



## City of Goodyear

### Meeting Minutes

#### City Council Work Session

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

Mayor Georgia Lord  
Vice Mayor Wally Campbell  
Councilmember Joanne Osborne  
Councilmember Joe Pizzillo  
Councilmember Sheri Lauritano  
Councilmember Bill Stipp  
Councilmember Brannon Hampton

---

Monday, February 26, 2018

Goodyear Justice Center

---

**Immediately following the Community Facilities District Meeting that begins at 4:30 PM**

#### 1 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Lord called the Work Session to order at 4:35 p.m.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 6 - Mayor Lord, Vice Mayor Campbell, Councilmember Osborne, Councilmember Pizzillo, Councilmember Lauritano, and Councilmember Hampton

**Absent** 1 - Councilmember Stipp

Staff Present: City Manager Julie Arendall, City Attorney Roric Massey, and City Clerk Darcie McCracken

#### 3. AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

- 3.1 [2018-6258ws](#) Council will receive information on the Land Use Assumptions (LUA) and Infrastructure Improvement Plan (IIP) updates that are statutory requirements for development impact fees.

Budget and Research Manager Lauri Wingenroth presented. Joining Ms. Wingenroth was Tony Hairston, Vice President of Raftelis Financial Consultants. Also introduced was Goodyear Budget and Research Analyst Tamara Blonar and Analyst Joe Williams from Raftelis Financial Consultants. Ms. Wingenroth said the State Statute requires updates to the plans and related fees a minimum of every five years. The law sets specific procedures and public processes that the city is required to follow, and the fees must be based on a Council adopted Land Use Assumptions (LUA) and Infrastructure Improvement Plan (IIP). During the Council Budget Retreat it was asked if the city could have impact fees for items such as installing fiber optics. Ms. Wingenroth confirmed that this is not permissible. Impact fees can only be assessed for items such as water, wastewater, storm water, libraries up to 10,000 square feet, streets, fire and police facilities, and neighborhood parks and recreation centers up to 30 acre facilities. Operation and maintenance expenses and replacement costs cannot be incorporated into the impact fee program. Impact fees can only capture the costs for growth-related

needs for infrastructure and must be built if the infrastructure is in the plan. The Statute also requires that a qualified professional prepare the infrastructure plan and underlying assumptions. She reviewed a map of Development Impact Fee Service Areas showing the North, Central and South areas. Council policy direction given is that growth pays for growth. Ms. Wingenroth indicated that the current plan does not include inflation or partial facilities. Staff is addressing prior costing and scoping issues similar to Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects, and clarifying street philosophy regarding what types of streets and intersections to include, and also the distribution of cost or demand for infrastructure for parks.

Mr. Hairston introduced Rick Merrit, President of Elliot D. Pollack & Company who helped prepare the Land Use Assumptions. The source data is from the Arizona Department of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). Mr. Hairston presented the Land Use Assumptions, Infrastructure Plan, summarized the fees, and compared Goodyear fees to other cities.

#### **Summary Infrastructure Level of Service (Forecast 2019 - 2028)**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Level of Service</u>	<u>Current Plan</u>	<u>Actual 2017</u>
Police	- SF Building Space per Service Unit	0.39	0.35
	- Vehicles per 1,000 Service Units	1.20	0.57
	- Service Units per Radio Tower	N/A	N/A
Fire	- Building Space per Service Unit	0.69	0.55
	- Apparatus per 1,000 Service Units	0.14	0.11
Parks	- Improved Acreage per 1,000 Svc Units:		
	North/Central	2.30	1.69
	South	2.30	1.49
Streets	- Lane Miles per 10,000 VMT	1.11	1.12
	- Traffic Signals per 10,000 VMT	0.44	0.36
Water	- GPD (average day) per EDU	390	402
Wastewater	- GPD (average day) per EDU	175	140

#### **Assumptions**

- Project costs provided by staff
  - >Streets supplemented by consultant
  - >Water and Wastewater supplemented by IWMP and Surface Water consultants
- 2018 cost levels
- Inflation at 3% per year

Fees that are collected for fire services must be used in the service area that the fees were collected in, and for that type of service. Fire has two service areas, North/Central and South. Fees collected for fire services in the South area are also reimbursable to Newland for developing the fire station.

Parks also has two service areas, North/Central and South, and the fees must be used in the area collected. There is reimbursement cost to Newland for construction of park infrastructure in that area.

The Streets philosophy is to equate them across the service areas. The current plan is limited to six-lane arterial lanes only and does not include enhancements. The key change is to cover the full costs of streets development (curb and gutter, sidewalks, landscaping, and utility relocations). A significant cost in the South area is the major improvement for the expansion of Estrella Parkway and the MC85 Bridge. Expansion is attributed to growth in the area.

The driving Water project for both the North/Central and South areas is the surface water project (\$114,000,000). The city has an agreement with Newland for part of the 8 million gallons per day (mpd) capacity (2.65 mpd). The growth demand in Wastewater is not as much as in surface water. In the South area, the major project includes the two plants that are located in the South. There is a reimbursement agreement with Newland for the Rainbow Valley plant. The expansion is due to growth in the area.

#### **North/Central Summary**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Existing Area</u>	<u>Calculated (Decrease)</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Primary Reason for Increase/Decrease</u>
Police	\$ 379	\$ 846	\$ 467	Radio Tower, cost updates, inflation
Fire	399	937	538	Additional fire facility, cost updates, inflation
Parks	922	2,244	1,322	Additional parks, cost updates, inflation, and inclusion of financing costs
Streets (North & Central)	1,402 & 1,743	8,911	7,509 & 7,168	More projects, cost updates, inflation (clear philosophy)
Water	6,368	8,719	2,351	Surface Water Plant and financing costs
Wastewater	4,210	2,130	(2,080)	Removed developer required lines, lowered service level
Total	\$14,021	\$23,787	\$9,766	

#### **South Summary**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Calculated South Area</u>	<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	<u>Primary Reason for Increase/Decrease</u>
Police	\$ 379	\$ 846	\$ 467	Radio tower, cost updates, inflation
Fire	719	660	(59)	Accounting for capacity available in existing facility
Parks	1,065	2,293	1,228	Added park, cost updates, inflation
Streets	1,179	6,380	5,201	Bridge, cost updates, inflation
Water	7,769	8,052	283	Surface Water Plant, financing costs
Wastewater	1,541	2,163	622	Cost updates, inflation
Total	\$12,652	\$20,394	\$7,742	

Mr. Hairston reviewed the Residential Comparison with Fee Types chart which compares Goodyear fees with Avondale, Buckeye, Peoria, Gilbert, and Surprise. Ms. Wingenroth wrapped up the Work

Session by reviewing the next steps. Staff's recommendation is to post the draft Infrastructure Improvement Plan, schedule the stakeholder meetings to gather input from the impacted communities, and continue the technical analysis to provide Council with more information based on the feedback received from the public input. The Statute lays out the process for implementing the fees, and it is expected that the implementation will be effective January 1, 2019.

**Council Discussion:**

**-Does the infrastructure have to be operational or started at the 10-year or 15-year time frame?** Ms. Wingenroth indicated that we need to be delivering that level of service and it needs to be operational at that point in time.

**-Projects need to be scoped out pretty well.**

**-Can we look at the plan earlier than the required five years?** Ms. Wingenroth indicated that the Statute requires that the plan be reviewed at least every five years, but it can be done more often.

**-Is the city on target, ahead or comparable when it comes to police service levels?** Ms. Wingenroth explained that the level of service shown on the slide indicates this is the highest level that can be included in the current impact fee update because we cannot exceed the current level of service in developing the fees. We cannot make a judgement in developing the fees to wish our service level was higher, we can only build it on today's level of service.

**-State Statute prevents us from increasing the level of service; however, it is acceptable to use the General Fund to bring up the level of service.**

**-Is the assumption paying for personnel or just equipment?** Mr. Hairston indicated it is just for equipment.

**-For clarification, areas in town that do not have sidewalks, curbs and gutters would not be included, but would be done using General Fund dollars.**

**-What was the philosophy or driving factors for the prior fees that were adopted?** Mr. Hairston indicated he does not know what the prior philosophy was for Streets, but for Parks, there was an explicit limit to maintain the cost and not over-commit to building. Ms. Wingenroth indicated that the existing plan does not clearly note the logic or reasoning behind the choices that were made.

**-Would like to see sidewalks on both sides of the street.**

**-Sidewalks, curbs, and bike lanes were considered complete streets in prior discussions and doesn't want to lose site of that.** Mr. Hairston indicated that if the street does not currently have a bike lane, then the fees to add that would need to come from the General Fund.

**-How do we include enhancements if we want to make it a standard?** Ms. Wingenroth indicated that staff will need to evaluate what the current status is of bike lanes and see if bike lanes can be incorporated. She explained that if it exists today on 5% of the arterial roads, for example, then perhaps we can include 5% of the cost for bike lanes for these projects. Council can also use the General Fund to add bike lanes to existing roads to get the service level up.

**-For clarification, if there is 5% for an enhancement in the current plan, we add 5% in the next plan making the allotment 10% for that enhancement. The following plan will then be allotted an additional 10% for the enhancement, and we will build up the allotment in that manner.** Ms. Wingenroth agreed.

**-Is there a development agreement reimbursement for the MC85 Bridge?** Ms. Wingenroth said she is not aware of any development agreement that would help fund this item, but will have staff

research.

**-Thanked staff for putting the bridge in the plan, it is definitely needed; the public keeps talking about the bridge.**

**-We have things in our city that other cities are not dealing with, such as our water solution and the bridge. Even though the comparison stings, it is smart planning for our citizens.** Ms. Wingenroth pointed out that there are other cities working on updating their plans now, so we are comparing our predicted fees to fees that exist today and we will monitor the other cities.

**-Pointed out that 61% is an increase over the South, but 41% of that is streets. In the North, there is a 69% increase, but the vast majority of that is for streets. If we don't do this now, we will fall further behind.**

**-This Council's philosophy has changed from the prior Council philosophy.**

**-Our residents will thank us in the future for this planning.** Ms. Wingenroth pointed out that when the Statute changed in 2014, it removed the ability to have fees for general government facilities such as a city hall. If you already had a fee in place and were paying debt service relative to those fees you could continue to collect it, but you cannot collect new fees for those types of facilities.

**-As we get updates, the update should be noted that they are older cities because it is a little shocking when you look at the comparisons. If you look at it with the indication that these are the fees of developed cities compared to an undeveloped city, our new fees are not substantially higher.**

**-Without roads we cannot develop. We don't have infrastructure in a lot of places and it is critical that we plan for the future because we want development to come to Goodyear.**

**-When you look at the pricing, if we don't put it on the impact fees, where growth pays for growth, then that means the current residents have to pay for it because it will have to come out of the General Fund.**

Mayor Lord recessed the Work Session at 5:50 p.m.

Mayor Lord reconvened the Work Session at 6:30 p.m.

- 3.2**      [2018-6265ws](#)      Council will receive a presentation regarding commercial parking standards in Goodyear and in other municipalities.

Planner III Karen Craver presented. At Council request, staff compared Goodyear commercial parking requirements to seven other valley cities. These are the same cities that were used when staff compared the industrial parking requirements. The goal was to determine if Goodyear requires too much parking resulting in large empty parking lots. The differences staff found were three other cities set maximums, one other city requires 10% of required parking in professional and medical to be covered, and retail tenants require parking agreements before coming to the city. Most of the parking agreements were in place prior to Uber and Lyft and the explosion of online shopping. Based on staff findings, Goodyear commercial parking requirements fall in line with other cities; commercial tenants often drive the size of parking lots; amending our commercial parking requirements is not warranted at this time, and staff will continue to evaluate the evolution of commercial users with regard to the parking requirements.

**Council Discussion:**

**-If the tenants are driving the requirements, if we lower or increase the requirement, the tenants are going to decide what they want. As time goes on and more people use online shopping, Uber or Lyft, maybe they will drive down the requirement. Does not see the need for a change at this time.**

**-Is there a separate requirement at the theatre, because the theatre does not fit into the categories you spoke about and there have been complaints by people using the theatres that there is not enough parking.** Ms. Craver responded that the requirement for theatres are based on seating within the theatre versus square footage of the building.

**-Last year was the first year that restaurant sales exceeded grocery store sales. Staff needs to be thoughtful of restaurants wanting to share parking spaces with other areas. In medical areas the parking is always full. Staff needs to watch who is sharing parking.**

**-We want businesses to have the flexibility to meet the customer needs and does not feel there is a need for a change. Another situation to watch is a church sharing parking space.**

- 3.3**      [2018-6269ws](#)      Staff will provide Council with several options for a City Seal and requests policy direction on updating the City Seal.

City Clerk Darcie McCracken presented. Ms. McCracken shared the differences between the city logo and seal and the uses of each, presented several designs created by our Communications Division, and requested guidance to move forward with updating the city seal.

**Council Discussion:**

**-Prefers Option A.**

**-Likes the current seal and feels that you will not see the detail of the other options that were presented due to the size of the seal.**

**-Likes A and B, but prefers A over B. Since we are coming up on the city birthday, do any seals show a special year?** Ms. McCracken said she has not seen a seal showing something like that, but that does not mean that something like that doesn't exist. We can incorporate anything that Council would like.

**-Option A stands out the best.**

**-Likes Option A but also likes having our history incorporated. Some public comments were not positive.**

**-Overall opinion is for Option A.**

**4.      INFORMATION ITEMS**

None.

**5.      ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to discuss, Mayor Lord adjourned the Work Session at 7:00 p.m.

---

Darcie McCracken, City Clerk

---

Georgia Lord, Mayor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_