



**MINUTES FOR THE
GLENDALE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SESSION
Council Chambers
5850 West Glendale Avenue
March 18, 2014
1:30 p.m.**

PRESENT: Mayor Jerry P. Weiers, Vice Mayor Yvonne J. Knaack and Councilmembers Norma S. Alvarez, Ian Hugh, Manuel D. Martinez, Gary D. Sherwood, and Samuel U. Chavira

ALSO PRESENT: Brenda Fischer, City Manager; Julie Frisoni, Assistant City Manager; Jennifer Campbell, Assistant City Manager; Michael Bailey, City Attorney; and Pamela Hanna, City Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

WORKSHOP SESSION

1. PALM CANYON PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT
PRESENTED BY: Jon M. Froke, AICP, Planning Director

This is a request for City Council to discuss and provide guidance on the applicant's proposal to amend the Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to allow two new static billboards at the Palm Canyon Business Park. The property is designated as Office (OFC) in the North Valley Specific Area Plan (NVSAP), which acts as the General Plan for this area of the city.

The Rose Law Group, representing Becker Boards, has filed a Rezoning Application on .17 acres. The site is part of the larger 26.1 acre Palm Canyon Business Park. The request is to amend the existing PAD (Planned Area Development) zoning district to allow two externally illuminated static billboards. The property is located at the northwest corner of Bell Road and Loop 101.

The applicant proposes to amend the permitted land uses for the Palm Canyon Business Park PAD to allow two static billboards on the vacant property (refer to the attached map and site plan). The proposed height of each billboard is 85 feet.

Two sign faces with a maximum sign area of 672 square feet each are proposed on the north billboard. The faces would be oriented toward the north and southbound lanes of the Loop 101. The south billboard, closest to Bell Road, is proposed to have three faces. The two oriented toward the Loop 101 would have a maximum sign area of 672 square feet. One sign face would be oriented to the west, toward Bell Road, and would have a maximum sign area of 420 square feet (refer to the attached sign elevations).

Mr. Froke provided an overview of this item. He said the initial PAD for Palm Canyon was approved in 2007. It was planned as a 2 story office building. He said nothing has happened on this property and the site remains vacant. Mr. Froke provided the history of approval of the North Valley Plan. He said the applicant is Rose Law Group and they represent Becker Boards. He said the request is to amend the existing PAD from 2007 to allow externally illuminated static billboards, proposed at 85 feet in height. He showed a map of where the signs would be located on the west side of the Loop 101. He said this case was presented to the Planning Commission in February and said there is newer commercial development in that area as well. He provided some information about static billboards and said they are regulated by the zoning ordinance. The billboards are primarily placed in commercial or industrial areas away from residential areas. They are permitted in the M-1 and M-2 zoning districts. He said sign standards can be established in a PAD subject to Council approval. Static billboards are most commonly found on Grand Avenue, Bethany Home Road, Camelback Road, Glendale Avenue and 67th Avenue. He said the zoning ordinance has changed over time, so some signs are considered non-conforming. Mr. Froke provided the zoning ordinance standards for the billboards.

Mr. Froke said after the Planning Commission, the applicant provided additional documentation that provides distance between Loop 101 and the Palm Canyon site. Mr. Froke explained each billboard will only have one column. He provided examples of how the billboards would look. Mr. Froke said the Planning Commission recommended denial of the application at the public hearing in February. Staff is seeking guidance from Council in advance of the voting meeting next week.

Councilmember Martinez said the same information was presented previously at a workshop and asked what is different in the staff report this time. He said he couldn't find any substantive difference.

Mr. Froke said there has been a lot of discussion with the applicant and we were able to clarify some of the materials contained in the original staff report.

Councilmember Martinez asked if there was anything substantive that would stand out.

Mr. Froke said there was mostly clarification.

Councilmember Chavira asked Mr. Froke if his recommendation has changed.

Mr. Froke said the staff recommendation stands. He said if Council has some other ideas on how to make the application work, he would appreciate any comments.

Councilmember Chavira said he appreciated the comments from everyone. He said discrepancies were brought up before and he wanted to make sure if there were any inconsistencies or information that had been omitted, that information was provided.

Mr. Froke said there has been a lot of dialogue between the applicant and city staff since February and information continues to come in from all sides.

Councilmember Alvarez said the only thing she read is there is no commitment from the City of Peoria that they are not going to put up billboards. She said either way, if they vote against them; Peoria is making arrangements to have the signs in their city. She said it was very clear in the newspaper article that Peoria has made no promises. She asked Mr. Froke if he was aware of that.

Mr. Froke said Peoria has been engaged in the application. He believed the city of Peoria may be speaking at the voting meeting next week. He did not wish to speak on behalf of Peoria.

Councilmember Alvarez said she was concerned because it was her impression from what she has read that Peoria was leading up to getting billboards in their city. She said there is no commitment from Peoria other than they are supporting Arrowhead. She said if they are going to support Arrowhead, why they are having meetings of their own to put the billboards in the same area. She respected Arrowhead residents' desire not to have billboards, and said citizens didn't want billboards in her district either. She said if Peoria is already making arrangements, they should check up on that. She said she resented the billboards her district has.

Councilmember Martinez said that Peoria has gone on record that they have no plans for billboards. He said they wrote a letter to Glendale they had no plans. He said Peoria wants to work with Glendale to model Glendale's ordinance. He said he looks forward to this. He said with respect to the other signs in the city, the one thing this would do is open the flood gates. He asked Mr. Froke to comment on that.

Mr. Froke said he will reach out to his counterpart in Peoria prior to next week's evening meeting to find out what the latest news is. He said that P83 is Peoria's sports and entertainment district. He said with respect to Centerline, the geographic area of 43rd to 67th Avenue on Glendale, there are a couple of PADs not far from this building that have been in existence pre-recession and none of those sites would allow billboards.

Councilmember Martinez asked if there were other PADs that were possibilities.

Mr. Froke said the closest one would be Manistee Ranch. He said that was approved in about 1995. He said that is primarily residential, commercial and a historic district. He said that PAD would not entertain billboards.

Councilmember Sherwood asked Mr. Froke to explain NVAASP, as he was a little confused on that. He said it was superseded by a PAD back in 2007 where there were no stipulations on billboards. He said there was a lot of conversation about this in the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Froke used an exhibit to explain the north valley specific area plan. He said this acts as the general plan for this geographic area. He said they implement the general plan by zoning and there were a couple of zoning actions taken. He said the first was in 1989 when the North Valley Plan was adopted. He explained the position of the mall itself and the commercial development around it. He showed where the Palm Canyon PAD was that was done in 2007. He said there were stipulations from 1989 because the North Valley Plan sign standards do not speak to billboards.

Councilmember Sherwood asked if that was mostly for building signs.

Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Sherwood said he was looking at the February 6th information that the Planning Commission had under the analysis. He said the NVSAP did not address billboards as specific to business signage.

Mr. Froke said it does not say they are allowed or not allowed.

Councilmember Sherwood said there was no mention of it. He said the approval of the PAD in 1989 stipulated the removal of existing billboards on any parcel and he believed those were all taken down when Arrowhead Towne Center was developed.

Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Sherwood said there was some discussion of the static billboards, to get rid of the old ones. He said he went back a long way on this from his days on the Planning Commission when they were trying to do a comprehensive plan on digital billboards. He said that never did get passed. He said back in 2012, Council passed the sports and entertainment district portion of that. He said never having gotten passed the Planning Commission; he said they were deficient in not having a more comprehensive plan for the Loop 303, Loop 101, Grand Avenue, and Northern Parkway. He said the concern he has heard is the proliferation of billboards, the city needed a comprehensive plan. He said he would have stated for that three mile section, it would have been a pure request. He said not very many spots of that three mile section would not interfere with neighborhoods. He said in this particular location, he did not see that. He said he was not a fan of static boards. He said if Council had some policy rationale that said they were not supportive of placing any billboards on the Loop 101 across from Arrowhead Ranch community. He said that is where most of the concern is coming from. He also said he has received a lot of calls in his district as well. He said constituents do not want to see a proliferation of billboards along the freeways. He said eventually the Council will come up with some plan to deal with the Loop 303 and Northern Parkway.

Councilmember Sherwood said he has attended the Peoria meetings and he felt they are going to go forward with this. He said they made a presentation for the P83 and they stipulated right now no digital billboards until such ordinance exists. He said he attended one meeting where they showed five billboards and one of them was in the location they were discussing at today's meeting. He said Peoria is in opposition to these particular billboards with the Arrowhead Ranch community. He said if they took a poll on this, most people would not even weigh in on it. He said this is not affecting property values and is not affecting any Glendale residents or even Peoria residents. He said if Glendale could come up with a policy statement saying they wouldn't go any further north, and no one on the Council is supporting putting billboards next to residential areas. He said the boards being discussed today are in a commercial area and he would like to see the city have that policy. It would alleviate the concerns of those opposed to this issue.

Councilmember Martinez said they do have a policy with the ordinance that was passed that made it very clear there would be no digital billboards north of Northern to 51st Avenue. He said residents don't want digital billboards. He said he didn't know what makes static billboards more appealing. He said the billboards would be visible and would be blight on the community. He said it is clear the residents don't want them. He said this was a grass roots effort where citizens got their neighbors to sign petitions opposing this. He said it has been very clear the residents do not want the billboards. He said they need to remember as elected officials, it is the constituents that put them in office and they represent the constituents and what they want. He said it is clear the neighborhoods and some businesses do not want the signs. He said reference Councilmember Sherwood's comments about the 303 and Northern Parkway that issue will be taken up as part of the general plan steering committee. It is very clear the neighborhoods do not want the signs.

Vice Mayor Knaack said they are here at the workshop today because there were questions at the voting meeting. She said the other Councilmembers wanted to be vetted before a vote was taken. She said in the February 6th Planning Staff Report to the Planning Commission, there were about 13 inconsistencies. She asked if any of those were substantiated and needed to be vetted today.

Mr. Froke said those 8 days after the Planning Commission meeting, Ms. Rose emailed Mr. Froke with a list of annotations. He said they went through each of the 13 annotations, some of them referenced as mistakes. He said they have spent many hours reviewing that, including time with the applicant, going over those. He said he did not think there was anything substantive or problematic. He was not going to bring up the 1989 case, but did so to provide context of what the history of the zoning was for the property. He said applicant left the meetings feeling like they had gone through each of the annotations and comments. He said the staff report for the voting meeting will be written to clarify the February 6th Planning Commission report. He said part of the problem is the record keeps changing with the additional information that keeps coming in. He said they have tried to keep up with that as best they could.

Vice Mayor Knaack said the reason they are here today is because of those questions. She wanted to make sure they were considered, vetted and they have done what was asked.

Mr. Froke said many hours were spent on this and they have vetted each one of them.

Vice Mayor Knaack asked Mr. Duensing about addressing any revenue?

Mr. Duensing said he previously sent the revenue information, but did not have it with him. He said he can provide that to Council prior to next week's voting meeting.

Councilmember Martinez said with respect to that question, the tax rate is 2.9 percent and he believed there was another five-tenths.

Mr. Duensing said the lease revenue if this sits on commercial property is 2.9 percent and it is taxable for advertising revenue depending on the amount of the advertising revenue that comes in.

Councilmember Sherwood said the email said it was 2.9 percent with an additional county tax of a half percent.

Vice Mayor Knaack read out of the workshop book, “with the adoption of the city’s design review in 1983, the community, the City Council, the Planning Commission and the city’s development team, has focused on creating and maintaining a reputation for quality development. This consistent focus has created the distinguished and recognized level of quality associated with both Glendale’s aesthetic appearance and unique character in the west valley.” She said billboards are definitely not the aesthetic appearance they want in Glendale. She said the Planning Commission voted 6-0 in opposition. She said they will be addressing the 303 for billboard issues with the general plan. She is still in opposition to the billboards.

Councilmember Alvarez said she agreed with Councilmember Martinez that we should respect the input of the constituents and neighborhoods, and that has not been done in the past. She hoped it will be fair from now on. She said Ocotillo has the old billboards and no one thinks there is anything wrong with that. She admired Arrowhead for speaking out and she wished the other districts would do the same. She encouraged residents to worry about the state the city is in now. Councilmember Alvarez said when there was discussion about billboards for Westgate, comments were made from Councilmember Martinez that billboards lowered property value. She asked Mr. Froke if that was correct.

Mr. Froke said the Westgate PAD was approved by a prior Council. He said he would prefer not to comment on property values. He said the applicant may be better able to address that at the voting meeting.

Councilmember Alvarez said residents are very concerned about property values and they should look into that. She said Arrowhead needs to look into the Peoria issue. She said if they don’t do anything and right across the street they get billboards, it would be like they did not do anything.

Councilmember Chavira said he is not anti-billboards. He favored the digital more than the static. He said when Councilmember Sherwood spoke about the 4 to 3 vote last Fall, he was part of the 3 votes. He said they were asking to revise the current policy. He also agreed with Councilmember Alvarez that there needs to be a fair and balanced policy, which needs to incorporate the whole city. He said the entertainment district is in the Yucca District and it is important for the Council to think ahead and include policies that include the billboard issue.

Mayor Weiers said Mr. Becker’s original request was a regular digital billboard and he said he was willing to go back to static.

Councilmember Hugh wanted a clarification of what Councilmember Alvarez was asking for.

Ms. Fischer asked Councilmember Alvarez what type of report she was asking for.

Councilmember Alvarez said she just got an email from Ms. Fischer that she needed to get permission from the rest of the Council.

Ms. Fischer said in an open meeting, she is able to request information from staff.

Councilmember Alvarez said she would send Ms. Fischer what she was asking for.

Ms. Fischer said this item was already on the agenda for a voting meeting next week.

2. COUNCIL ITEM OF INTEREST: UPDATE ON POSSIBLE ARCHERY RANGE AT HEROES REGIONAL PARK

PRESENTED BY: Erik Strunk, Executive Director, Parks, Recreation and Library Services, and Chris Gallagher, Recreation Manager

This is a follow-up item to an October 15, 2013 Council Item of Interest and will provide the City Council with an update regarding the possible construction of a temporary archery range at Glendale Heroes Regional Park.

Mr. Strunk said Council asked for a calculation of costs to install a soccer field, the ongoing OIM costs, cost estimates of a green up of the southwest portion of the park and ongoing cost estimates and costs with regard to an archery range. After discussion, Council expressed interest in the archery concept and to see if the public was interested in this concept. Mr. Strunk spoke with the Parks and Recreation Commission twice and sent out notices to the general public in the area. He said 81 individuals showed up to two meetings. At the meetings, there were a lot of questions about archery and how the concept would work. He said they informed everyone they were working with several partners as experts to assist with the open meeting. The second meeting included live demonstrations and the comments they received were overwhelmingly in support of moving forward with the archery concept. He said they will continue with this project if they are able to continue to substantiate community interest because they cannot do this themselves and need community support. He also said they do not have the staff resources at this time to manage this type of facility. He said they would issue a RFP calling for the ongoing management of the facility. He also said they would like to give this project a deadline of July 2015 to get the partners in line to see if this would work. He said the proposed location of this archery range would be temporary in nature as its proposed location is on a baseball field. He said they would emphasize that in the planning process. He emphasized they do not have the financial means to construct or operate the facility at this time.

Mayor Weiers said Game & Fish seemed like they were very optimistic that funding was available.

Mr. Strunk said they have a grants program that they would be interested in funding this program.

Vice Mayor Knaack asked the cost of this.

Mr. Strunk said the anticipated cost is about \$50,000 and an ongoing cost at about \$5,000 a year. He said he would ask the community for assistance with this ongoing cost. He said this is a very common practice.

Vice Mayor Knaack asked about the time involved in staff creating a business plan. She asked if the department was able to take on that additional duty.

Mr. Strunk said they can handle this duty as they are currently staffed, but he would need to designate a point person in charge of the project

Vice Mayor Knaack said 81 people showing up is a very good turnout.

Councilmember Chavira said he was approached by citizens with ideas on how to use the park space. He said the Mayor was a big help in developing this idea. He said he was working hard to seek out the private partners to make this project happen.

Mayor Weiers said there was a consensus to move forward on this item.

3. DISCUSSION AND UPDATE RELATED TO PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 91ST AND NORTHERN AVENUES AND THE TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION APPLICATION FOR TRANSFER OF THE LAND INTO TRUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION

PRESENTED BY: Michael Bailey, City Attorney

Staff is providing an update and seeking guidance from Council regarding property located at approximately 91st and Northern Avenues and the Tohono O'odham Nation application for transfer of the land into trust for the benefit of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

Mr. Bailey provided a brief history on this issue. He said staff has met with the Nation on a few occasions to begin discussions on this issue. He asked Council for more direction on how staff should move forward. He said there are several court issues pending at this time and the city is in a holding pattern for those court decisions.

Councilmember Chavira asked about being specific about the facts or did he just want direction from Council.

Mr. Bailey said they have considered as another development project and staff is comfortable with that. He said he wants to make sure that staff is not getting too far ahead of the Council regarding their wishes on this issue. He said before staff does anything beyond fact finding, he wanted Council feedback.

Councilmember Chavira said he would like to move forward and transition from fact finding to negotiation. He also wanted to advise staff to have the city oppose HR1410. He said he is doing this because if that goes through, everything they have done to this point will be in vain until the compact is revisited.

Councilmember Alvarez agreed with Councilmember Chavira and they need to move forward and start with negotiations. She is in favor of the resort because it will bring jobs to the city. She said the east valley has lovely casinos which make money for those east valley cities and there is no reason why Glendale shouldn't have the casino. She asked the Council to work with the Nation to get the negotiations started.

Councilmember Hugh said he is in favor of moving forward with negotiations and opposing HR1410.

Mayor Weiers recognized President Enos and Chairman Norris who were in the audience. He is in favor of HR1410. He said the whole state needs to know how this will end. He is not in favor of moving forward with this.

Vice Mayor Knaack said on April 7th, it will be five years since they voted on the resolution. She said this issue needed to be decided once and for all, even if it has to go to the Supreme Court. She said they have spent over \$3 million and she wants to see a decision on this issue, otherwise they have wasted that money. She said the compact is broken that gaming could be opened up everywhere. She said the compact was crafted to be fair to all tribes. She wants to see all the tribes be successful and make money. She said voters had the same intent in mind. She is still opposed to this issue and stands by the resolution passed in 2009.

Councilmember Alvarez said all of them want to be fair and doesn't see why they have to be unfair to the Nation. She asked why it isn't fair for the Nation. She said the Nation has gone to court and they have won and the city owes them money. She is in favor of beginning negotiations.

Councilmember Martinez agreed with Mayor Weiers and Vice Mayor Knaack. He said they need to wait and get the decision of the court. He said the City has an official position and the resolution passed in opposition to this. He said nothing has changed in his mind for moving in a different direction. He said their congressional delegation as well as the other tribes are all opposed to this. He said the compact was passed by the voters, limiting the casinos. He read from some election material, "does Prop 202 limit the number of tribal casinos in Arizona, and the answer is yes, in fact, Prop 202 limits the number of vicinity of facilities each tribe may operate. Under Prop 202, there will be no new facilities authorized in Phoenix and only one additional facility permitted in Tucson. The official pamphlet by the Secretary of State told voters that the purpose of 202 was to 'assure that no new casinos will be built in the Phoenix metropolitan area and only one in Tucson for at least 23 years.'" He said the voters were told this would not happen, but there is an attempt to build this resort.

Councilmember Martinez quoted former Governor William R. Rose wrote from a newspaper and he read some key points, "There's no literal translation in English that does justice to the word hlmdag. As Governor of the Gila River Indian Community, hlmdag guides my every decision, my every action. Hlmdag has passed down by our elders across hundreds of years and teaches us respect for all things, including the value of a promise, abiding by the law and concern for the welfare of others. Respect, as a guiding principle, feels old fashioned in the 21st Century, but it exists all the same, even when our community is compelled to sign its name to a lawsuit against the United States Department of the Interior. You may have read about the lawsuit filed September 16th, you may also have read about Glendale's lawsuit to stop the casino. Out of respect, I believe that I must explain the reasons why my community so pointedly disagrees with Washington and with the southern Arizona sisters tribes plan to build a casino on land they secretly bought in Glendale 160 miles from their reservation headquarters. My explanation can be summed up in a single sentence. We believe the TO Nation, with the assistance of the federal

government, has disrespected the rule of law, the balance carefully struck among Indian gaming tribes, our community, Glendale and every Arizonan. At the crux of our lawsuit, there is clear evidence that the proper procedure for creating an Indian casino has been sidestepped. I will leave the legal wrangling to the lawyers, but in the 21 months since our sister city tribe surprised us with plans to build a casino in aboriginal lands, our community has learned more than we would care to about legal loopholes, PR spin and shading the truth. The surprises have continued to come and so have the disappointments, especially where our sister tribe is concerned. In the past, my community and the TO Nation have lived side by side and mutually benefitted from our entwined cultures and interests. There is no better example than the Indian gaming compacts ratified by Arizona voters in 2002. Prop 202 supported by 17 tribes statewide including the Gila River and TO communities, created a sound but delicate balance, a promise that kept casinos out of urban neighborhoods, gave much needed revenue to the state and created an economic engine to lift every tribal community. To see that balance upset and that promise broken, and to see one tribe use secrecy and legal maneuvering to benefit at the expense of every other tribe in our state, is difficult to comprehend, let alone stand for in silence. Thus, the Gila River Indian Community has taken the case to federal court. Our first goal is to force the federal government to apply federal funding and federal gaming laws evenly. Never before has a tribe been allowed to shop for reservation land half a state away from its homeland, then open a casino in the newly created 'pocket reservation.' That not only flies in the face of the federal gaming law, but in the face of every Arizonan's vote for Proposition 202. As for our sister tribe, I know our disagreement is temporary and if hlmdag is a place of supreme importance to their culture too. I would like to believe that their leadership will rediscover the way soon enough. I believe we can achieve more together than apart and that greed should never be allowed to trump respect for all things." Councilmember Martinez said this issue is at the Supreme Court and at the district court level. He said they need to stay the course and wait for a decision to be made. He said there is another case in Michigan where a tribe bought some land away from their reservation and built the casino without going through proper federal authorities. He said Michigan filed suit and the court sided with them. He said the tribe appealed and the district court said the suit of the state would not receive any consideration because of sovereign immunity of the tribes. He said since then, a few states have gotten together to filed a brief with the Supreme Court and that is where it sits. He said they need to wait and see what the courts decide.

Councilmember Alvarez said she remembered when she came into office and there were ordinances that needed to be changed from a decision that was done before. She said because it was done before, she before doesn't mean we can't change it. She said they can change the resolution and have done it with the charter. She asked Councilmember Sherwood to say how he feels.

Councilmember Sherwood said in November he felt it was a shame they had gone more than 4 years without having any dialogue. Since the fact finding enough information has come forward, he still hasn't changed his opinion that under the guise that the casino is presented back then and now, he is totally against it. But if they can treat the Nation as close to a private entity as possible and gain some much needed revenue for the city, then he is in favor of that. He said his biggest resistance is that the city was not going to gain anything from this project. He said the 2025 general plan shows that the city owns that land and they expect to get between \$4 and \$5 million in city sales tax, but the city doesn't own that land. He said they had a chance back in the 1980s, but it was pulled off the

agenda. By agreeing to continue the discussion, it doesn't mean their requirements are going to be met and he doesn't see any risk to the city. He said he started looking at this differently when all the projects went down during the recession, but things are coming back slowly. When major events come to the sports and entertainment district, there is nothing to hold people in the area. He said the owners in the Westgate area are looking for that competition. He said the lawsuit should continue to its end. He said the legislation said you can't build a casino and does not do any party any good. He said the city is looking for revenue and a casino might help the whole area. He said it doesn't put the city at risk to move forward at this point. He said opposing HR1410 does not do the city and the TO Nation any good. Councilmember Sherwood said he was in favor of moving forward with negotiations.

Councilmember Martinez said Council directed staff to meeting with TO and gather information. He thought there would be a second meeting to continue the discussion. He said they didn't want to meet unless it was a negotiation.

Mr. Bailey said they have met three times and from a staff perspective, they have fulfilled the request and he asked where they go from here.

Councilmember Martinez said the original request also asked that the other tribes also be contacted and to gather some information from them.

Mr. Bailey said if there is the need for additional fact finding with other tribes they can address that, but he did not recall any specific direction to that effect.

Vice Mayor Knaack said she was the one who asked for it. She said she would agree for staff to do an assessment on the impact, not negotiation or dialogue. She also said to have discussions with the other tribes to give them the opportunity to share their side. She said they have not spoken to the other tribes.

Mr. Bailey said they didn't want to get into a position to start negotiating with other nations. He said this may not have totally fulfilled Vice Mayor Knaack's request. He asked if there was something more specific they were looking for. He said they know their position and their concerns.

Councilmember Chavira said they need to stick with the direction for the city to oppose HR1410 and to continue with consensus they have today.

Councilmember Sherwood said that was what he was agreeing to. He asked for staff to begin fact finding with the tribe.

Mayor Weiers asked if Councilmember Sherwood was opposed to HR1410.

Councilmember Sherwood said yes.

Councilmember Alvarez said they have four Councilmembers that want to negotiate.

Councilmember Hugh clarified if Councilmember Alvarez is in opposition for HR1410.

Councilmember Alvarez said she was.

Vice Mayor Knaack asked Councilmember Sherwood if he was still in support of resolution 4246.

Councilmember Sherwood said he was not changing his position on the lawsuit or the resolution. He did not want to see the house bill move forward.

Councilmember Martinez said it appears there is consensus for negotiation, he asked as part of that other tribes be contacted and see what proposals they have. He would like to give them opportunity to see what other tribes would propose.

Ms. Fischer said she had discussions with Mr. Kalis from Gila as did Mr. Bailey.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus.

Mr. Bailey said with consensus to move forward in opposition of HR1410, they would need to bring back a resolution to clarify what the city's position is.

There was further discussion about resolution 4246. Mr. Bailey said there may be a need for a resolution to clarify the agreement with resolution 4246 and the opposition to HR1410.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

No comments were made.

COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

No comments were made.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:14 p.m.