mueller stated that if he were a CAC member, which he used to be, he would look at it as a year's work and as people help out, he would narrow it out. It will be six to eight months of work to categorize the five recommendations.

Council Member Huisking stated that Council does not have anything to look at. Mayor Mueller stated that he would like to get with Ms. Jacobs and rewrite Paragraph A to include deliverables and have the CAC come back to Council sometime in November. He will ask Ms. Jacobs for another write up with different forms of tasking for Council to look at.

Council Member Huisking asked if this could be looked at in phases. Mayor Mueller stated that grouping of commissions can be done; but there needs to be a proposal with flexibility so that they can plan the work.

Council Member Calhoun asked how the communication will take place so that the commissions bring things to Council.

Council Member Calhoun asked about fund raising. Mayor Mueller stated that it needs to be made clear to the commission and staff can make sure that commissioners are being trained.

Council Member Calhoun indicated that one piece was finance and the other was the relationship with staff and department. They have two people sitting at commission meetings.

Ms. Adams stated that the overall procedures do not address operating guidelines for commissions.

Council Member Ash stated that she sees both positives and drawbacks of using the CAC and she feels like using an outside organization is good so that it can be objective. The CAC is more reflective of Council's comments and it will be difficult for CAC members to gain a full understanding of the work that the commissions do. It seems cumbersome; but getting the chairpersons together regarding training and etc. might be an option Mayor Mueller stated that the CAC can probably get them all in the same room and have a discussion.

Council Member Huisking stated that it is a good idea for them to meet. Council Member Calhoun noted that the Cultural Diversity is having another meet and greet and plans to invite the CAC to start developing a relationship and to start lobbying.

Council Member Huisking stated that she would like to get feedback and that her plan is procedural, starting from the bottom on up; but Mayor Mueller's plan is from the top to the bottom. Mayor Mueller stated that it could be included in the procedural handbook.

Council Member Gray noted that CAC should not review itself. Mayor Mueller stated that CAC should not be on the list. Council Member Gray suggested a taskforce. Mayor Mueller

explained that the CAC works like a taskforce. Council Member Calhoun asked what the concern is with using the CAC. Council Member Gray stated that it is a steep learning curve and suggested a taskforce comprised of two council members, staff and commissioners. Mayor Mueller noted that there was no consensus.

Council Member Gray stated that Council is asking the CAC to do a long complicated tasking. Council Member Huisking stated that it can be done in chunks and the meetings are open to the public. Council Member Gray noted that by doing it in chunks, they will not be getting the whole picture.

Mayor Mueller noted that he will take the comments back to Ms. Jacobs and request a handbook for commissions to include financial and support roles. The rewrite will include the added deliverables discussed.

D. Report on Recent Trips, Meetings and Future Meetings

Council Member Huisking reported on the State Sister Cities Conference in Fountain Hills. She also stated that Sierra Vista will be hosting the next conference on October 2017.

Council Member Huisking stated that she talked to the Mayor about a trip to Cananea, Sonora Mexico during the month of September and asked if Council should invite Cananea to the July 4th festivities along with a picnic for the fireworks; but noted that the Sister Cities Commission cannot pay for the picnic and asked for suggestions on how to pay for it. Council Member Calhoun suggested a potluck.

E. Future Discussion Items and Council Requests

Ms. Fleming will brief Council at a work session on employee health care costs as requested by Council Members.

Ms. Jacobs will get back to Council regarding review of the boards and commissions.

Council Member Calhoun announced the next Council Meet and Greet scheduled for June 15, 2016 at the Library at 4:30 p.m.

3. Adjourn

Mayor Mueller adjourned the work session at 5:06 p.m.

Mayor Frederick W. Mueller

Minutes prepared by:

Attest:

Maria G. Marsh, Deputy City Clerk

Jill Adams, City Clerk