



**MINUTES OF THE  
GLENDALE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SESSION  
Council Chambers – Room B3  
5850 West Glendale Avenue  
August 5, 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**

**MOMENT OF SILENCE**

**WORKSHOP SESSION**

**1. COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: ARIZONA SPORTS AND TOURISM AUTHORITY  
UPDATE REGARDING CAMELBACK RANCH SPRING TRAINING FACILITY FUNDING**

PRESENTED BY: Michael D. Bailey, City Attorney

Tom Sadler, President/CEO, Arizona Sports and Tourism Authority

At the request of the Glendale City Council, the Arizona Sports and Tourism Authority (AZSTA) has been invited to make a workshop presentation regarding the status of funding for Cactus League facilities and to specifically address revenue streams and funding sources for the city-owned Camelback Ranch Spring Training Facility. This report and presentation is for Council information only.

Mr. Bailey introduced Mr. Tom Sadler, President/CEO, Arizona Sports and Tourism Authority

Tom Sadler introduced Kevin Daniels, the CFO with the Arizona Sports and Tourism Authority, and Sarah Strunk, attorney with Fennemore Craig. He said the presentation will discuss current and future funding recipients and provide a time frame of when funding may be distributed to recipients. They will also provide information on what AZSTA projects to pay out over 30 years.

Mr. Daniels said there are subordinate bonds with Surprise at the facility for the Kansas City Royals and Texas Rangers. He said that is on track and the final payment will be paid in July of 2026. He said they will be done with the subordinate bonds at that time. He said they are also paying Tempe and Scottsdale for renovations on both facilities there. He said Tempe will be paid off in 2020 and Scottsdale in 2021. Mr. Daniels said there are other signed agreements for stadium renovations with existing facilities, Phoenix with the Maryvale Complex, Mesa with the Hohokam complex, Peoria with the Peoria Sports Complex. He said they anticipate Surprise will come in at the end of their lease with their two teams for possibly \$16.5 million in principal around 2022. He provided estimated repayment schedules.

Mr. Daniels also discussed classification for new construction. He said Camelback Ranch is one of those facilities. The other is the Goodyear facility. He said both facilities signed IGAs in 2007. He said the original principal with Glendale is \$60 million plus accrued interest. He said Goodyear is \$57.5 with accrued interest. He said they anticipate beginning to pay on both those debts in about 2021. He said there will be an additional revenue flow after 2031.

Councilmember Sherwood said Goodyear was half of what the Glendale payment was going to be. Mr. Daniels said it was not split 50/50 and Councilmember Sherwood was correct. He said Glendale gets two-thirds to one-third in the actual distribution of payment. Councilmember Sherwood said that is not shown on the charts they were provided. Mr. Daniels agreed that was not shown and Councilmember Sherwood was correct.

Councilmember Alvarez said in Glendale where it says \$60 million principal plus interest, she asked if that will start in 2021. Mr. Daniels said payments are forecasted to begin in 2021. Councilmember Alvarez asked what those payments would be. Mr. Daniel said he did not know right now, but it was when funds become available, and it was based on the flow of funds through AZSTA and the city will get what is available at that time. Councilmember Alvarez asked how sure AZSTA was that they were going to get funds. Mr. Daniels said it is a revenue forecast and it is only an estimate at this time. Councilmember Alvarez said so they really do not know for sure if Glendale is going to get any funding at all. Mr. Sadler said that was correct and there was no guarantee that the funds will be available. He said if they continue experiencing economic growth, they anticipate funding will be available, but they cannot guarantee given all the economic factors that could play into this.

Councilmember Alvarez said they cannot even think about budgeting this money because they don't even know if anything will be available. Mr. Sadler said there is no guarantee. Councilmember Alvarez asked if the Council was advised at that time there was no guarantee. Ms. Strunk said they were not advising the Council at all. The city was represented by the city attorney and the city manager and she said they presumed the city attorney and the city manager advised the Council. She said it was talked about in their board meetings in connection with approving the agreements and it is clear in the agreements as well. Councilmember Alvarez said so the Glendale representatives knew this was a chance the city was taking. Ms. Strunk said she believed that was correct. Mr. Bailey said the agreements set forth a payment schedule and it is an estimated payment schedule. Councilmember Alvarez said she was not interested in the agreement, she was interested in whether this was a for sure thing or not. She said if there is no

money, the city is not going to benefit at all. She wanted to make sure everyone knew this was not a for sure thing.

Councilmember Martinez said with respect to the issue whether the Council knew. He said Council gets advice from staff in all financial matters and there are a lot of those that come before Council. He said staff presents Council with what they feel is the best scenario, but it is ultimately Council's responsibility. He said he did not want to point any fingers at staff. He said whatever recommendation was given, Council thought it was the best recommendation, they considered it and they went ahead and did it. He said look at the Council and don't look at the staff.

Councilmember Alvarez asked who this was presented to. Ms. Strunk said the city attorney, the city manager and the mayor. Ms. Strunk said she believed all of them, including the chief financial officer, were at the board meeting when this was approved and discussed.

Mr. Daniels explained where they are on Prop 302. He said original legislation had modeling for AZSTA being able to contribute about \$205 million through the Cactus League promotional account. He said the Maricopa County Stadium District would contribute another \$198 million for a total of \$403 million available for Cactus League and promotions. He said this is where this money comes from for paying for refurbishments, paying for the new construction. He said based on the latest modeling he has using a 2.5 percent conservative compound annual growth rate from 2014 through 2031, he anticipates they will have about \$240 million available to pay out through the Cactus League. He said this is far short of the \$403 million originally forecast in the Prop 302 legislation. He said at a 5 percent compound annual growth rate, the amount increases to \$325 million, which is still a \$78 million shortfall. Using an extremely aggressive 7.5 percent compound annual growth rate for revenues, it almost gets to the \$403 million target. He cautioned they are very conservative in their presentation and used the 2.5 percent figure for this presentation. He said the historical compound annual growth rate has not approached those higher percentages. He said the original modelling in Prop 302 had a very aggressive growth rate with no decline in the economy at all.

Councilmember Hugh expressed his concern about the car rental tax and asked how that would play into this. Ms. Strunk said since 2005, there has been a challenge to the collection of the car rental tax as being unconstitutional. She said a recent court ruling found it deficient under the state constitution. She said the ultimate resolution of that case will impact the tax revenues that fund the Cactus League. She said they are still months away from an appeal until a final order comes down. Councilmember Hugh asked what the impact would be if they lose. Mr. Sadler said because of the other revenue streams, they will be able to pay the debt services on the stadium for the bonds that were issued. He said the other priorities, including tourism and Cactus League, would receive nothing.

Councilmember Sherwood asked what happens after 2031 when AZSTA's charter runs out. Ms. Strunk said the funding provisions, the taxes sunset in 2031 so they will no longer be able to collect the hotel tax or the car rental tax. She said they will continue to collect the Maricopa County Stadium District Tax and it does not sunset. She said those funds are dedicated only to the Cactus League. Councilmember Sherwood asked if those funds could be used for improvements to current facilities. Ms. Strunk said yes. Councilmember Sherwood asked if those funds could be

used for repayment of bonds for existing construction. Ms. Strunk answered yes. Ms. Strunk added the board has decided that it will just be for renovation projects after payment of the existing obligations. Mr. Sadler said they were not going to issue anymore bonds.

## **2. 2015 LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES AND TOWNS RESOLUTIONS**

PRESENTED BY: Brent Stoddard, Director, Intergovernmental Programs

This is a request for the City Council to review and provide guidance on the proposed resolutions which will be voted on at the August 19, 2014 League of Arizona Cities and Towns (LACT) Resolutions Committee meeting.

Mr. Stoddard provided background on what resolutions are and how they are developed. He explained when the League sends out the resolution packet, it is distributed to appropriate city staff for staff to make recommendations. He said there was only one recommendation that had a conflict between what the League recommended and what staff recommended. He explained resolutions are submitted in concept form only and the resolutions presented today do not make up the city's legislative agenda.

Mr. Stoddard went through the individual resolutions that are recommended for adoption. He said resolution #1 is to enhance municipal service districts. Resolution #2 would allow cities to create revenue allocation districts to invest future local revenues for economic development projects. Resolution #3 seeks to allow cities to provide property tax incentive to commercial and industrial zoned parcels to spur new speculative development. Resolution #4 seeks to authorize retention basin improvement districts and give them the ability to levy and expend money to operate, maintain and repair those retention basins within the municipality. Resolution #5 provides for renewable energy and conservation districts. Resolution #6 seeks to end legislative sweeps of HURF funds.

Councilmember Sherwood said the cities that put resolution 6 forward were not very big cities, but he asked if there was anything stronger that the league could do on an issue like this. He would like to make a stronger statement about this issue than just a resolution. Mr. Stoddard said the effort to restore HURF has been ongoing for many years and is led by the cities and counties. He said many projects are proceeding because the larger cities have other alternatives. He said the rural communities suffer the most when the HURF funds are taken away and the strongest statements come from those communities. He said the city and its partners could not be stronger in advocating this issue to restore those funds.

Mr. Stoddard next explained Resolution #7 which recommends to legislature the formulation of a HURF revenue study committee to analyze transportation funding challenges. Resolution #8 seeks to authorize municipalities' options besides conducting an official census to determine population estimates for use in distribution of shared state revenues. He said staff recommends a position of not supporting this resolution. He said in current state statute, there already exists the authority for a municipality to work with the census bureau to do an official census survey and they can use that number for their official population number as it is used for distribution of state shared revenues. He said this resolution would give any city the ability to use the state's

department of economic security population estimates for their population number for state shared revenue purposes for the next five years. Mr. Stoddard provided some background for the precedent that has been set. He said this resolution would allow the cities and towns to update their census figures solely using the DES numbers. He said there are significant financial consequences in utilizing a system with questionable methodology to distribute \$1.6 billion in revenue. He said he supports cities going forward with authorization that is currently in state statute. He explained even though the city may be growing in population, if it isn't growing as fast as some of the other cities, the portion of state shared revenue the city receives could actually decrease. He said staff's recommendation is to oppose this at the resolutions committee.

Ms. Fischer said this is relevant because state shared revenue is Glendale's second highest resource for the city's general fund, about 32 percent.

Mr. Stoddard said Resolution #9 would call on the legislature to restore funding to the Arizona State Park Heritage Fund. Vice Mayor Knaack asked what the odds were to get any of those funds. Mr. Stoddard said the Heritage Park funds are important and there may be a fighting chance for these.

Resolution #10 would provide flexibility in the annexation process regarding county islands. Resolution #11 would provide public record request reform. Resolution #12 would provide a permanent fix for calculating a majority of voters in an election. Resolution #13 will encourage resources to improve Arizona's port of entry with Mexico. Resolution #14 urges support for the long term retention of Arizona's military installations.

Mr. Stoddard next went over the resolutions with recommended amendments or changes. Resolution #15 would provide additional financing tools and resources to rural communities by restoring funds to the Greater Arizona Development Authority (GADA) fund. Resolution #16 and Resolution #17 would be combined to expand the PSPRS and ARS boards to include additional city representatives. Resolution #18 is a recognition of the shortage of physicians and medical professionals in the state. Resolution #19 was not recommended for passage by the subcommittee. This resolution was to allow the state to partner with cities to operate and maintain state parks under long term leases. He said the state already authorizes short term agreements which are working now.

Mr. Stoddard next went over resolutions that had significant municipal issues. Resolution #20 would seek to restore Arizona trust funds that were the victim of the legislature sweeping of funds. Resolution #21 would ban the use of cell phones while driving. He said the state already have distracted driving laws. He said this resolution would provide uniform legislation for this issue.

Councilmember Martinez wondered if the police chief could provide information about how many citations were issued in the city for distracted driving. The chief said she could provide that information. Councilmember Martinez said he would be interested, and guessed there haven't been many citations issued. He said there are articles at least every week on this issue about people being killed or injured. He said he cannot understand why the league would not take up this issue as a full body. He said he had a grandson who lived in California. When the grandson's

phone rang while he was driving, he would not pick it up. He said it was a big fine in California to have anything in your hands. He said he has seen distracted drivers and it seems this is something that should be pursued. Mr. Stoddard said that is the reason why this is a significant municipal issue. He said if another organization tried to advance this issue, Council would see the league come out in support, but as a part of the league's legislative agenda, the league itself won't be driving this issue at this time.

Vice Mayor Knaack asked if any other organizations were bringing this issue forward. Mr. Stoddard said there has been a wide group of stakeholders and lobbying groups who support this issue. He said the league won't drive this issue as part of their legislative agenda, but would support this issue if it is brought forward.

Mr. Stoddard next discussed some league staff positions on issues that will come up in the future. League proposed issue #1 authorized the league to support legislation to preclude ADOT from requiring cities and towns to indemnify ADOT in order to obtain access to certain federal funds. League proposed issue #2 is to support legislation to streamline implementation of development impact fees including expansion and clarification of allowable uses, shorter implementation time frames and reduction of complexity and ambiguity.

There was consensus with staff recommendations for the resolutions presented.

### **3. ANNEXATION DISCUSSION**

PRESENTED BY: Sam McAllen, Director, Development Services  
Jon M. Froke, AICP, Planning Director, Development Services

Staff will provide an update to the Council concerning the City's Annexation Policy. Staff will also update the Council concerning the adopted Pre-Annexation and Development Agreement (PADA) with the Loop 303 Corridor Group and will discuss the proposed Zanjero Pass, Granite Vista and Marbella Ranch development projects.

Staff is seeking guidance from Council concerning the following matters:

- Possible annexation of properties located in and around the Loop 303 (State Route 303 Loop).
- Direction on annexing future residential properties in the Municipal Planning Area (MPA).

Mr. McAllen explained the policy matters under consideration for this item.

Mr. Froke provided an overview and history of the annexation policy. He said they would like to update some items in the annexation policy and will present those specific items at a voting meeting later this year. Mr. Froke provided a map of the Municipal Planning Area (MPA). He said the city does not provide water and sewer service west of 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said there have been additional development projects that are pending. These are Zanjero Pass, Granite Vista and Marbella Ranch. Mr. Froke provided an additional map of Loop 303 and the Northern Parkway area showing the areas already annexed in that area.

Mr. Froke said Zanjero Pass is both a residential and commercial project. He said Granite Vista is near Zanjero Pass and staff is seeking Council guidance on potentially annexing this development. He said outside of the Loop 303 area and along Northern Parkway is Marbella Ranch. He said there may be some commercial and industrial development along Northern Parkway along a portion of Marbella Ranch.

Councilmember Chavira said the majority of the three parcels will be residential and will contribute regarding the presentation about state shared revenue. Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Alvarez said the last time this was discussed, the areas did not want to be annexed and Council agreed with that. She said now the city is thinking about annexing these properties. She asked why they did not think about the money before. She said residents do not want this and she is confused on this. Mr. Froke said historically the city has not pursued "hostile annexation." He said things have changed with the city regarding Northern Parkway and the Loop 303 and the potential that holds for the city. He said the city would like to capture both sides of Northern Parkway frontage opportunities. Councilmember Alvarez asked if the developers want to be part of Glendale now. Mr. Froke said the Maricopa Water District at the Zanjero Pass property filed applications last year and a review has been done. He said because of some of the confusion the city has caused, they just want an answer one way or the other, if they can just entitle the property, zone it through Glendale or Maricopa County and move on.

Mr. Froke said it is complicated because they are part of the pre-annexation development agreement so in order for them to opt out of the PADA, this would be brought forward in a voting meeting for Council action to formally release them from the PADA. Councilmember Alvarez said it bothers her that they made a decision not that long ago and now they are making a change. She said the city is known for making changes that are not in agreement with people. She said if they are going to get the 50 plus 1, they'd better be happy people. She said they made up their minds just recently and now they are asking for Council input again. Mr. McAllen said they have had conversations with two of the developments and they are interested in developing within the city with the city's standards and want to make sure they have a clear understanding of that.

Councilmember Chavira said there is so much potential with the Loop 303 and Northern Parkway and this can affect the city in a positive way. He asked if they have reached out to the parties involved. Mr. Froke said that staff is working on updating the general plan and they are looking at these potential growth areas.

Councilmember Hugh asked which party they have not spoken with. Mr. Froke said they have had conversations with all three properties and all three are represented in the audience. Councilmember Hugh asked if any of these three are ready to start development. Mr. Froke said Zanjero Pass and Granite Vista are relying on the private water and sewer system that is part of the PADA. He said Marbella Ranch is not within the water and sewer service area. He said they are looking at private water providers for utilities at this time. Councilmember Hugh asked if Marbella Ranch is closer to development than the other two. Mr. Froke said that is correct. Councilmember Hugh asked where they were on their plans. Mr. Froke said Marbella Ranch has county zoning approval and their next step would be preliminary and final plats. He said he did

not think they had begun that process yet. Councilmember Hugh asked if they were going through the county. Mr. Froke said if they got guidance today, he would prefer they go through the city. Councilmember Hugh said they would consider people if they wanted to come in. He said there should be a reason why people want to be in the city rather than in county jurisdiction. He doesn't want to ask anyone to make anyone move in if they don't want to. He asked if that would slow down development. Mr. Froke said they will move as quickly as they can on any annexations. Councilmember Hugh asked if there was anything the city could do to speed up the process for those projects in the county process. Mr. Froke said yes there was, and it was to provide very good customer service and designate a planner that would work closely with that developer and try to meet their development timeframes. Councilmember Hugh said he wants people to come to the city because they see the benefits of being here.

Mr. Bailey said comments have arisen with discussions with the legal department. He wanted to make sure everyone understood where some of the discussion comes from. He said this is the general planning area and being constructed in the next largest commercial corridor in the state. He said the city has the ability to work with developers now to formulate what the future development is going to be like in the western half of the city. He said when Council thinks about this, he wanted them not to focus on whether or not they are going through the county specifically. He asked them to keep in mind this is high level policy discussion of what the Council wants to see happen out in this area. He said they do finally have a solution regarding water and wastewater so there is an opportunity to develop. He said with Northern Parkway and the Loop 303, the city has potentially one of the busiest intersections in the future in the state. This is Council's opportunity to move forward on that. He said one of the things they need to recognize is if they choose not to develop, the city will become smaller and smaller and they will lose out on potential revenue. He said other cities continue to look for growth opportunities. He said this is perceived to be the next big growth area. He said if developers don't want to be in the PAD, he said they would need to deny that project. He said now they have agreements in place and resources provided. He asked Council to think about what they foresee what the western portion of the city is going to be and if they want the Loop 303 to be a viable commercial corridor that is part of a greater plan.

Councilmember Chavira said one of the main issues was the wastewater and this issue has been resolved. He said an issue still pending is the individuals who have moved forward with the county process. He said providing superior customer service will attract those individuals. Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Alvarez said she is not against this at all. She said Council discussed this recently and they were in agreement in accepting their decision that they did not want to be in Glendale. She said they are going to change and it is difficult to change once plans have been made. She said they need to be sure people are happy living in Glendale.

Mayor Weiers said the decisions regarding this area have changed just in the time he has been in office. He asked when this changed because it wasn't that long ago.

Ms. Fischer said the county is questioning the city that this area is in the city's planning area and the city is supposed to annex this once development comes into those areas. She said there is some frustration at the county due to the city's changing position. She said the city almost needs

to update the annexation policy rather than focusing on these three specific parcels. She said this is where the next wave of growth is going to be. She said this is the Council's change to be visionary and embrace this opportunity for the long term benefit as a community. She said that commercial development will be revenue generating and will protect the state shared revenue as well. She said they need Council direction on what they want to do and then what Council wants to do with the three specific areas.

Mayor Weiers said he has had phone calls regarding people who do not want annexation. He hoped this has been fully vetted and everyone has a chance to speak on this issue.

Councilmember Martinez said he thought he heard that two of the three properties do want to come into the city. Mr. McAllen said two of the developers are interested and are willing to have further conversations. He said staff is also going to be modifying the annexation policy and bringing that before Council. Mr. Froke said the strip annexation was created in the 1970's. He has met with the County Planning Director to discuss the city's land planning issues. He said they would like to let the city chart its growth. He said some areas of the MPA will likely never be annexed. He said it is the city's opportunity to set the tone for development patterns.

Mayor Weiers wanted to make sure there is no possibility the city was putting these developers in a position of thinking that if they don't go along with what the city wants, they will not be approved by the county. Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Chavira wanted to remove any confusion and asked if any confusion was caused, if the city would try and make that right. Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Martinez said if we approve and give direction today to proceed, are we on a path that would be a hostile annexation. Mr. Froke said the city practice of annexation is they do not employ those techniques. Councilmember Martinez said if they went ahead with this and someone said I do not want to be part of your planning area, at that time they would have the option to stay with the county. Mr. Froke said that was correct. Councilmember Martinez said in view of that, he wanted to go with staff's recommendation.

Councilmember Hugh felt they were all saying about the same thing. He said if someone is interested in being in the city, they want to bring them in. He said talking specifically about these three properties is the start of the build out. He said he did not want to do anything to hinder the progress of the one developer already in process.

Councilmember Sherwood said when you talk about state shared revenues; right now Glendale is the fifth largest city. He said Gilbert, Peoria and Surprise will surpass Glendale. He said they seem to be hung up on one of the properties, Marbella Ranch, that has gone through the process. He said it looks like they are very close other than figuring out water and sewer. He said if the city can make amends to them and speed up the process, he thought that was something the city would do anyway. He said just for those developments, it is nearly 3,000 rooftops added. He said they have the commercial to support that, including the commercial development in Marbella Ranch. He discussed the developers who wanted to be part of the city at Granite Vista. Mr. Froke said Elliott Homes is in the middle of their county process right now. Mr. Froke said they do not

want to interfere with that. He said if they received guidance to further explore annexation with them, if the city did eventually annex Granite Vista, then Council would place similar zoning as what was approved by the county and place similar city zoning on that property. Councilmember Sherwood said he thought they were all saying the same thing. They think this is a good thing and don't want any hostile activity. He said if they can make good with those developers that are making their way through the county process and include them into the city, he was all for this change of direction. He said this is the city's last frontier for growth.

Vice Mayor Knaack said 20 years ago, Glendale was a bedroom community and the decision was made to try and bring in more commercial and industrial. She said now they are trying to maintain a balance. She said she is fully in favor of the new direction.

Councilmember Alvarez said she would like to have the opportunity to hear from the developers before Council gives direction about what would happen. She said developers should be given this opportunity before moving forward. She wanted to know if they want to be in the annexation. Mr. Froke said through the annexation process, public hearings are required and they can continue to have that dialogue with any participant in the MPA. Councilmember Alvarez said things have happened before when direction was given and Council approved it. She said Sonorita was one of them. She said the people that will be affected don't really know what is going on and that also occurred with Centerline. She said the city has destroyed neighborhoods and they need to think about this and have meetings with the developers.

Mayor Weiers said he was seeing nods from the developers that they would like to have a meeting.

Councilmember Hugh asked if the Planning Commission had been involved in this. Mr. Froke said annexation does not include the Planning Commission. He said the Planning Commission would be involved in the General Plan.

Councilmember Chavira said by moving forward with the Council consensus given today, the process is Council will meet with the individuals that want to meet so they can determine if they want to be annexed. He said they will have the opportunity to speak and asked as part of the process. Mr. Froke said that was correct. He said they would come back after meeting with property owners, present the item to Council at a voting meeting, a public hearing would be held and speakers can speak at that hearing.

Councilmember Martinez commented that he did not know of any neighborhood that had been destroyed by anyone. He said the other comment they have heard more than once is that no area is going to be taken in that does not want to be annexed by the very process. Mr. Froke said that is correct. Councilmember Martinez said the bottom line is they need to move ahead with staff's recommendation today.

Mayor Weiers said his concern is regarding the people who are in the process already. He asked if that is going to slow down what those people are currently doing right now. He asked for assurance that the process is not going to be slowed down and said he had no problem with the recommendation if that was the case. Mr. McAllen said their plan is not to set anyone back. If the direction is to welcome new Glendale residents, they will move forward.

Vice Mayor Knaack said she would like them to go over the economic impact analysis.

Mr. Froke provided some information regarding population and state shared revenue. He also said they did do third party verification and the study was updated. He said the study focused on revenues and expenditures. He said there will be a net cost to the city as there is more residential development. He also said the revenue impact analysis t found that in a 25 year build out scenario the MPA would realize a positive annual impact to the city of approximately \$1.8 million. He said it also speaks to a population increase of approximately 50,000. He also said each department reviews annexation requests as it relates to the department's ability to provide services. He said they would also look at public/private partnerships depending on the project and what it might look like in terms of land use mix or development patterns. He said the Loop 303 infrastructure would be private. He said this is the last growth frontier for Glendale and if they do not include the rooftops, the city will remain steady or drop in population base. Costs would be incurred as they are in property and staff is available if there are any specific questions. He clarified with respect to properties shown in green on the PADA, they are not asking them to come in right now. He said it will be whenever they are ready to proceed with annexation. He said the annexation policy is 9 years old and does not really reflect what Glendale is today. He said they are working on that and will bring those forward for Council consideration.

Mayor Weiers said he was still confused about how the change happened so quickly. He said there was Council consensus to move forward. He added that staff should have a meeting with the three developers and report back.

### **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

**No items to report.**

### **COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

Councilmember Alvarez wanted the urban irrigation considered at a workshop.

Councilmember Chavira referenced the city's bulk pickup and how it is advertised and when people scrap through the bulk pickup and make a mess. He also wanted to talk about how crime has increased in those areas where scrapping occurs at bulk pickup.

Mayor Weiers said he is reminded by military representatives about homebuyers who purchase homes on or near a military base. He would like to discuss the possibility of adding an additional identifier to the zoning of properties within those military areas. He would like to find out potential costs to help keep Luke Air Force Base.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.