

City of Glendale

5850 West Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301



Meeting Minutes - Final

Tuesday, June 2, 2015

1:30 PM

Workshop

Council Chambers - Room B3

City Council Workshop

Mayor Jerry Weiers

Vice Mayor Ian Hugh

Councilmember Jamie Aldama

Councilmember Samuel Chavira

Councilmember Gary Sherwood

Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff

Councilmember Bart Turner

CALL TO ORDER**Rollcall**

Present 7 - Mayor Jerry Weiers, Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Samuel Chavira, Councilmember Gary Sherwood, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner

Also present were Richard Bowers, Acting City Manager; Jennifer Campbell, Assistant City Manager; Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager; Michael Bailey, City Attorney; and Pamela Hanna, City Clerk.

WORKSHOP SESSION

1. [15-365](#) COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP 2016 PLANNING UPDATE
Staff Contact: Jean Moreno, Economic Development Officer
Presenter: Tom Sadler, President and CEO, 2016 Arizona Organizing Committee
Presenter: Win Holden, Co-Chair, 2016 Arizona Organizing Committee

Ms. Moreno said this presentation was an update on the planning efforts for the 2016 game. Ms. Moreno introduced Tom Sadler, President and CEO, 2016 Arizona Organizing Committee, and Win Holden, Co-Chair, 2016 Arizona Organizing Committee. Ms. Moreno provide a summation of what was included in the presentation which included the differences between the bowl championships (BCS) and the college football playoff (CFP), the city's obligations, the Arizona Organizing Committee, CFP events, a timeline of activity and stakeholder engagement.

Ms. Moreno first discussed the differences between the BCS and the CFP and said Arizona has hosted the collegiate championship four times and two of those took place in Glendale. In 2012, the organizers submitted a proposal to change the system. She said the resulting agreement provided that teams would be selected based on performance. The four teams selected would proceed to semi-final championship play and the top two teams would proceed to the championship. She said there are four days of activity, which is significantly more than the BCS championship. She said the agreement also calls for host communities to bid to host the game. This requires the organization to put together a formal organizing committee.

Ms. Moreno said the city's obligations include participation on AOC subcommittees, providing the city's standard allocation of parking, and public safety staffing in accordance with our contractual agreements for stadium events. She explained that Global Spectrum contracts apply to inside staffing, the city will provide traffic management and there are free/in-kind assets for special teams. She said there will be a Development Services point person, CVB grant funding, and commercial activity restrictions.

Mr. Sadler said they are fortunate to be able to put in a bid and thanked everyone for their assistance. He explained they have added more bowl games and said they have to bid on the championship game as a community. He explained the organization of the AOC and said their fundraising goal is \$13 million plus. He said they are engaging the

community for that revenue. The economic impact of the previous BCS championships the valley has hosted is over \$646 million. He said they are leading a regional planning effort and want to take it statewide. He said this event will showcase Arizona for economic development opportunities as well. Mr. Sadler said the college football playoff events include Playoff Fan Central, CFP Ultimate Kick Off Party, AT&T Playoff Playlist Live, and Saturday Night Event (Night of Champions). He said these events are similar to the Super Bowl events that were held.

Councilmember Turner asked where the playoff events will occur.

Mr. Sadler said Playoff Fan Central will be held at the Phoenix Convention Center, CFP Kick Off Party and the AT&T event will be held at Block 23, which is in downtown Phoenix and the Saturday Night Event will be held at the Phoenix Convention Center. He reminded everyone that the location of these events have been selected by the CFP after touring the venues. He mentioned other events will help benefit education in Arizona. Mr. Sadler went over the timeline of activity beginning in early December 2015 through game day on January 11, 2016. Mr. Sadler said the CFP and AOC have had meetings with key stakeholders, including Westgate, Tanger and Renaissance. He said there have been CFP production meetings, AOC regional meetings as well as collaborative press activities. He said there is AOC stakeholder support. He said they have a great team working on this.

Mr. Holden said this event is a new enterprise and is not a Fiesta Bowl event. He said these events forge new ground and said the decisions are made by CFP regarding this event and their job is to give opportunities and options. He said they also take into consideration how the Glendale Media Center could potentially be used during the event.

Councilmember Turner asked for a description of the Saturday Night Event and where it would be held.

Mr. Sadler said it is an ESPN event it will be held at the Phoenix Convention Center.

Councilmember Turner said the expenses for this totaled \$401,000, but he didn't see anything in terms of revenue in the documentation given to Council.

Ms. Moreno said those are budgeted expenses for police, fire and transportation. They were broken out because this is a regional event. If it was a regular event at the stadium, those funds would be in the stadium operations budget. In terms of revenue, they are looking at transaction privilege tax generation from Westgate development in similar fashion as the Super Bowl. She said there will also be fee revenue associated with plan reviews and inspections. She said some of the revenue they had during the Super Bowl may not happen and they did not budget specific revenue for this event as it is TPT based.

Councilmember Turner asked if they had an estimate of what that might be at this point, and asked if there was any revenue from ticket sales for the city.

Ms. Moreno said it would be a similar model to the Super Bowl. The city will collect taxes associated with ticket sales from the taxpayer and the standard agreement applies in terms of the rebate to Arizona State Tourism Authority (AZSTA). The city would retain 1 percent for Public Safety and Transportation Sales Taxes.

Councilmember Turner asked if there was a ballpark figure they might look at for revenue.

Mr. Duensing said they are conservative on this and any revenue the city might make increases the bottom line.

Councilmember Turner said the taxpayers are hosting a national event, costing the city at least \$400,000 and the revenue will be generated in neighboring cities.

Ms. Moreno pointed out that the city has several agreements including an IGA with AZSTA. She said this agreement requires the city to support these events and provide services related to these events. She said they will get some reimbursement from Global Spectrum as a result of the contracts they have with the city. She said the city might not be reimbursed the entire \$400,000.

Councilmember Turner said this is a much bigger production than the bowl games held in the city in the past with a lot more money and revenue involved. He said he is concerned that even though the scope of the event has changed, it has stayed the same for Glendale. He said he is not against the idea of supporting collegiate football, but knows many taxpayers are against this sort of thing. He said a model where Glendale is subsidizing other cities may not be successful year after year.

Ms. Moreno said the city does receive reimbursement for the public safety services and the staffing model depends on the position of the person working and their normal hourly rate. She said staff does work very hard to make sure there is cost recovery for those positions. She explained these are obligations that take place for any event that takes place at the University of Phoenix Stadium where attendance exceeds 40,000.

Mayor Weiers said Westgate has been involved in this and have some plans made for events similar to what occurred during the Super Bowl to try and bring in more revenue. He wanted more information on the city breaking even.

Mr. Sadler said they have spoken with Mr. Teetsel and explored what was done during the Super Bowl. He felt they did a pretty good job driving traffic into Glendale. He said they are looking at a similar concept for this event and are trying to find ways to assist with that.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if there were any projects that had to be done inside or outside the stadium and asked if full permit fees would be paid for any of those projects.

Ms. Moreno said there will be build out, but not as significant as the Super Bowl. All of these projects will go through plan review and the inspection process and no agreements have been made to waive fees for those projects.

Mr. Holden said it is likely to assume ESPN will also have a presence both inside and outside the stadium on game day. He said those will also have to go through the approval process as well.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if any changes would be made to the seating in the stadium.

Mr. Sadler said the configuration is not that different than seating during the Fiesta Bowl. He said they are able to seat about 72,000 fans. He also spoke about the game schedule and the challenges they might face if the Cardinals are in the playoffs.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said that was going to be her next question.

Mr. Holden said he loved a challenge.

Vice Mayor Hugh asked about obligations in parking.

Ms. Moreno said the standard obligation applies with supplying 11,000 spaces for parking in both Westgate and off-site property for any event at the stadium. She said CFP has no intentions at this time to secure additional parking as was done during Super Bowl.

Vice Mayor Hugh asked for clarification on the parking the city provides.

Ms. Moreno said the city provides 11,000 parking spaces.

Mr. Sadler added with regard to the costs for public safety, the AZSTA and Global Spectrum work closely with police and fire to identify a working rate for events that covers the cost of using city personnel. They actively reevaluate and negotiate these rates because AZSTA does not expect a subsidy from the city, and he said it is his belief they are reimbursing the city for all or nearly all of its costs.

Councilmember Aldama said that was the question he was going to ask.

2. [15-348](#)

AMENDMENTS TO THE MODEL CITY PRIVILEGE (SALES) TAX CODE AND BUSINESS LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Staff Contact and Presenter: Vicki Rios, Interim Director, Finance and Technology

Ms. Rios said they were going to discuss the Model City Tax Code, changes to the licensing and regulations of sexually oriented businesses and were seeking direction on changes to Chapter 21 of the City Code, which regulates license taxation, and miscellaneous business regulations.

Ms. Rios first discussed Chapter 21.1, the Model City Privilege (Sales) Tax Code. She said this was created to ensure uniformity among cities and said code changes must be approved by the Municipal Tax Code Commission (MTCC). She said the language for these code changes is given to us by the MTCC. Cities are required to abide by changes on the effective date they were enacted. She explained Council must take formal action to adopt the changes into City Code. She said, the Model City Tax Code his differs from the Arizona State Tax Code but sometimes state legislation includes municipalities. Ms. Rios said most of the current changes are a result of legislation that took place at the state level and were approved in 2013. The changes were part of the simplification efforts to make the Model City Tax Code align more closely with the Arizona State Tax Code. Many of these changes are exemptions the state had, but the cities did not have the exemption. The most significant change was an exemption for commercial leasing between affiliated parties. Ms. Rios explained changes have already been implemented and there have not been any significant revenue impacts.

Ms. Rios said another code change that also came from the state legislation is on regulations for sexually oriented businesses. This was legislation passed by the state and requires businesses that have performers not be able to accept electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards. The language for that change was not given to the city and the Attorney's Office is in the process of drafting the language but this must be added to the City Code. She explained only one business in Glendale is affected by this change and the business owner has been notified. She said we are required under the law to monitor

their compliance and they are being monitored in accordance with the law.

Ms. Rios went over the current status of business licensing. She explain that the city currently has two types of licenses. She said one type of license is a Transaction Privilege Tax (TPT) license for taxable businesses. She explained the current fee for that license is \$50 and the license goes through an approval process through Finance, Building Safety, Fire, and Planning and Zoning to make sure the business is in compliance with City Codes. The license is renewed once a year. There is also an Occupation License, which also has a fee of \$50. This license goes through a similar approval process and is renewed once a year. She explained these licenses are for businesses that do not remit Transaction Privilege or Sales Tax.

Ms. Rios said the state is scheduled to start administering TPT licenses in 2016. She explained that once the state takes over, there will be no approval process by the city and applicants will go through the state to obtain a license. The revenue will still come to the city through the Arizona Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue interprets confidentiality laws much differently and their position is that no information from a license will be able to be used by the city for anything other than TPT administration. The city will not be able to share that information with anyone once the Department of Revenue (DOR) takes over administering these licenses. Enforcement of licenses will be handled by the state as well. The city will still be able to administer its Occupational Licenses.

Ms. Rios consulted with other cities regarding what they planned to do after these changes go into effect, and looked at some options. She was seeking Council direction on this issue. Option 1 would be to keep TPT license, but the city could adopt a business license for all businesses, including taxable and nontaxable. She said every business within the city would have a city license. Also, if this were adopted, the taxable businesses would have two licenses, one through the state and one from the city. This would allow the city to continue the approval process that is in place now. Because those licenses would be issued by the city, the city could use that information for economic development purposes or any other purposes. She said they would still maintain taxpayer confidentiality as they do now, but they would be able to use the information a little more freely. For that type of occupational License, the city would have enforcement in the event of nonpayment. Also, Council would set the fee for those licenses. They could adopt it in such a way to generate additional revenues or in a way to remain revenue neutral to the city.

Ms. Rios said the other option, which she called Option 2, would be to maintain the current system as it is. She said taxable businesses would go through the state. She explained it would be considered a city license, but it would be administered by the state. In this option, taxable businesses would have one license and occupational businesses would have the licenses they have now. The city would have an approval process on the Occupational Licenses, but not on the TPT licenses. The city would not be able to use the information on the TPT licenses and the city would have no enforcement. She anticipated some loss of revenue, but only because the city has no enforcement. She said if there was a business in noncompliance, the city would have to go to the state for enforcement.

Councilmember Aldama asked how often the DOR will send the city the revenues.

Ms. Rios said the state will collect revenues and remit them weekly and will also send a monthly report for reconciliation. She said they will do an annual renewal, so Council may see revenues come in once a year and then smaller amounts of revenue coming in

weekly from new businesses.

Mayor Weiers said once this process begins, they will be a couple of months behind getting revenues back to the city.

Ms. Rios said upon initial transition of administration from the city to the state, they anticipate a delay in some revenues up to possibly two months. She said once it starts coming in, they anticipate receiving those funds weekly.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if any analysis has been done regarding what the expense would be to manage a separate system of licenses in Glendale from Option 1.

Ms. Rios said she will talk about that in the next slide, and she went on to discuss revenue effects of this upcoming change. Ms. Rios showed a chart with analysis of the revenues from licensing. She said under the current system with taxable and nontaxable businesses paying the same fee, the city is generating about \$737,000 worth of revenue. She said there is a system in place right now to administer both types of licenses and there would be some costs associated with maintaining that system. She did not have the exact number, but this was the type of revenue this generates. She also said they anticipated still having staff for enforcement.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the city would somehow have to notify businesses that Glendale requires a city license as well and also asked what the costs would be for notification.

Ms. Rios said there would be some initial costs for public outreach, but these are businesses already licensed through the city. It would be the state's responsibility to notify businesses that they now have to obtain licenses through the state.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the city has to notify new businesses coming into Glendale that they would have to also obtain a license from Glendale.

Ms. Rios said that is something to be considered and they will have to make sure outreach is done to those businesses.

Mayor Weiers said Vice Mayor Hugh has a Glendale business with a city license, as well as a license with the state. He said for example, if the city did nothing at all, Vice Mayor Hugh would only have one license, but if they keep the system they have now, Vice Mayor Hugh's business would still have two licenses.

Ms. Rios said if they keep what they have right now, Vice Mayor Hugh would still have two licenses, it is just that the fees for both licenses would be paid directly to the state and the licenses would be issued by the state.

Mayor Weiers said that is not as confusing as what it sounded like earlier. Mayor Weiers referred to the chart Ms. Rios presented with an illustration of Option 2 where TPT licenses would have a fee of \$35 and nontaxable businesses would have a fee of \$25. He said in the nontaxable there is a \$25 decrease, but there is an increase on the taxable. He asked why they couldn't be balanced out so no one had an increase at all.

Ms. Rios explained the information she was presenting was to show what the fees could be if Council wanted the fees to be revenue neutral. A suggested fee would be \$35 for the TPT and \$25 for the Occupational License. At that point, the sum of the two is \$60 for a taxable business who would have both of those licenses. Ms. Rios said the reason

for the difference is because with some businesses, particularly residential rentals, the city cannot obtain an Occupational License from them, so there is a loss in revenue. Some businesses will not have two licenses and the city can only get a TPT license on residential rentals. A state law prohibits cities from requiring any other type of license from a property manager or residential rental property. With this fee scenario, the city would receive revenue close to what it receives now which is a net sum of \$733,000. The nontaxable businesses pay only \$25 and the taxable businesses pay \$60 because they require both licenses.

Councilmember Sherwood asked how they got from \$45,000 to \$263,000 if you were lowering it. He said they were going from \$45,000 current revenue to \$263,000 on the occupational side.

Ms. Rios said that is because right now the city only has about 900 businesses that have an Occupational Only License. Under the Option 1 scenario, every business the city has would be required to have that license. Therefore, about 14,800 businesses would have a license at \$25. The number of TPT licenses goes down by the amount of residential rentals.

Mayor Weiers said the whole concept was brought on by the state to make tax easier.

Ms. Rios said these changes to Chapter 21.1 and 21.2 will have a public hearing and ordinance before the Council on June 23, 2015. Also on June 23, 2015, Council will also see a new Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with ADOR, also because of the change of administration. That IGA takes effect on July 1, 2015 and replaces the current IGA. Some aspects of this IGA will not take effect until the state begins TPT administration. Ms. Rios said after Council gives direction on business licensing, staff will bring an ordinance to Council for approval. She anticipates bringing that forward in Fall 2015 due to the DOR taking over administration in 2016. However, because of challenges ADOR is having in getting the system working, the changes may not be needed, but they will know more in the fall.

Councilmember Aldama asked if staff had a recommendation on the options presented.

Ms. Rios said staff recommends going with the two licenses primarily because of the approval process. She explained if the city does not license all businesses with an Occupational License, the city will lose the ability to regulate those businesses in advance and all regulation of zoning, codes or signage for the business would have to be done a different way. She said it would not be part of the licensing process.

Councilmember Aldama clarified that is Option 1.

Ms. Rios said they are recommending Option 1. She said the City of Phoenix operates this way and a business might be up and operating before the city realizes the business does not have the right kind of signage or is not zoned properly. She said other cities currently under state administration, they all have some type of Occupational License for this reason, so they can do regulation in advance and they can use the information from the Businesses Licenses for economic development.

Councilmember Turner said it is appropriate that all Glendale businesses have a city license. He asked if all businesses were currently paying a TPT fee or an occupational license fee.

Ms. Rios said that was correct.

Councilmember Turner said the question hinged on whether the Council wants to keep this revenue neutral or whether they were looking at cost recovery or anything else. He said he wasn't sure if the \$35 fee for TPT and \$25 fee for Occupational Licenses was the right mix, but he wasn't sure of an alternative either.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said a new business would only be required to have a license from the state. She asked how the city would obtain the license from that new business. She said there might be a delay between the time the business is licensed by the state and has opened before the city knew they were doing business in the city.

Ms. Rios said there were a number of ways that could be accomplished, one of which was public outreach. She said in her experience, a business might come pull permits and staff could provide information about getting a city license. She said businesses will contact the city through various departments asking what they need to do business in the city and the information could be provided at that point, as well. She also said the city could also develop a brochure on what a new business needs to do to operate in the city. She said the state would also be aware of the city requirements and the state would notify the business of the need to obtain a city license. She acknowledged there will be businesses that don't know about the city requirement until after the fact. The state will provide that information to the city so the city can obtain licenses from those businesses.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said she would not want to be perceived as not being business friendly.

Mayor Weiers asked if this came up because contractors were complaining about every city requiring a license in addition to the license required by the state.

Ms. Rios said that is a consideration that different cities have different requirements. Even though the simplification efforts took place and the state is going to administer the TPT license, many cities are still going to have a separate Occupational License, and they have the ability to do that.

Mayor Weiers said the state made an agreement that the cities could do that to make it more tolerable because the issue was so complex.

Ms. Rios said that was correct.

Councilmember Sherwood asked about the fees in both options presented and the revenue that would generate.

Ms. Rios said when she prepared the Council Report, she was looking at if the city were to keep the TPT license in place and add an Occupational License for everyone, what we would see is that \$692,000 figure double, except it is a little lower because of the residential rentals. She explained that is how the \$670,000 came about. She said that would mean the taxable businesses would now be paying \$100 and that is where that revenue comes in. She said you are keeping the \$50 for everyone and then the TPT businesses coming through the state would have another \$50.

Councilmember Sherwood said this is revenue generating and this is cost neutral.

Ms. Rios said that is right, if the desire of Council is to generate additional revenue, then you could set the fee such that if you were setting the fee of \$50, you would generate

approximately \$670,000. To remain revenue neutral, she also looked at a \$35/\$25 model, but said it can be set at whatever amount Council desires.

Councilmember Sherwood said he would like to see them remain as cost neutral as possible. He said the state is administering the licenses, but the cities want to retain information and compliance and that is the added license they are talking about.

Ms. Rios said that is correct.

Councilmember Sherwood said he agreed with Option 1.

Councilmember Turner asked if the fee the business pays to have the TPT License comes back to the city of Glendale.

Ms. Rios said the money does come back to the city.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was a certain amount of money Glendale pays to the state to administer this program.

Ms. Rios said the city will pay a fee to the state.

Mr. Duensing said he did not know the number, but guessed it was in the \$600,000 range, for the state to administer collection of the TPT.

Councilmember Turner said the city is losing almost \$600,000 in revenue and said the city should be looking at ways to recoup those funds in this process. He said there are two parts, they not only have the license fee, and they also have the taxes that are remitted to the state.

Ms. Rios said those taxable businesses will license with the state and remit their taxes through the state.

Councilmember Turner said the state will take their cut at least on the remittances for processing costs and send the city back the difference.

Ms. Rios said the state will send the city everything and then bill the city for the payment of the \$600,000.

Councilmember Turner said it is important that the city has the information on the businesses that do business in the city. He said a \$50 license fee is less than \$2 a week. He said if \$50 was an appropriate fee for an Occupational License last year and the year before, he thinks \$50 is still appropriate today to continue to have access to that business information. He said it would not bother him to have a \$50 Glendale Business License fee.

Ms. Rios said they can go back and look at keeping the Occupational License fee at \$50 and review what the TPT License would be. She said they initially looked at an option of making the Occupational License \$50 and the TPT License zero. She said it seemed close to being revenue neutral, but the city does lose the revenue from residential rentals as well as a disincentive for people to become licensed at the state level because there is no fee. She said there are certainly other options they can look at for an appropriate TPT license fee at the state to ensure businesses are getting appropriately licensed.

Ms. Rios said she was looking for Council direction.

Councilmember Aldama asked why under Option 1, it says Council will adopt fees and under Option 2, it says Council can adopt fees. He asked what the difference was between the two.

Ms. Rios said she wasn't sure why she wrote it differently. She clarified if the city does nothing, the fees are already set. She said there is an option here to do nothing and leave everything exactly the same. The state would begin collecting a \$50 fee from taxable businesses and the city would collect a \$50 fee from ours. She said fees can be raised at Council's discretion, but she said Council can choose to do nothing. She said there might be a slight drop in revenue because of enforcement because the city will lose enforcement power. The city would have to go to the state for enforcement and wait for the state to do the enforcement. She explained it is the city's fee and Council always has the option to modify it as they see fit.

Councilmember Turner said if they do nothing, the finances stay the same, but the city loses the information on over 14,000 businesses.

Ms. Rios said that is correct. The city will receive the information from the state, but the city will not be able to use it for any purpose.

Councilmember Turner clarified the city will lose the use of the information. He said he didn't think the city should lose the use of the information.

Mayor Weiers said it sounds like there is a consensus to keep this as cost neutral as possible, which is Option 1, and the other Councilmembers agreed to this consensus.

3. [15-366](#)

COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Staff Contact: Brent Stoddard, Director, Intergovernmental Programs

Ms. Goad said City Council Guidelines state that Council should consider appointments to the Council subcommittees at the first workshop each June. Each committee should have three members and the appointments will be made for the upcoming fiscal year. She said the committees are the Government Services Committee and the Council Sustainability Committee, which has been inactive since 2012. She said the policy is Councilmembers can only serve on a committee for two consecutive years. Vice Mayor Hugh and Councilmember Chavira have been serving the Government Services Committee since 2013.

Councilmember Sherwood was appointed to that committee in 2014, so he is eligible for an additional year on that committee. Ms. Goad said staff is seeking guidance on committee appointments for the upcoming year.

Councilmember Aldama asked if they are looking to nominate someone.

Ms. Goad said the practice has been Councilmembers would indicate which committees they are interested in serving on and then the Council would come to a consensus on which members would serve on the committee.

Mayor Weiers asked where they go from here.

Ms. Goad suggested the Council consider two members to join the Government Services Committee.

Mayor Weiers said Councilmember Tolmachoff is not currently on a committee and asked if they can ask her if she wants to serve on the committee.

Ms. Goad said they could ask.

Mayor Weiers said Councilmember Turner was on a committee.

Councilmember Turner said as far as Council committees, there are two and that is where conflict might arise. He said there are also committees outside the city they are appointed to serve on. He asked if it was a conflict for those outside committees.

Ms. Goad said those outside committees such as MAG do not fall under the purview of the guidelines Council has adopted, the guidelines only apply to the Glendale Council Committees.

Mayor Weiers said with two people leaving, it would leave an opening for the two people who haven't served on a committee.

Councilmember Chavira asked if he could recommend someone.

Mayor Weiers said that was fine.

Councilmember Chavira recommended Councilmember Aldama to replace him on the Government Services Committee.

Councilmember Sherwood said they had spoken about substituting a committee to talk about the Council Guidelines for the Sustainability Committee, and said in the near future there would be another subcommittee formed for that reason that an additional 3 Councilmembers will serve on. He wanted to bring that up for consideration.

Councilmember Aldama said he did not realize by selecting that committee he would be excluded from any other committees. He said had that been mentioned to him, he might not have accepted it. He said he would enjoy serving on the Government Services Committee, but through the actual body here.

Ms. Goad believed the committee Councilmember Aldama is referring to is a MAG committee, so that would not preclude him from serving on one of the Glendale Committees.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was anyone else who wanted to be on the Government Services Committee.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said she would serve.

Mayor Weiers said there were a couple Councilmembers who would like to serve.

Councilmember Turner said there are two Council committees, one of which has no members at this time and the other which has three members. He said it does not seem to mention how many committees a Councilmember may serve on, and says one cannot be the chairperson of more than one committee. So even if they do create future committees, by serving on a committee today, it would not preclude you from serving on a new committee tomorrow.

Ms. Goad said that was her interpretation as well.

There was City Council consensus that Councilmembers Aldama and Tolmachoff would be appointed to serve on the Government Services Committee for FY16.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Acting City Manager Bowers had nothing to report at this time.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

City Attorney Bailey had nothing to report at this time.

COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

The Councilmembers had no items of special interest to discuss.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council moved into Executive Session at 3:00 p.m.