City of Glendale

5850 West Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301

Meeting Minutes - Final

Tuesday, April 18, 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 6 - Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Joyce Clark, Councilmember Ray Malnar, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner

    Absent 1 - Mayor Jerry Weiers

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

WORKSHOP SESSION

1.   [17-138](#)   PRESENTATION ON THE ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP) SYSTEM SELECTION PROJECT
Staff Contact and Presenter: Vicki Rios, Director, Budget and Finance
Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Assistant City Manager
Staff Presenter: Lisette Camacho, Assistant Director, Budget and Finance

Mr. Duensing said the request was to replace the ERP system. The new system would replace several outdated systems currently in use and would make data easier to access by staff and Council. It would be easier to make data-driven decisions and to be proactive on financial issues. He said a consultant was hired to determine what the City's needs were and the process had been ongoing for several months.

Ms. Camacho said representatives from Tyler Technologies and Berry Dunn were in attendance to answer any questions. She said the ERP was a financial system that recorded revenues, tracked expenditures, issued purchase orders and paid vendors. The ERP system was also the Human Resources payroll system, which recruited, tracked and paid employees. The ERP system also was used for reporting and would provide information for decision-making and compliance with regulatory requirements.

Ms. Camacho said the current ERP system used by the City was Peoplesoft. There were several other systems also used by staff to capture data which did not integrate with Peoplesoft.

Councilmember Clark asked if all the systems shown did not interface with Peoplesoft.

Ms. Rios said each system did not integrate directly with Peoplesoft. She explained there were some file upload options available, but those were manual processes.

Councilmember Clark asked which of the systems required manual upload.

Ms. Rios said they all required some type of manual intervention, although some had a file upload option such as the budget system. Neogov had no upload option into Peoplesoft. The CAFR was a download from Peoplesoft to another database.

Ms. Rios said the budget CIP system was a separate Access database, which was developed by staff who were no longer working for the City. The system could not be

accessed by multiple users and the report from the database could not be changed or modified, nor could a year-by-year comparison be done.

Ms. Rios said the Employees Relations database tracked matters affecting employees, and maintained information regarding investigations involving employees. The P-card system did contain a file upload to Peoplesoft, but when the file was uploaded it did not contain the vendor and other important information. If a purchase had been created for a vendor, a P-card could not be used to pay the vendor without manual input by staff.

Ms. Rios said the Sage Fixed Asset System was used to track major assets for the City and record asset disposals. The information had to be manually re-entered into the Peoplesoft system. The Sage Fixed Asset System was purchased as an interim solution due to audit findings about the inability to determine depreciation correctly. The City did not have a database that tracked contracts, expiration dates or terms of contracts. She explained the new contract manager had created some systems in Sharepoint to track the data in the larger City contracts, but it was still a manual process and there was no integration with Peoplesoft for the system.

Ms. Rios said the budget system was an Access database and the information was used to produce the budget books. It was very difficult to make changes in the system and the system had to be manually reconciled. The supplemental budget process also did not work within the database and a separate form had to be created in Sharepoint to capture the information. She said the database did not produce charts or graphs and had to be manually produced in Excel.

Ms. Rios discussed the cost of the inefficiencies with the processes. Several City departments were asked to quantify any savings they would see with the new ERP project. She provided examples of the costs incurred. She also explained the lengthy process of billing for vendors.

Mr. Duensing had asked the departments how much time and effort was spent working in all the various systems. He did not know what the exact time savings would be or what functions the employees would be able to eliminate with the new ERP system. He said with a robust ERP system, staff could produce monthly reports that could be used by Council and staff to determine any issues that needed to be addressed. The new ERP system would be much more proactive than the systems currently in use.

Mr. Phelps had been involved in an integrated ERP update in his prior position. The new system was more user-friendly and it was easier to become a data-driven organization. He said staff was able to query the kind of information that allowed departments to make course corrections on a real-time basis. He explained there was potential for error with every manual input into any of the shadow systems.

Ms. Rios said so many different systems created inefficiencies. Although there were dollars in the budget for a new e-procurement system and a grants management systems, as well as several other systems, the new ERP system was an opportunity to gain new functionality with system enhancements. She said the future of Peoplesoft was unclear and it was no longer being actively marketed or sold. A recent upgrade of the human management side of Peoplesoft was completed in 2015. Oracle had indicated that it would not be enhancing or upgrading Peoplesoft after January 2018, and the Human Resources side would be out of support in March 2021.

Ms. Rios said several options were considered, which included maintaining the status quo with an unsupported system. The City would not get any security updates or any

type of tax, legal or regulatory updates. An unsupported system would lead to an audit finding by the external auditors, which would lead to bond rating downgrades.

Ms. Rios said a second option was to migrate the financials to version 9.2. The quote to migrate the financial system was $1 million and would require the same staff resources and time as implementing a new system because it was a major migration. The City would receive little or no benefit from that migration. The system would be supported, but the City would get nothing new and would still have to implement a new ERP system at some time in the future.

Ms. Rios said a third option was to replace the ERP system for an integrated system that would allow the City to streamline processes. The system included budget, procurement, capital assets, as well as grant and project management functionality. She said there were benefits in having a cloud-based system. She said the City would have the benefit of upgrades without any additional cost. She said with the software as a service system, if software was identified that might be useful, the vendor updated the software and all the users gained that functionality. The vendor completely supported the software and there was no need for IT staff to support the software. If there were issues with the software, a user would contact the vendor's help desk, not the City's help desk. The data was backed up and stored regularly in the cloud to ensure a smooth recovery if there ever was a disaster.

Ms. Camacho said the total budget for the project was $6 million over a two-year period, and the project was planned for and budgeted. The project would be cash-funded. The implementation services cost included software configuration, data conversion, interface, report development, testing and training. Ms. Camacho explained there might not be a need for the full-time project manager, business process consulting and change management consulting. Other items in the budget included subscription maintenance and support, project management, backfill, and contingency. She said the project manager cost was $150,000, which would be expended in FY16-17.

Ms. Camacho provided an annual cost comparison between Peoplesoft and Tyler Munis. She said several projects were put on hold when the City began the ERP system project. If Council decided to stay with Peoplesoft, it would be purchasing a budget system, an e-procurement and bid management system and a grant management system at a cost of $182,000 annually. She explained the City was currently paying for Neogov, capital assets and accounts receivable in Quickbooks and if a new ERP system was approved, those costs would be included in the price, for a savings of $64,000. She said the City would also gain additional functionality with a new ERP system that it did not currently have, including employee management and expense reimbursement, P-card reconciliation, contract management, project accounting, CAFR builder, analytics and reporting.

Ms. Rios said the new functionality of an ERP system included real-time access to information across all modules, electronic routing and approval, multi-year budget projections and what-if scenarios, ability to forecast future salary and benefit costs, awarded bids that could be converted into purchase orders or turned into contracts, tracking of budgets, expenditures and revenues for capital improvements, tracking of grant applications, funding, expenses and reimbursements, billing and collection of miscellaneous invoices and analytics and reporting.

Mr. Duensing said it was important to be able to complete a five-year financial projection to plan effectively. The Tyler Munis system allowed cities to forecast revenues as well as budget and forecast salaries and related costs. He said Tyler Munis was an intuitive

product by allowing a view of funding sources and vendor payments. Accessing that type of data in the Peoplesoft system was a much more complicated process. The City currently had a lack of good financial reporting and Tyler Munis allowed monthly financial reporting for both revenues and expenditures.

Ms. Rios said the Tyler Munis system had an integrated P-card reconciliation that included the ability to import transaction details from the bank, electronic receipt attachment and tracked expenditures against a vendor or a contract. The system also had an employee expense reimbursement function which allowed travel request and approval. The process eliminated paper receipt storage and allowed the ability to create expense reports and view status of pending requests.

Ms. Rios explained that in the Peoplesoft system, the financial system and the payroll system were not integrated. An upload was required from the payroll system into the financial system.

Mr. Duensing said the positives of the proposed system included integrated systems including budget and e-procurement, paperless electronic routing and approval of items, tracking multi-year capital projects, contracts and grants and an integrated P-card module that captured expenses by vendors. Other positives included paperless employee expense reimbursement, electronic receipt and storage, collection and billing of miscellaneous invoices, as well as tracking job applications and employee's employment history, managing employee professional development and performance evaluations, and CAFR builder, dashboards, analytics and reporting. There was no perfect software system out there and staff might have some integration issues.

Mr. Duensing said negatives of the new ERP system included the initial up-front investment, a change in business processes, users must learn a new system and unknown integration.

Mr. Phelps said it was a significant capital investment, but it touched every single function and every employee in the organization and having software to manage the people and finances would never be obsolete. He explained the cost of the project had been built into the five-year forecast and did not take away from attaining the $50 million fund balance goal. He said there would be efficiency gained for employees and the access to good data in a timely manner made it worthwhile and the right investment for Glendale.

Ms. Rios said the project was in the recommended budget and the item would come forward once contract negotiations had been completed.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked when the Council would know the actual cost of the project.

Ms. Rios said the contract would have the final costs when it was presented for approval. She said staff was still discussing the costs for the full-time project manager, business process consultant and change management consultant to determine if those responsibilities could be handled by City staff.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said it was still a $1 million difference in cost for the project and asked what the timeline was to determine actual costs.

Ms. Rios said staff would come forward with the contract for the project at the May 23rd Council meeting and staff would know the final costs well before that date.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the City of Gilbert managed its own conversion.

Ms. Camacho said Gilbert was still in the process of implementation, but was moving from a Tyler Munis product to another Tyler Munis product. She said Gilbert was not using the full-time project manager, business process consultant or change management consultant and their transition would be much easier than Glendale's project.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if Scottsdale only converted their Human Resources systems to Tyler Munis.

Ms. Camacho said that was correct.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if anyone knew what system Scottsdale was using for their financials.

Ms. Camacho believed they were using a home-grown system for their financials. She said Scottsdale had not identified funding for their financials system, but was planning on replacing that system in the FY17-18 budget.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if it was possible to make the transition in a two-step process.

Ms. Rios said generally it was done in a two-step process, with the human resources/payroll side completed first. She said they were electing to do the financials side first because of the timeline from Peoplesoft.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked how saving so many staff hours with implementation of the new system would translate to benefit for the taxpayer.

Mr. Duensing said staff did not currently know whether it could reduce costs or increase service levels. He said his department had so many financial reporting needs that had gone unmet, the time they saved would be redeployed into providing information and actively managing the financial reporting. They would not know what the impact would be until the system was implemented and up and running.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the system would be able to provide information on whether they had more employees than they actually needed. She was looking out for the taxpayer and asked how the new system would help them.

Ms. Rios said with the type of project, it was difficult up front to say positions could be eliminated, however, it would allow the City to grow in the types of functionality and the things it could do without adding staff. She said by automating processes, staff might be able to grow service levels without adding more staff. She said the system would be more efficient and staff might be redirected to other functions which better served the taxpayers. She would like to be able to do the reporting that the Council expected and deserved in a more timely manner.

Councilmember Malnar said it was just the type of information he needed to analyze the project. He asked if the existing hardware would integrate into the system, or if additional hardware would be necessary.

Ms. Rios said it was a cloud-based system and no additional hardware would be needed.

Councilmember Malnar liked the idea that no IT staff would be needed to support the project.

Ms. Rios said that was correct. She said it was becoming harder and harder to find people who support the Peoplesoft system because Peoplesoft was not marketing and selling the systems any longer. She said service was very expensive. She said the new system would be supported entirely offsite by the vendor.

Councilmember Malnar asked how the cloud-based system worked now and what efficiency would be gained ensuring the system was properly backed up.

Ms. Rios said they did have data backups through IT, but with the new business model, the information was stored in the cloud.

Councilmember Malnar asked if it would be more automated.

Ms. Rios said yes, the vendor would do that.

Councilmember Malnar asked what the timeframe was for implementation.

Ms. Rios said implementation of both phases was a two-year project.

Councilmember Malnar encouraged staff to keep track of what it was gaining from the system and how the hours were being reallocated to improve services. He asked staff to let Council know how those extra hours were being used within the departments to make services better.

Councilmember Malnar asked how long the City has had the Peoplesoft system.

Ms. Rios said the City has used the Peoplesoft system about twenty years.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the new system was expected to last about twenty years.

Ms. Rios thought that was correct.

Councilmember Malnar calculated a payback rate of eight years based on the numbers provided. He liked the monthly reporting and thought it would be beneficial to the City to stay on track with revenues and expenses.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the $6 million fee included the maintenance fee of $998,000.

Ms. Rios said the $6 million included the first two years and the $998,000 cost would begin in year three and beyond.

Councilmember Turner said change was inevitable and the question became what did they go to and the timeframe for the change. He was happy there were cash reserves to make the change. He asked if the cost for the project was spread out over two years or if there was some benefit to spreading the cost over more than two years.

Ms. Rios said the project cost over two years was to get the software up and running. She said the project would be depreciated over a longer period of time and they expected to expend the funds for the implementation of the project over that two-year period.

Councilmember Turner asked if the City had the option of taking a longer payment schedule, but still receiving the implementation on the front end.

Ms. Rios did not believe that was an option. She explained initially staff thought it would be a three-year project, but said it would all be expended in the first two years.

Councilmember Turner asked if the payments were phased with the installation and training for the program.

Ms. Rios said that was correct and payments would be made as certain project milestones were met.

Councilmember Aldama said Council didn't know what the benefit was to the citizens, but did know where they could put $6 million. He did understand the inefficiencies of the current system. He was uncomfortable with the comments about audit findings and bond ratings and felt it strong-armed the Council to move the item forward. He said the capacity for error in manual inputting would not make the bond rating go down.

Councilmember Aldama asked if there were any positives in staying with the current system.

Ms. Rios explained the audit findings and downgraded bond ratings would be if the City continued with an unsupported system. The City would have to do an upgrade in order to remain in compliance. That was anticipated and had been budgeted.

Ms. Rios said the positives were that users would not have to learn a new system and would not have to change the way they did business. She said the implementations were a great deal of work and employees would be asked to test the new system. She said it was a difficult and time-consuming process to test a new system. They did feel that staff time and the investment were worth the positive outcomes that were anticipated.

Councilmember Aldama understood staff wanting to bring in a system that would make them more efficient and said he would like staff to quantify the savings if the project was implemented. He was also glad staff was looking at eliminating some parts of the project to save money.

Councilmember Clark asked how long Peoplesoft would provide support with an upgraded module.

Ms. Rios said if Peoplesoft was upgraded, they would have support until 2027.

Councilmember Clark wanted to make it clear there was an option to upgrade Peoplesoft and there would be continued support for another ten years. She was concerned that the City spent $1.5 million to upgrade the Peoplesoft Human Resources system in 2015, which was supported through 2021. She asked if the current Peoplesoft system could be used to recruit employees.

Ms. Rios said the current Peoplesoft system did not have a recruitment function. She said Neogov was used for that process and it did not integrate at all to Peoplesoft.

Ms. Rios said Peoplesoft tracked employee wages, salaries, benefits and position numbers, but did not track employee performance, certifications and training. She said it also did not track any type of disciplinary action an employee might have received.

Councilmember Clark asked if Peoplesoft had the ability to pay employees.

Ms. Rios said Peoplesoft did have the ability to pay employees.

Councilmember Clark asked why the Fire Department staff hour inefficiencies were so high.

Ms. Rios said the Fire Department used several spreadsheets with data obtained from Peoplesoft, including training records, security card information and contracts for purchase orders. There were estimates of 80 hours per week by staff who worked on the various spreadsheets updating real-time information. She said the Fire Department also tracked the PA system and the drop program on the spreadsheets.

Councilmember Clark said the Police Department was a much larger department and required 1,000 hours less than the Fire Department. She was not opposed to financials moving toward the new system, but was not sold on immediately implementing the Human Resources portion of the ERP system because of the upgrade on the system less than two years ago.

Councilmember Clark was not sure there was a benefit to the taxpayer, although she did see the benefit for staff. She was pleased to see consideration of eliminating some costs that might be incurred for the project. Another concern was that Council would not learn about the final cost of the project until the end of May. She thought staff might have a pretty good idea of the final cost of the project since it had been working on the project for a year. She would have liked to have received the PowerPoint information last week, rather than just prior to the meeting. She supported moving forward with the financial module, but did not see the need to move forward with the Human Resources module.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked what the cost was to implement the project in a two-step process.

Ms. Rios said the costs had been separated out by module, but if only the financial module was completed, staff would need to create an interface with the new financial system and the Human Resources system. She did not know what that cost would be. There would not be a complete integration of all the other systems that were being used outside of the Peoplesoft system and it would be necessary to keep several systems, including Neogov, the retiree database, the risk management database and employee relations.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if all of those databases were already being kept separately now.

Ms. Rios said that was correct.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the bulk of the problems seemed to be with the financials and she wasn't sure it was worth it to proceed with upgrading the Peoplesoft in light of the investment the taxpayers recently made into the system. She also asked if the recent upgrade made the Human Resources system more user-friendly and more easily integrated with a new financial system.

Ms. Rios said an upgrade was done to the Peoplesoft system in 2015 but it did not include any additional functionality except for a couple of things. She said those few improvements did not have any impact on the ability to integrate with the financial

system. If the financials were upgraded at this time, staff would have to go back to Oracle and Peoplesoft and determine what the cost was to do an integration to the new system.

Mr. Phelps said staff could work with the vendor regarding a two-phased approach, including costs regarding licensing fees. Staff would come back to Council with the additional information.

Councilmember Turner asked what the compelling arguments were to move to upgrading the Peoplesoft system in 2015, since the larger upgrade project was in the works at that time.

Ms. Rios said the Human Resources version was very old in 2015. It was important to have an updated and supported version of Peoplesoft to get the required IRS tax table updates to be in compliance for payroll and reporting. She said the Peoplesoft financials upgrade was budgeted for the year after the Human Resources upgrade. At that time, Finance and IT staff had discussions about the difficulty in supporting Peoplesoft in general, including increased costs and the lack of support staff.

Ms. Rios said staff discussed whether to make an investment to purchase additional functionality for outside systems to integrate into the Peoplesoft system which was going away in 2018. Later, staff received information that the Peoplesoft system would be extended, but did not have that information at the time the decisions were made.

Councilmember Clark said based on when the announcements by Oracle were made, if staff hadn't known about the continued support, IT should have known about it.

Vice Mayor Hugh said there were no other comments.

2.	[17-142](#)	**CIOSI: CREATION OF A TEMPORARY CITY COUNCIL AND BUSINESS LEADER SUB-COMMITTEE**

Staff Contact and Presenter: Sam McAllen, Director, Development Services

Mr. McAllen said the Council item of special interest was to create a temporary one-year City Council and business leader sub-committee. He said the sub-committee would review City processes and City codes, make policy recommendations to Council regarding improvements to make it easier for businesses to get started and grow within the community. The goal was to make Glendale more business-friendly and enhance Glendale's reputation for supporting job attraction, creation and retention. Staff was asking for policy direction on the item.

Councilmember Clark said since 1992, there had never been a review of the codes and policies regarding regulation of businesses in Glendale. The sub-committee would provide an opportunity to review all of the items for the purpose of recommending to Council the removal of outdated, ineffective and redundant business regulations. It would send a positive message to all businesses that Glendale was serious about improving the business climate. She said business participation on the committee was critical. She had intentionally proposed it as a short-term committee to help Glendale become more business-friendly.

Mr. McAllen explained the committee would be made up of three Councilmembers and four business leaders. He identified six steps that would need to be followed, including a mechanism to create the sub-committee, authorizing the sub-committee, forming the

sub-committee, forming the internal staff support team, convening the sub-committee and reporting to Council.

Mr. McAllen said the goal of the sub-committee was to make Glendale even more business-friendly and enhance Glendale's reputation for supporting job attraction, creation and retention.   There would be a staff team consisting of approximately ten staff members, averaging two to three hours a week during the one-year time period.   He said the estimated impact would be 1,040 to 1,560 staff hours.   Staff was seeking policy guidance and direction from the Council.

Councilmember Malnar said the recommendation was for only three business owners and one design professional on the committee.   He recommended increasing the number of members because there were commercial, residential and design and suggested including a commercial developer, a residential developer as well as an engineer on the sub-committee.

Councilmember Aldama wanted to add members of woman-owned and minority-owned business organizations, as well.

Councilmember Tolmachoff had a concern about staff administratively proceeding with some changes without consent of the Council.

Councilmember Clark said her original intent was that the sub-committee be advisory only.

Mr. Bailey said any recommendations of the committee would have to come before Council for discussion and approval.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if it would be brought back for a vote of Council.   She did not want the committee to make decisions and implement changes without Council approval.

Councilmember Turner said prior to implementing the sub-committee, he would like to see the Chamber survey its members regarding existing issues, solicit feedback from the service counter to see what issues patrons might have and the establishment of a hotline, monitored by the City Manager's Office regarding issues.   He would like to do this for one year before committing staff time and effort to the sub-committee.

Councilmember Clark said a committee reviewing City codes took many hours and lasted much longer than a year.   She said all the suggestions received were welcome and doable and she thought Council could achieve consensus.

Vice Mayor Hugh liked the idea of putting more people on the committee.   He asked what the next step would be and what staff was looking for from the Council.

Mr. McAllen said two items were under discussion.   The first was moving the committee forward and the second item was a recommendation not to move the committee forward, but to gather background data.   He said adding additional members and clarifying the text were things that could be easily done.

Councilmember Aldama asked how much money would be involved in the staff hours necessary for the committee.

Mr. McAllen had broken down the departments that might be responsible, but was not

sure at what level in the organization the participating individuals would be. Staff would need about 2 to 3 hours per week during the one-year period. He said staff could provide an estimate of the dollar amount involved.

Councilmember Aldama said whatever policy the committee created could generate revenue in the future so the staff costs would be recovered.

Mr. McAllen said the goal of the committee was to improve how the City did business with its customers.

Councilmember Tolmachoff liked the idea of moving both proposals forward and would like to establish the committee as well as having a hotline and a counter survey to get a bigger picture of some of the issues businesses were having.

Vice Mayor Hugh said that was a good suggestion and it could all happen simultaneously.

Mr. McAllen said he would combine the data-driven process with the sub-committee and would proceed with expanding the sub-committee to about ten individuals.

Councilmember Clark would like to the committee to stay at an odd number because it might end up trying to achieve consensus or taking a vote.

Councilmember Aldama asked to include his suggested business organizations.

Mr. McAllen said he had included that in his notes and there would be between 11 and 13 individuals, inclusive of what was recommended.

Councilmember Malnar suggested combining the woman and minority requirement into some of the other members of the committee.

Mr. McAllen said staff would continue with the data-driven process, moving the committee forward as outlined by Council comments.

3.   17-148   COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: CREATION OF A DIVERSITY AWARENESS AND HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION
Staff Contact and Presenter: Nancy Mangone, Assistant City Attorney and
Staff Contact and Presenter: Jim Brown, Director, Human Resources and
Risk Management

Ms. Mangone explained Council was transforming the current Commission on Persons with Disabilities to a more robust Diversity Commission. She said in her research, she had found there was a common language in diversity and it included characteristics that made people different from one another. There were primary or internal characteristics of diversity, which people could not change, which might be protected by state or federal law. The secondary characteristics were external dimensions, such as work experience, socio-economic status and religion.

Ms. Mangone said diversity commissions had a definition of diversity as well as goals or a priority statement. She found nine Arizona cities and towns that had boards and commissions addressing cultural diversity issues. She said four of the communities had generic language in their ordinances that generally posed a goal, but did not identify the characteristics that made members of a community diverse. Three of the cities identified some characteristics that would make members of their community diverse. Phoenix

and Tucson each had a very long list of characteristics that defined diversity in their community.

Ms. Mangone also looked at what the City's business partners were doing to define diversity, such as the United Way, National Football League, the NCAA and the U.S. Air Force. Ms. Mangone also reviewed the Council and City's prior actions regarding the issue. In 2014, the City signed the Unity Pledge, and since February 2015, City contracts included a non-discrimination provision.

Ms. Mangone said in drafting the ordinance language, she tried to create an overall goal for the commission. The proposed language eliminated prejudice and discrimination in Glendale and promoted equal opportunity, tolerance, mutual respect, understanding, awareness and unity among all citizens who lived, worked and spent time in the City. She had tried to create a commission that was consistent with the other commissions already in place in the City.

Ms. Mangone said the Diversity Commission would be an advisory board to promote diversity, cultural awareness and inclusion. The commission would also expand the role and amend the language of the City's existing Commission on Persons with Disabilities, and work with the City's Diversity and Inclusion Network to plan educational and cultural events and host dialogues to build community relationships. The commission would have no independent authority to act and would make recommendations to Council.

Ms. Mangone explained the commission's role would be to give citizens a permanent forum to engage City staff and Council on diversity issues and bring information and programs to Council for consideration. The commission would allow for public input on issues of concern to individuals or groups of diverse backgrounds who might feel excluded or marginalized by others in the Glendale community. Further, individuals and groups were identified in the language, so they knew they were welcome to participate and take advantage of the commission's efforts.

Ms. Mangone said membership on the commission was set at 14 members and members were appointed by each Councilmember, Vice Mayor and Mayor. Members must be residents of Glendale and could have special dedication to and knowledge of diversity issues. All subcommittee members must be members of the commission and the subcommittee would have no authority to act independent of the commission.

Ms. Mangone provided a draft of proposed language and said most of the language came from the policy currently adopted by the City of Scottsdale and City of Chandler. She had also used the language that was used in the City's contracts and added several more characteristics or dimensions of diversity which would be covered by the work of the commission.

Councilmember Aldama said the City already defined itself as a city that celebrated diversity. He said it was a position the City believed in, being inclusive, diverse community in all that it did, for those who lived, worked and did business in Glendale.
Councilmember Turner was happy with the proposed language and that the City was following the lead of high profile partners in the community. He said it would provide opportunities for all people, economic development and future Glendale businesses. He supported the language wholeheartedly.

Councilmember Malnar asked what was the purpose for establishing the commission and asked what problem it was resolving.

Ms. Mangone said her job was to do the research.

Councilmember Malnar asked what was the reason the matter was brought forward.

Mr. Brown was not aware of any problems or issues that would make the commission a necessity. He said community meetings and some outreach had been done and there hadn't been any issues. He said Glendale had consistently been rated low in the municipal equality index because of a lack of language in contracts and a commission. He said Council has had some discussions about it in the past.

Councilmember Malnar had thought about the issue and spoken with his constituents. The commission idea did do something good for the community. He provided alternative language for the ordinance.

Councilmember Malnar had problems with the language regarding the differences in people. There were 23 differences identified in the proposed ordinance. He had always tried to recognize the things people had in common. The ordinance seemed to segregate people rather than bring them together as a whole. He was proposing more generic language which did not include a forum for the community to express concerns to the commission. He believed the role of the commission was to make recommendations to the Council about what the City could do to welcome all people and discourage discrimination. He recommended that his version be approved, rather than the version presented by staff.

Councilmember Aldama said Councilmember Malnar's proposed language wanted to remove the word community and he did not feel that was appropriate and believed the Diversity Commission was a segue to bettering business in Glendale. If Councilmember Malnar wanted to change the language, he also might want to go back and repeal the language in the Unity Pledge and the language in City contracts. Those documents contained the same language as the proposed ordinance. He did not understand how Councilmember Malnar could support those documents, but not the proposed ordinance.

Councilmember Clark said of the nine benchmark cities, seven of them used the title Human Relations Commission, which was all-encompassing. Diversity was an opportunity to point out differences in people, and she was not sure that was the direction the Council should go. She supported Councilmember Malnar's version of the proposed ordinance and a Human Relations Commission. It did recognize the goal of eliminating prejudice and creating mutual respect and understanding, which was what she would like to see the commission do.

Councilmember Malnar said the current ordinances did apply to the City as the City did operate as a business. He said the issue reached out to the entire community. He said the ordinance was for the entire City and had implications for all residents and businesses within the City.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said some categories of persons from other ordinances were not included in the proposed language. She agreed with the other comments that they might end up not listing some group that should be on the list and the list could go on forever. The Human Relations Commission and the language proposed by Councilmember Malnar covered everyone. She supported the changes proposed by Councilmember Malnar.

Councilmember Turner acknowledged that Glendale was a forward-facing community and the future was important. He said prejudice and discrimination had existed and did still

exist in Glendale. He said Council should call out that prejudice and the draft ordinance provided by staff did exactly that. He suggested peoples' differences were not weaknesses, but were strengths. The ordinance proposed by Councilmember Malnar was described as generic, but no one preferred generic. He said the citizens and the community in Glendale was not generic and each and every one were special and the differences should be highlighted.

Councilmember Turner said the suggestion which would not allow public input was a serious mistake. He said efforts had been made to include everyone from the past discussions Council had had about the ordinance. He encouraged Council to add to the language if it felt someone had been left out and said there was a process to amend the ordinance at a future date, if necessary.

Councilmember Turner supported the draft language in the proposed ordinance. A great deal of thought had gone into its preparation and there was nothing in it that was a citywide mandate for anyone. It created an opportunity for the commission and the Council to do the right thing. He said it was an advisory commission to the Council, just like many of the other boards and commissions. He supported the draft ordinance presented by staff.

Vice Mayor Hugh said all Council could try and do was discourage prejudice. He trusted the Council to be fair and just in how it handled the citizens. He would like to see something move forward to a vote.

Councilmember Aldama would like to see the item move to a voting meeting to be passed. He asked what part of the original proposed language the Councilmembers would like to see removed. Council should set forth in the ordinance what they supported and what they wanted to include. He asked the Council what parts of the original ordinance they didn't support and to consider passing the ordinance proposed by staff.

Councilmember Clark did not support the spaghetti bowl language in the original ordinance and didn't like pointing out specific groups, because someone would inevitably be missed. She liked the language in Councilmember Malnar's proposed ordinance and it stated specific goals, including encouraging mutual respect and understanding among all people.

Councilmember Aldama took offense to the words "spaghetti bowl." Glendale was a diverse community with many unique individuals. He said what Councilmember Malnar and Councilmember Clark were saying was the Unity Pledge supported a bowl of spaghetti and the contracts supported a bowl of spaghetti. He did not define the members of the community as a bowl of spaghetti. If Council did not approve the original ordinance language, he would expect them to repeal the Unity Pledge and remove the ordinance which added the language to contracts.

Councilmember Malnar did not have any intention of repealing any ordinance already in place that protected individuals who worked for the City or were employed by the City as subcontractors. The language he proposed was a compromise and brought together the language he felt was appropriate. It would help Glendale be a better community for all people. He asked if there was consensus to move his proposed language forward.

Councilmember Turner said there was some discussion that income was not included, but he said the staff proposed language did include the words socio-economic condition, which covered far more than income. He said the language was expansive and inclusive.

Councilmember Clark supported Councilmember Malnar's version moving forward.

Councilmember Turner said Councilmember Aldama had worked hard on his item of special interest and Council should consider his proposal first.

Councilmember Aldama said he had asked for a consensus prior to Councilmember Malnar asking for a consensus.

Vice Mayor Hugh asked if there was consensus to move the staff version of the ordinance forward.

Vice Mayor Hugh said there was no consensus.

Vice Mayor Hugh said there was consensus to move Councilmember Malnar's version of the ordinance forward.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Phelps had no items to report.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Bailey had no items to report.

COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

There were no Council items of special interest.

MOTION AND CALL TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Aye: 6 - Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

Absent: 1 - Mayor Weiers

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council entered into Executive Session at 5:01 p.m.

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

Aye: 6 - Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

Absent: 1 - Mayor Weiers

ADJOURNMENT

The City Council adjourned at 6:07 p.m.