



City of Goodyear

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

Mayor Georgia Lord
Vice Mayor Joe Pizzillo
Councilmember Joanne Osborne
Councilmember Sheri Lauritano
Councilmember Wally Campbell
Councilmember Bill Stipp
Councilmember Sharolyn Hohman

Meeting Location:
Goodyear Justice Center
14455 W. Van Buren St.,
Suite B101
Goodyear, AZ 85338

Monday, April 27, 2015

4:30 PM

Goodyear Justice Center

1 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Lord called the Work Session to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Mayor Lord, Vice Mayor Pizzillo, Councilmember Osborne, Councilmember Lauritano, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Stipp, and Councilmember Hohman

Staff Present: City Manager Brian Dalke, Assistant City Attorney Sarah Chilton (City Attorney Roric Massey arrived after the recess), and City Clerk Maureen Scott

3. AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

- 3.1 [15-5595ws](#) Provide Mayor and Council with the history and current status of the Yuma Road Bridge CIP project.

Deputy City Manager Bob Beckley, presented. On April 3, 2015, the City received a notice of de-obligation of federal funds from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for the Yuma Road Bridge Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project. The City may be required to repay \$413,780.32 previously reimbursed on this project. In 2003, the Yuma Road Bridge project was proposed as a CIP project. During storm events, Yuma Road between Bullard Avenue and Estrella Parkway would flood from the nearby Bullard Wash, requiring road closures.

Due to the recession and other priority projects in the city, the Yuma Road Bridge project has not been funded in the CIP and has not moved past design and Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition. Improvement to the section of Yuma Road that is in question is not programmed in any of the phases of the Master Transportation Plan that was approved by Council.

Councilmember Campbell arrived at the Work Session at 4:37 p.m.

Council accepted the dedication of Yuma Road ROW and Slope Easements for the noted

project in December 2009. In addition, Council approved the consultant contract, and an Intergovernmental Agreement with ADOT for project design, in May 2010.

Key Events:

- >2003 - MAG (Maricopa Association of Governments) awarded \$746,000 of federal funds to the City to design the Yuma Road Bridge.
- >March 2009 - Yuma Road Bridge was unfunded in the 5-year CIP. It was programmed in the "out years" for \$5.2M.
- >June 2009 - ADOT Environmental Group determined that the project meets the criteria of an Environmental Categorical Exclusion (CE).
- >September 2009 - ADOT Environmental Group submitted the project's CE to Federal Highway Administration (FHA) for approval.
- >December 2009 - Mayor and Council accepted the ROW for the Yuma Road Bridge.
- >October 2013 - ADOT requested a formal letter from the City explaining why the project has not advanced into construction.
- >November 2013 - the City sent a letter to ADOT explaining why the project has not been constructed. Included in the letter was when the ROW was acquired by the City and approved by ADOT.
- >June 2014 - FY2014-15 Annual Budget approved including authorization of \$1M for the project in FY2019-2024;
- >April 2015 - ADOT notification to the City of fund de-obligation for the project design.

Last year, staff put this project in the budget for funding in the amount of \$1M in the 2019-2024 CIP Plan. This was intended to show good faith to ADOT so they could present this information to the Federal government through the FHA. Staff knew there was a 10-year window of obligation for the project, but they believed that an extension could be granted through a request made by ADOT on our behalf to the FHA. This year, ADOT indicated that we would need to commit to an immediate construction schedule, or that the funds would be de-obligated and would need to be refunded to the Federal Government. Beckley reported that, since we are not planning to build this bridge as part of our Master Transportation Plan, this hurts our case to appeal the decision.

The City Attorney is reviewing our legal obligation for repayment, and a recommendation will be forwarded to Council once the request for repayment is received from ADOT.

Beckley stated that the City needs to provide the financial capacity for repayment of design services in the amount of \$413,780.32 by funding this amount in the FY16 budget.

Council Discussion:

>**When was it originally planned to build the bridge?** Beckley responded that it was never actually in the CIP to fund the building of the bridge. Only the design stage was funded. In 2009, it was programmed to be in the Regional Transportation Plan but the funding was never planned for.

>**Are there any appeals available because of the economic downturn?** Beckley responded no. That is not a legitimate reason for non-construction. The fact that we had it planned and

obtained the ROW may give us some leeway.

>Are there any other projects that fall under these circumstances? Beckley responded that staff is not aware of any other projects like this.

>Where is the money coming from? Beckley responded that it will come out of the General Fund, and that Finance Director Lange will explain this in detail later in the evening.

>It is very disappointing that we got so far ahead of ourselves with this project, and it was allowed to die. Asked that staff investigate every angle to see how we got to this point, and if there are any remedies available to us.

>Concerned that this is a lot of money, and Council was not made aware of this before now. Staff has been aware of this possibility since October 2013.

>Asked if any other cities have experienced this sort of thing with their projects. Beckley responded that staff will check into this. Staff is trying to be more careful on projects that involve grant money.

>Do we keep the plans that were paid for? Beckley responded yes. The plans may need to be updated, but that will be far less costly than redoing the entire plan.

3.2 [15-5594ws](#) Provide Mayor and Council with an update on the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) traffic signals.

Engineering Director Rebecca Zook, and City Traffic Engineer Luke Albert, explained how traffic signals are evaluated and prioritized for inclusion within the traffic signal CIP program.

The need for the installation of a traffic signal is governed by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which is published by the Federal Highway Administration.

The MUTCD contains nine nationally recognized traffic signal warrants that are a starting point for determining whether or not a traffic signal should be considered to improve an existing traffic condition. The warrants take into consideration such factors as vehicular traffic volumes, pedestrian traffic volumes, travel speed data, traffic accident data, and the physical character of the intersection. Of the nine warrants, seven criterion are most commonly utilized within the industry. Below is a list of the nine traffic signal warrants:

- Warrant 1 - Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume
- Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
- Warrant 3 - Peak Hour
- Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume
- Warrant 5 - School Crossing
- Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System
- Warrant 7 - Crash Experience
- Warrant 8 - Roadway Network
- Warrant 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

These warrants are only a starting point, and traffic signal control is not a solution to every situation. In some instances, a traffic signal may lead to a reduction in operational efficiency and safety of an intersection. It is important that the analyst consider how the intersection fits against each of the traffic signal warrants before making an installation recommendation.

There are nine intersections that have been studied for traffic signal warrants that are not currently signalized and are considered to be part of the CIP Traffic Signal program. In addition to these intersections, there are others within the city that are evaluated for activation of an installed signal. They are identified below:

- Yuma Road and Canyon Trails Boulevard
- Elliot Road and San Gabriel Drive/Starpointe Entrance
- Estrella Parkway and Harrison Street
- 158th Avenue and Van Buren Street
- Estrella Parkway and Romley Road
- Bullard Avenue and Earll Drive
- Estrella Parkway and Vineyard Avenue
- 135th Avenue and Thomas Road
- 152nd Drive and Van Buren Street

The intersection on this list currently being tracked most regularly is the intersection of Elliot Road and San Gabriel Drive/Starpointe Entrance. This intersection had a significant increase in traffic between 2013 and 2015 with the opening of McDonald's in the Safeway Shopping Center. Traffic is anticipated to continue to increase with the opening of Taco Bell later this year, and overall increase in customers to this shopping center. While a traffic signal is not currently warranted, the volume of pedestrians crossing Elliot Road at San Gabriel Drive/Starpointe Entrance and the future opening of Taco Bell justifies continued attention at this intersection.

As development increases within this area, a signal will become warranted. As such, Engineering is recommending the approval of funding for the installation of a signal. If approved, a design will be completed, a contractor will be identified through procurement procedures and signal equipment/poles will be secured. The installation would occur in Spring 2016.

Intersections listed above will be re-evaluated, and new intersections will be studied for traffic signal warrants as traffic patterns change for reasons such as development, the extension of the Loop 303, or possibly the construction of an additional leg of an intersection.

In past years, staff would have identified traffic signals in the CIP when it got closer to being warranted. Zook proposed that staff update Council annually on traffic signal priorities and any upcoming funding requirements.

There is no ongoing funding for traffic signals. Projects are requested as warranted. Three signals are recommended for funding in FY16. One at Yuma Road and Canyon Trails Boulevard, one at Elliot Road and San Gabriel Drive, and another which is still undetermined.

Council Discussion:

>**Are traffic signals sensor driven?** Albert responded that the traffic signal monitor will adjust signal times based on video detection of the intersection.

>Will the costs be split between the City and the developer at the intersection of 158th & Van Buren? Zook replied yes, that "impact analysis" conversations are conducted with developers as soon as possible so they fully understand the costs associated with their development.

>Concerned with close proximity of three signals on Van Buren near Estrella Parkway within about 1/2 mile of each other. Albert replied that those lights will be synchronized to avoid traffic issues.

>Asked about the need to fund warranted traffic signals that are not scheduled for funding through the CIP. Zook proposed that staff update Council annually on traffic signal priorities and any upcoming funding requirements. There is no ongoing funding for traffic signals. Projects are requested as warranted.

>Are some of the lights on the study on the Impact Fee list? Finance Director Larry Lange clarified that under the old impact fee statutes, two or three lights were funded each year with impact fees during the high growth period. Under the current statutes, we have to be more specific. Impact fee funding is not available for any of the traffic signals presented on the list tonight. We need to have a means to have funding on an annual basis. There are some intersections that were included in the Impact Fee Study, but none of those were included on this list. They need to be arterial, or arterial connected streets to be funded with impact fees.

- 3.3 [15-5560wsa](#) Council will receive information on and discuss the estimated fiscal year 2015-16 (FY16) revenues and expenditures. This is a continuation of the April 20, 2015 Council work session.

Budget and Research Manager Laurie Wingenroth, and Finance Director Larry Lange, presented. They continued with the presentation and discussion from the April 20, 2015 Work Session.

EXPENDITURES - Enterprise Fund Supplementals:

Sanitation Supplementals - \$453K

Base Budget:

- >Credit Card Services - \$17K
- >Household Hazardous Waste - \$25K
- >Residential Garbage & Recycle - \$216K
- >Citywide Vehicle Parts - \$16K

NEW:

- >Sanitation - Sanitation Worker I - \$54K
- >Sanitation Container Program - \$125K

Wastewater Supplementals - \$689K

- >Collection Ongoing O&M - \$32K
- >Chemical products for Corgett, Goodyear WRF & Rainbow Valley WRF - \$71K
- >Ongoing O&M for Corgett, Goodyear WRF & Rainbow Valley WRF - \$500K
- >Environmental Quality Permit Fees - \$35K
- >Credit Card Services - \$11K
- >Fuel Increase (Corgett) - \$7K

NEW:

>SCADA Radio Study - \$33K

Water Supplementals - \$1M

One-Time:

>Spare Well Equipment - \$157K

Base Budget:

>Electricity - \$159K

>Credit Card Services - \$11K

>CAP Water Order - \$339K

>Permit Fee line increase - \$43K

New:

>SCADA Radio Study - \$33K

>ASU Internship - \$2K

>Brine Pilot Cooperative - \$26K

>Director of Public Works Position - **\$230K***

***Employee costs include full benefit package costs, including a vehicle.**

Council Discussion:

>**What is the current number of employees?** Dalke responded there are currently 527 employees, and staff is proposing adding four more during next fiscal year.

>**In case there is a declared water emergency, is the CAP water amount locked in?** Mark Holmes, Water Resource Manager, responded that if there is a declared water shortage that affects the amount of water that CAP is able to deliver, the rates would go up based on the anticipated shortage of the entire customer base, and they would reconcile at the end of the year. This also works the opposite way. Last year, we were refunded for a credit in the amount of \$55K.

>**What does the purchase of CAP water allow us to do?** Holmes responded that our total water supply is groundwater. Under State law, we are required to replenish the groundwater that we pump out. In order to do this, we purchase CAP water (the most economical water supply that we have), and it goes into a CAP recharge facility. This allows us to take the water indirectly into various recharge facilities within our aquifer basin. This allows us to meet legal replenishment laws.

>**What happened with the \$55K refund money from last year?** Holmes responded that the money was used to opt into a rate stabilization program. This helps to stabilize rates, even if there is a declared water storage.

Wingenroth reviewed key changes to FY16-25 CIP:

>Impact Fee funded projects delayed

>3 projects to Asset Management

>No pre-August 2014 impact fee resources remain for Van Buren: Estrella to Sarival project

>Partially funded Yuma Rd Bridge & Bullard Wash has been cancelled

>Prior approved changes for Goodyear Blvd

>\$70,000 moved between two streets fiber projects to capitalize on outside resources available in FY16

Council Discussion:

>**Would like playground equipment installed at the Estrella Foothills Community Park near the ball fields and pump track.** Nathan Torres, Parks and Recreation Director, reported that playground equipment is included in Phase II of the plan.

Follow-Up from 4/20/15 Work Session:

Lange reviewed staff's interpretation of Council comments from the April 20th Work Session, and asked for input from Council to make sure that staff incorporates this information into the draft budget.

Not funded in FY16:

>FY16 Undesignated Asset Management - \$2M

>Reduce Food Tax Rate

>ROW Landscape - Litchfield Road (South of Yuma/Western)

Lange stated that the understood proposal is to fund the Van Buren: Estrella to Sarival project. The Estrella Intersection would be funded in FY16 and FY18 under this proposal. Sarival: 1-10/Portland Street to Van Buren Street would be funded in FY16. That project is funded out of development impact fees in FY16 through FY18. If Sarival is the higher priority of those two projects, we will pre-fund the program and, over the following two years, we will repay the General Fund from the received impact fees in order to have the funding for the Van Buren Street project. There is no impact fee funding available for the Van Buren Street project. The reduction of the Asset Management Program allows us to be able to do this. Lange expects that next year, the Asset Management Program will be funded with an annual budgeted amount.

Council Discussion:

>**Does Portland to Van Buren include signaling and improving the intersection?** Lange responded that it does.

>**Asked about intersection improvements of Estrella to Sarival.** Wingenroth responded that this provides for another turn lane when the intersection is built out.

>**Asked for a breakdown on the proposed improvements on Van Buren Street.**

>**Can FY16 budgeted funds from the Community Center that won't be built until 2019 be used toward the projects on Van Buren?** Lange stated that staff will research this possibility.

>**Would like to identify a way to get the Van Buren project started in FY17.**

City Manager Dalke stated it his understanding that the direction Council wants to take is to use the \$2M from the Asset Management Program. \$1.7M will be used for the Sarival Avenue - Portland Street to Van Buren Street project, and the remaining \$300K will be used for the design of Van Buren Street.

Mayor Lord recessed the Work Session at 5:57 p.m. in order to conduct the Regular Meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Mayor Lord reconvened the Work Session at 7:40 p.m.

City Attorney Roric Massey arrived at the Work Session.

Continued Council Discussion:

>Where is the Indian School Road project in the CIP? Zook responded that there was \$500K in FY15 in the plan to build two lanes of the road with no medians. In FY23, there is a plan to build four lanes (two in each direction) with a median. In coordination with Sun Belt (the developer who owns the property to the north and south), staff will bring an agreement to Council in May where Sun Belt will build all six lanes (three lanes in each direction, with a median) in cooperation with the money that we were going to be expending this fiscal year. They are doing this because it will benefit their property.

Impact to Reduce the Food for Home Consumption Tax:

- >Total FY14 Revenue is estimated at \$2M
- >Value of 0.25% Tax Rate Change would reduce revenue by \$250K
- >Slightly less than 1/2 of a grocery store bill goes toward food (Grocery Store Split - 46% Food/54% Retail)

Council Discussion:

- >**Need to look at a balance for our citizens as far as tax revenue goes.**
- >**Councilmember Osborne would like to see this tax reduced by either .25% or .5%, even if it has a January 1 implementation date.**
- >**Other Council consensus is that this is not the time to reduce the food tax.**
- >**We still have too many needs to consider before reducing this tax.**
- >**We need to wait until the economy and housing start to improve.**
- >**Not in favor of reducing the food tax until another revenue source is identified to replace the money.**
- >**We are still facing economic uncertainty, but are still growing our budget and adding employees. The food tax should become a discussion every year before budget discussions begin.**
- >**If we take away the food tax, it could also affect Ballpark debt repayments. Now is not the time to reduce the food tax.**

Staff recapped the following:

- >Council does not want to fund the ROW Landscape project at Litchfield Road south of Yuma/Western Avenue.
- >Council wants to fund a third General Fund traffic signal, and develop a path to fund the signals as they are warranted.
- >Budget to repay the de-obligated federal grant for the Yuma Road Bridge in case the City Attorney's office is not able to find a remedy or other alternatives.

There is also an emerging issue regarding an Ambulance Service Study. This issue will be brought before Council at a Work Session in May.

Staff will present Council with a draft balanced budget on May 4th. A Public Budget Forum will be held on May 6th. Final Budget Adoption will be held on June 22nd.

4. INFORMATION

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mayor Lord adjourned the Work Session at 8:26 p.m.

Maureen Scott, City Clerk

Georgia Lord, Mayor

Date: _____