

City of Glendale

5850 West Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301



Meeting Minutes - Final

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

1:30 PM

Workshop

Council Chambers

City Council Workshop

Mayor Jerry Weiers

Vice Mayor Ian Hugh

Councilmember Jamie Aldama

Councilmember Joyce Clark

Councilmember Ray Malnar

Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff

Councilmember Bart Turner

CALL TO ORDER**ROLL CALL**

Present 7 - Mayor Jerry Weiers, Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Joyce Clark, Councilmember Ray Malnar, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner

Also present were Kevin Phelps, City Manager; Michael Bailey, City Attorney; and Julie K. Bower, City Clerk.

WORKSHOP SESSION

1. [17-045](#) DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF GLENDALE'S COLORADO RIVER SUPPLY AND EFFORTS TO HELP MITIGATE THE RAPID WATER LEVEL DECLINE IN LAKE MEAD THROUGH THE DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN
Staff Contact: Craig Johnson, P.E., Director, Water Services
Staff Presenter: Doug Kupel, PhD, Deputy Director, Water Services
Staff Presenter: Drew Swieczkowski, Environmental Program Manager, Water Services

Mr. Johnson explained the purpose of the item was to provide information on the City's Colorado River supply and proposals to reduce water level declines in Lake Mead. The Colorado River supply was an integral part of the City's water supply and must be protected to slow the decline in water levels in Lake Mead.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the area had been in a 17-year drought resulting in reduced water levels in Lake Mead. He explained delivery of water would be done in tiered increments and Arizona, Nevada and New Mexico would experience shortages. The drop in water levels would trigger reductions in water delivery from Lake Mead. New future predictions indicated that the 2007 guidelines were not enough to keep Lake Mead safe from drastic water level declines. He said California did not have any reductions under the 2007 guidelines.

Mr. Swieczkowski said once Lake Mead fell below the 1,025 elevation level, there was a potential for total loss of hydropower generation. The Secretary of Interior might act to protect Lake Mead from future water level declines, however those actions were unknown. Actions could include drastic reductions in Colorado River water supply to Arizona and other lower basin states.

At elevation 1,000, there was insufficient storage to meet lower basin deliveries. At elevation 895, also called the dead pool, there was no water available for delivery and only 2 million acre feet of water in storage. A tier 1 shortage began when elevation at Lake Mead fell to 1,075 feet, tier 2 began when elevation fell below 1,050 feet and tier 3 when Lake Mead fell below 1,025 feet. Once levels fell below tier 3, mandatory consultation with all users and the Secretary of Interior began. He explained municipal water and Indian water would not be reduced under any of the tier reductions.

Mr. Swieczkowski said predictions for the drought contingency plan (DCP) indicated that

more was needed to be done for Lake Mead beyond the 2007 guidelines to prevent catastrophic declines. The DCP was developed to delay Lake Mead going into shortage tiers. He said the DCP had an immediate reduction to Arizona and Colorado River supplies with deeper cuts to both states during each shortage tier. The Bureau of Reclamation and Mexico gave up water and California shared in the reductions and would surrender a portion of its allocation.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the Arizona Municipal Water Users Association (AMWUA) was the main communication link between the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) and the municipal providers. The DCP Plus plan sought to keep Lake Mead above 1,075 ft., and conserved 1.2 million acre feet in Lake Mead over three years. The DCP Plus plan helped assure that all Arizona water sectors agreed to the DCP. Voluntary conservation of 1.2 million acre feet reduced the likelihood of cuts to agricultural pool and NIA water.

Mr. Swieczkowski said key funding sources identified for the DCP Plus program were the State of Arizona, the City of Phoenix and AMWUA, and a commitment was expected in early 2017, with a needed contribution possibly later in 2017. Glendale's annual contribution was \$100,000 for three years and staff recommended the funds be taken from CIP funds that had been set aside for water recharge activities. These funds were in the water recharge budget for FY17 and proposed budget for FY18.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the raw water increase in costs for cities with and without the DCP Plus contingency program was already going up and would continue to rise in the future. The main reasons were the fixed costs for operating the CAP must be spread over a lower volume of water delivered through the canal, rising energy costs and maintenance of an aging canal infrastructure. The DCP Plus program would increase costs over the current published rates and rates would continue to increase for Colorado River water delivered through the CAP.

Mr. Swieczkowski said a lot of work still had to be done and agreements had to be made before DCP Plus was approved in Arizona. He said staff was supportive of the DCP Plus plan efforts and believed it could protect Lake Mead from a shortage in the next few years. Staff was seeking Council feedback regarding support for DCP Plus, including possible expenditures of \$100,000 per year over a three-year period.

Councilmember Clark asked why California was not compelled to reduce its water allocation until the DCP program was implemented.

Mr. Swieczkowski said when the 2007 guidelines were first established, California felt it did not have an obligation to lose any of its water. Arizona had always been a very low priority for Colorado River water because it had to fund the CAP being built.

Councilmember Clark asked if Glendale voluntarily took less water, how would the City compensate for the reduction.

Mr. Swieczkowski said Glendale had a robust water portfolio and an ample supply of groundwater. The City had been recharging its aquifers and there was a three-year supply. Each of these supplies could make up for some of the loss the City might experience.

Councilmember Clark said the proposal would only get the City through the next five years. She wanted to know what was being done to create new supplies of water or to make the current supplies more robust during that time.

Mr. Swieczkowski said Glendale had a great conservation team and recharged as much water as it could to build up reserves for the future and was looking for new ways to improve the supply. He explained conservation and recharge were the two biggest things the City was doing now to save water.

Councilmember Clark asked if the state or region had considered desalinization and if it was viable.

Mr. Swieczkowski said there was an augmentation committee that was looking at ways to augment the water supply that included desalinization. He said desalinization had a very high cost per acre foot. Costs would go down as processes improved and it might be sooner rather than later because of the drought conditions.

Councilmember Clark asked if the recent rains might hold off the DCP Plus plan for one year.

Mr. Swieczkowski said there had been discussions about the snow pack, but the long-term deficit of losing the water that was not being replenished was a bigger problem. Plans for the future included a continuing drought.

Councilmember Clark said the two primary sources were CAP for the northern part of the City and SRP for the southern part. She asked if it was possible to move back to SRP and get an increase in allocation to make up for loss of the CAP water.

Mr. Swieczkowski said SRP water had to be served on member lands. If it was taken off and served north of the Arizona Canal, the City was charged for that. SRP did not allow SRP water to be taken off project.

Councilmember Clark asked how SRP did that if it served the City with blended water.

Mr. Swieczkowski said SRP kept very good track of that and staff received a report from SRP showing what amount of water was delivered on project and delivered off project. He said if the City ended up sending more water off project, the City had to pay that back in CAP or other sources of water.

Councilmember Clark asked if it could be paid in dollars.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the contract stated either CAP water or new conservation space water.

Councilmember Clark asked if getting more SRP water for on project lands would be helpful to the City.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the City currently had ample SRP water. Any time agricultural land was developed, that water was sent over to the City.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the water saved during the DCP was somehow banked for City use at a future date.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the water was not given back and was only a savings of water in Lake Mead. The plan was to store more water in Lake Mead so future reductions were not necessary. If tier 3 levels were reached, the water would go down much faster due to the shape of the lake.

Councilmember Clark said it was California's problem as well. She asked what the calculations were based on.

Mr. Swieczkowski said it was based on a percentage and Arizona was always the lowest priority in receiving Colorado River water. He said although California was involved in some of the discussions, it was not giving up much water. Nevada had a relatively small allocation of Colorado River water to begin with so its reduction was much larger.

Councilmember Clark wanted to make the point that Arizona could continue with the plan to conserve water, only to have it consumed by California because it was still taking its full allocation every year.

Dr. Kupel said when Arizona received authorization for CAP, the agreement was that Arizona's shortage would come before any shortage in California. There was nothing in law that said California ever had to take a shortage. The same was true with Mexico as well. It was a major accomplishment to get California to the table and agree to share in the shortage. He said the other issue was Arizona was giving up some water to avoid a bigger impact. It would not have an immediate impact on Glendale's water supply, but it would have an economic impact on Arizona if water to agricultural areas were cut. He said they were trying to be part of the regional and economic solution to the problem.

Mayor Weiers asked if all the water user groups and SRP were in favor.

Dr. Kupel said there was disagreement among water user groups, but said most were supportive of the DCP and the DCP Plus. He said staff believed it was in the City's best interest to be on record as supporting the plan. The DCP Plus was created to address some concerns and there were differences of opinion among the other cities, depending on the contributions being made.

Mayor Weiers asked what Phoenix would be paying.

Mr. Swieczkowski said Phoenix proposed to contribute \$3 to \$6 million to the DCP Plus program.

Councilmember Turner said California was now in a position of power.

Dr. Kupel said that was correct and that was the price Arizona paid to begin the CAP project.

Councilmember Turner asked if there was any incentive for California to join in and begin to reduce their water usage earlier than necessary.

Dr. Kupel said it was to avoid the catastrophic decline in Lake Mead. It would affect hydroelectric power generation at Hoover Dam and California was a beneficiary of that power. Any decrease would affect the entire southwest, including California and Nevada. He said California realized that something needed to be done sooner to avoid a catastrophic event.

Councilmember Turner asked what had been the trend in water conservation in Glendale.

Dr. Kupel said the City had done an excellent job in water conservation but could not conserve its way out of the problem.

Councilmember Turner said if Lake Mead continued to fall in the future like it had over the last ten years, he believed the levels would be lower than third tier levels. He said keeping water levels higher would keep Arizona in control. If water levels fell far enough, control would fall to the federal government.

Councilmember Aldama said they were protecting the basin of water that Arizona drew from and asked when the guidelines from 2007 would be reviewed again.

Mr. Swieczkowski said the guidelines expired in 2026 and would be reviewed before then.

Mayor Weiers spoke about a plant in Yuma that was owned by the federal government, that was built to clean up the high saline in the water there. It was not currently being used. He asked if there were any plans to use the facility to clean up the water.

Dr. Kupel said the plant was very expensive to operate and the ground water augmentation council was looking at using the facility again. The lead time was long on any project like that.

Mayor Weiers asked how many feet they could go down before there was no water.

Dr. Kupel said the 1,025-foot level was the most dangerous. At that point, the Secretary of the Interior would take action and start making decisions.

Councilmember Aldama hoped there was a plan in place for advocating over the next eight years.

Councilmember Clark hoped the cities would consider any imbalances that might occur and create equity. She asked if the City had any attorneys on retainer regarding the DCP Plus issue and how much money had been paid to those attorneys.

Dr. Kupel said Bill Anger of Engelman Berger was its outside counsel and represented the City on two water matters but no specific attorney was engaged for the DCP issue. He explained the payments did come out of the Water Services budget enterprise fund.

Councilmember Clark asked for a list of the payments made in FY2016.

Mayor Weiers asked if staff needed direction from Council.

Mr. Johnson asked for Council support to move forward with the plan to support the overall DCP Plus and spending the \$100,000 a year for three years.

Mayor Weiers asked for information on what all the cities involved would be paying.

Mr. Johnson said staff would provide all information requested.

Mayor Weiers said there was Council consensus.

2. [17-047](#)

COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: TRANSIT SERVICES FARE STRUCTURE

Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Trevor Ebersole, Deputy Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Kevin Link, Transit Administrator, Public Works

Mr. Link said Mayor Weiers requested a Council item of special interest in August of

2016 regarding an explanation of the Dial-A-Ride fare structure and the higher rate charged for ADA trips. Staff was seeking guidance on a possible fare adjustment.

Mr. Link said the Dial-A-Ride program began in 1975 as a six-month demonstration project and was the first of its kind in Arizona. It was originally contracted with a vendor until the City took over operations in 1977. He said the last fare adjustment was in 1991. The service area was now 55 square miles and was still available to the general public. There were currently 22 Dial-A-Ride wheelchair accessible buses and over half were in service during peak times on weekdays. Same day service was available Monday through Friday; however, reservations were required for service on weekends and holidays.

Mr. Link said ADA riders had more flexibility with Dial-A-Ride with additional hours, tighter pick-up windows, and door-to-door service. He said in July 2016, regional ADA service was implemented, which was provided by a Valley Metro contractor. The service was available to the ADA eligible residents of all Valley Metro partner cities. There was a flat, one way \$4.00 fare to any destination within the service area and the rider's city of residence paid the remaining balance of the trip cost.

Mr. Link provided information about the City's Glendale Urban Shuttle (GUS) service and the area each shuttle services. He said all the GUS buses were wheelchair accessible. He said ridership was trending downwards.

Mr. Link provided information about the current fares for the Dial-A-Ride program and ADA one-way fares along with proposed adjustments. The biggest change would be the general public fare. Those customers would have an easier time using fixed route service if they chose to do so. Mr. Link explained Glendale had the most robust service program of all the other cities.

Mr. Link said there would be an expected decrease in ridership any time fees were adjusted, but the decline would probably be temporary. The City could expect an additional \$23,000 in revenue with the fare increase. He said there was a large demand for ADA trips and the service was inherently more costly. The goal was to encourage residents to use the same day service and to stay and shop in Glendale, rather than use the regional service.

Mr. Link also proposed eliminating the reduced peak hour rate for the GUS fares and said counting the twenty-five cent fares was labor intensive and eliminating the fare would provide a better customer experience. Currently, the fare was not cost recoverable and there were 17 circulators in the region, 15 of which were free. He also said elimination of the fare would attract new riders and increase ridership.

Mr. Link said the fare adjustments would provide a net positive revenue of just over \$2,000 to the transit budget. The current operating budget for Dial-A-Ride was \$2.8 million and the current operating budget for GUS was \$769,000. He said it was critical to get input from citizens and residents on the fare adjustment. If Council provided direction to proceed, staff would seek continual discussions with the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee. Additionally, there would be community outreach through the Glendale Star, Channel 11 and the City website. There would also be public meetings in various locations throughout the City in April and May 2017. The item would be presented at a Council workshop in May and a voting meeting in June and any changes would take place thirty days after approval.

Mayor Weiers asked if it had been 26 years since a fare adjustment.

Mr. Link said that was correct.

Councilmember Aldama asked who was riding GUS the bus.

Mr. Link said it was a mixture of high school students, seniors and riders connected to fixed routes.

Councilmember Aldama would like to have seen specific numbers about the GUS ridership. He asked in which part of the City was Dial-A-Ride used the most.

Mr. Link said Dial-A-Ride was not tracked geographically, but it was used pretty evenly throughout the City.

Councilmember Aldama asked if Dial-A-Ride covered the whole city.

Mr. Link said it went out to 115th Avenue and up to Pinnacle Peak.

Councilmember Aldama was concerned with raising the rates to that extent and thought it was designed for low income riders. He wasn't sure raising rates would help those vulnerable and fixed-income riders. He would like to see more data on who used the service.

Mr. Link said the majority of the riders were seniors or disabled persons based on fare type. He said some of the disabled riders were clients who were ADA eligible who chose to use the same-day service and paid the cheaper fare. He said during the recession, staff received information from riders that riders would be willing to pay an additional charge to keep the service available. He said for some, it was their only transportation option.

Councilmember Aldama agreed that the service did encourage riders to shop locally.

Councilmember Clark supported the proposal and said it was logical. She said Glendale was only one of two cities who provided this type of service. She would like to see GUS provide service out to Bell Road.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if selling advertising would help offset the costs.

Mr. Link said staff was looking at possibly advertising on the bus shelters but had not discussed advertising inside or outside the buses.

Councilmember Tolmachoff was interested in seeing more information on the program. She would like to see the GUS bus branded more toward Glendale. It currently looked very similar to the Dial-A-Ride buses.

Councilmember Turner said 91 percent of the ridership were seniors and ADA riders.

Mr. Link said that was correct.

Councilmember Turner asked how many trips a senior or disabled person might make in a month on the Dial-A-Ride program.

Mr. Link said it varied. Some rode as often as 3 or 4 times a week, while some rode more often than that. Some patrons only used the service to go to church on Sundays.

Councilmember Turner said a senior might see a \$22 impact to their budget with the proposed rate increase.

Mr. Link said that was true and said it could impact the riders' travel habits.

Councilmember Turner said it might cause riders to want to stay in Glendale and shop locally. He said he supported the changes and was interested in the public feedback.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said it might cause a hardship to some of the citizens. She asked about resources available to riders to assist with the fare.

Mr. Link explained the lunch trips to the Adult Center and trips to the Y, were subsidized. He said the Kidney Foundation also subsidized certain trips.

Councilmember Turner suggested considering a monthly pass at a lower rate for those who might ride on a regular basis. He said they didn't want to discourage people from being active in the community.

Mr. Link said staff had discussed the idea.

Mayor Weiers said even with a new fare structure in place, Glendale would still be offering more opportunities than any other city in the valley.

Mr. Link said that was correct.

Mayor Weiers said the City needed to do something after so many years, but all citizens benefited from the service.

Councilmember Malnar asked what the fare might be today in real dollars if the fare had been increased on a regular basis.

Mr. Link said the purchasing power of a dollar in 1991 was \$1.83 in today's money based on the inflation rate.

Mayor Weiers said there was a consensus to move forward.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Phelps had no items to report.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Bailey had no items to report but said there was an Executive Session scheduled after the meeting.

COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Councilmember Aldama asked that a disparity study be conducted to identify inequalities in the City. He said there was a feeling that the City was not equal in the services it provided. The study should be broad and might be outsourced. He wanted the study to look at the economic differences in the City; differences in programs for the elderly, youth and children; differences in sporting programs; differences in facilities and amenities; operations of city-owned facilities; and events that served children and seniors in different parts of the City.

Councilmember Clark wanted to develop regulations regarding lobbyists working in the City, developing a reporting form and establishing policy regarding registration of lobbyists. She also wanted to consider zero-based budgeting for next fiscal year, beginning with Human Resources and Code Compliance.

Councilmember Malnar said there appeared to be a conflict with what was allowed regarding fireworks in the state statute and the City Code and wanted clarification. He also wanted to get Police and Fire input regarding fireworks at a future workshop.

Councilmember Tolmachoff would like to see information about the possibility of red light cameras to help prevent accidents at dangerous intersections.

Vice Mayor Hugh agreed with Councilmember Tolmachoff and said he was in favor of anything that could be done to do reduce the number of traffic accidents in Glendale.

Mayor Weiers would like information about posting a sign listing the name and number of miles to sister cities, beginning with Orland, Norway. He also wanted to talk about a future trip to Orland, Norway.

MOTION AND CALL TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

A motion was made by Councilmember Clark, seconded by Councilmember Tolmachoff, to enter into Executive Session. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Weiers, Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council entered into Executive Session at 3:13 p.m.

A motion was made by Councilmember Aldama, seconded by Councilmember Malnar, to adjourn. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Weiers, Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

The City Council adjourned at 4:39 p.m.