



# City of Glendale

5850 West Glendale Avenue  
Glendale, AZ 85301

## City Council Workshop Agenda

*Mayor Jerry Weiers*  
*Vice Mayor Ian Hugh*  
*Councilmember Jamie Aldama*  
*Councilmember Samuel Chavira*  
*Councilmember Gary Sherwood*  
*Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff*  
*Councilmember Bart Turner*

---

Tuesday, April 21, 2015

1:30 PM

Council Chambers - Room B3

---

### Workshop

One or more members of the City Council may be unable to attend the Workshop or Executive Session Meeting in person and may participate telephonically, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431(4).

#### CALL TO ORDER

#### WORKSHOP SESSION

1.     **15-262**           BOND REFUNDING RECAP  
Staff Contact: Tom Duensing, Director, Finance and Technology  
Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Director, Finance and Technology  
Guest Presenter: Mr. Kurt Freund, Managing Director, RBC Capital Markets
2.     **15-269**           COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATE - POLICE  
DEPARTMENT  
Staff Contact: Debora Black, Police Chief
3.     **15-268**           COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATE - FIRE  
DEPARTMENT  
Staff Contact: Mark Burdick, Fire Chief

#### CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

**This report allows the City Manager to update the City Council. The City Council may only acknowledge the contents to this report and is prohibited by state law from discussing or acting on any of the items presented by the City Manager since they are not itemized on the Council Workshop Agenda.**

#### CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

**This report allows the City Attorney to update the City Council. The City Council may only acknowledge the contents to this report and is prohibited by state law from discussing or acting on any of the items presented by the City Attorney since they are not itemized on the Council Workshop Agenda.**

#### **COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

**Councilmembers may indicate topic(s) they would like to have discussed by the Council at a future Workshop and the reason for their interest. The Council does not discuss the new topics at the Workshop where they are introduced.**

#### **MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

##### **1. LEGAL MATTERS**

A. The City Council will meet with the City Attorney for legal advice, discussion and consultation regarding the city's position in pending or contemplated litigation, including settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3)(4))

B. Council will meet to discuss and consider records exempt by law from public inspection and are specifically required to be maintained as confidential by state or federal law. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4))

##### **2. PERSONNEL MATTERS**

A. The City Council will meet to discuss and consider the City Manager recruitment, and consult with the City Attorney for legal advice. (A.R.S. § 38.431-03 (A)(1)(3))

**Upon a public majority vote of a quorum of the City Council, the Council may hold an executive session, which will not be open to the public, regarding any item listed on the agenda but only for the following purposes:**

- (i) discussion or consideration of personnel matters (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(1));**
- (ii) discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(2));**
- (iii) discussion or consultation for legal advice with the city's attorneys (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3));**
- (iv) discussion or consultation with the city's attorneys regarding the city's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation, or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4));**
- (v) discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations with employee organizations (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(5)); or**
- (vi) discussing or consulting with designated representatives of the city in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(7)).**

**Confidentiality**

Arizona statute precludes any person receiving executive session information from disclosing that information except as allowed by law. A.R.S. § 38-431.03(F). Each violation of this statute is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$500, plus court costs and attorneys' fees. This penalty is assessed against the person who violates this statute or who knowingly aids, agrees to aid or attempts to aid another person in violating this article. The city is precluded from expending any public monies to employ or retain legal counsel to provide legal services or representation to the public body or any of its officers in any legal action commenced for violation of the statute unless the City Council takes a legal action at a properly noticed open meeting to approve of such expenditure prior to incurring any such obligation or indebtedness. A.R.S. § 38-431.07(A)(B).



## Legislation Description

---

**File #:** 15-262, **Version:** 1

---

### **BOND REFUNDING RECAP**

Staff Contact: Tom Duensing, Director, Finance and Technology

Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Director, Finance and Technology

Guest Presenter: Mr. Kurt Freund, Managing Director, RBC Capital Markets

### **Purpose and Policy Guidance**

The purpose of this item is to provide Council a final recap on the four bond refunding transactions which began in November 2014 and were completed in March 2015.

### **Background**

On November 24, 2014, Mayor and Council took action to authorize staff to take the necessary action to refund (refinance) outstanding 1) Transportation bonds, 2) Water and Sewer bonds, 3) General Obligation (G.O.) bonds, and 4) Municipal Property Corporation (MPC) bonds.

Over the next several months, staff worked closely with RBC Capital Markets, the City's Financial Advisor and Greenberg Traurig, LLP, the City's Bond Counsel to develop the documentation, identify the structure of potential debt service cost savings through debt refinancing, and execute the transactions.

### **Analysis**

Overall, the net present value savings on the four transactions totals \$48.1 million with total cash savings of \$49.4 million over the life of the bonds. Net present value (NPV) is the value of the transactions in current dollars and the total savings is the actual cash savings throughout the life of the new bonds. A summary of each of the four transactions is as follows.

#### **Transportation Bonds**

Source of Repayment: Transportation Fund

Par Refunded: \$59.1 million

NPV Savings: \$5.3 million (9% of Par)

Total Savings: \$6.8 million

#### **Water and Sewer Bonds**

Source of Repayment: Water and Sewer Fund

Par Refunded: \$129.5 million

NPV Savings: \$14.3 million (11% of Par)

Total Savings: \$14.8 million

**General Obligation Bonds**

Source of Repayment: Debt Service Fund (Secondary Property Taxes)

Par Refunded: \$42.0 million

NPV Savings: \$2.8 million (7% of Par)

Total Savings: \$3.5 million

**Municipal Property Corporation Bonds**

Source of Repayment: General Fund

Par Refunded: \$130.6 million

NPV Savings: \$25.7 million (19% of Par)

Total Savings: \$24.3 million

Representatives from RBC Capital Markets will present an overview of the bond refunding transactions and answer any questions from Mayor and Council.

**Previous Related Council Action**

On November 24, 2014, Council approved four ordinances authorizing staff to take the necessary action to proceed with the transactions.

**Community Benefit/Public Involvement**

Bond refinancing directly impacts the cost of borrowing (debt service costs) of the City and allows the City to structure debt service payments to its advantage. This is a complicated process involving City staff, the City's Financial Advisor, the City's Bond Counsel, and other financing participants. Financial advisors have a fiduciary responsibility to the City and are critical in structuring deals that minimize costs, create financial flexibility, or address financial challenges a City may face. Bond counsel provides assurance both to issuers and to investors who purchase the bonds that all legal and tax requirements are met and works closely with City staff and the City's financial advisor to ensure relevant legal issues are addressed.

**Budget and Financial Impacts**

The net present value savings on the four transactions totals \$48.1 million and the total savings totals \$49.4 million over the life of the bonds.



## Legislation Description

---

**File #: 15-269, Version: 1**

---

### **COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATE - POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Staff Contact: Debora Black, Police Chief

#### **Purpose and Policy Guidance**

At the March 17, 2015 Council Workshop, as a Council Item of Special Interest, Councilmember Sherwood requested a presentation be made by Public Safety in order to provide an update on service, including statistics, and further indicated the update should discuss performance and deficiencies and provide an opportunity for the Police and Fire Departments to identify any needs. This Council Report is for information only.

#### **Background**

The Glendale Police Department (GPD) is currently operating under the FY2014-15 budget, which supports expenses associated with staffing levels of 426 police officers and 129 civilian employees responsible for providing police services in the city. Since FY2013-14 sworn staffing levels have seen an increase of 17 positions due to grant funding. The COPS grant supports a portion of the salaries for 10 police officers, and school districts have allocated grant and district funds to contribute to the salaries for 7 police officers. With the addition of police officers, unfortunately non-sworn support staff has not seen the same increase. Although patrol staffing has remained constant over the last several years, the GPD has not been able to deploy officers to meet the defined ideal recommended allocation while maintaining staffing for other essential functions such as traffic enforcement, investigations, and undercover operations.

Staffing levels and officer deployment strategies vary significantly between jurisdictions. Common methodologies used include the analysis of historical staffing patterns, community surveys, population growth, the ratio of officers to population, and the ratio of sworn to non-sworn employees. Although police staff-to-population ratios remain common practice, no national standard exists. Functional staffing plans must be based on sound police management practice. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) has long been recognized for its prominence in the field of patrol staffing, deployment, scheduling, and productivity. The IACP recognizes that ready-made, universally applicable patrol staffing standards do not exist. The GPD has modeled a patrol staffing strategy from the IACP which suggests allocating patrol resources as follows: 20 minutes of each hour be allocated to calls for service; 20 minutes of each hour be allocated for administrative duties; and 20 minutes of each hour is free for proactive patrol response (20/20/20). Political considerations, economic conditions, demographics, city leadership goals, crime trends, calls for service, and community expectations, to one degree or another, have all factored into staffing plans. Two additional factors considered in GPD staffing levels are response times to priority calls for service and crime rates.

#### **Analysis**

The new Computer Aided Dispatch system installed in late 2013 has allowed the GPD to more accurately collect and record calls for service activity. The significant improvement is demonstrated by the overall increase in the number of calls for service, from 130,051 in 2013 to 161,529 in 2014, or a 24.2% increase. The GPD strives to respond to high-priority calls in five minutes or less, and efficiency is measured by how frequently the goal is met. In 2014, officers responded to high-priority calls in five minutes or less 77.2% of the time. This is an increase from officers meeting the goal 74.2% of the time in 2013.

Crime rate data is collected by the FBI through Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The UCR Program collects data for crimes including homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault (also referred to as violent crimes), as well as burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson (also referred to as property crimes) in order to measure the level and scope of crime occurring throughout the Nation. Overall, Glendale experienced a reduction of 7.5% in crime between 2013 and 2014. In particular, property crimes declined significantly by 7.9%, and violent crimes decreased slightly by 0.9%.

### **Previous Related Council Action**

On April 2, 2013, as a Council Item of Special Interest, the Police Department and Fire Department provided a Public Safety update on the department budgets and baseline service levels.

### **Community Benefit/Public Involvement**

For over a decade the Glendale Police Department has held accredited status through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and is currently involved in the reaccreditation process. Accreditation promotes quality practices in public safety services, primarily by maintaining a body of standards developed by public safety practitioners covering a wide range of contemporary public safety initiatives. This is a voluntary process and a highly prized recognition of professional excellence in the field of law enforcement. As part of the on-site assessment, members of the community are invited to offer comments at a public session.



## Legislation Description

---

**File #: 15-268, Version: 1**

---

### **COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATE - FIRE DEPARTMENT**

Staff Contact: Mark Burdick, Fire Chief

#### **Purpose and Recommended Action**

At the March 17, 2015 Council Workshop, as a Council Item of Special Interest, Councilmember Sherwood requested a presentation be made by Public Safety in order to provide an update on service, including statistics, and further indicated the update should discuss performance and deficiencies and provide an opportunity for the Police and Fire Departments to identify any needs. This Council Report is for information only.

#### **Background**

The Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire suppression, emergency medical services, technical rescue, hazardous materials, fire prevention, public education, and emergency management to the City of Glendale, Arizona. GFD is continually striving to achieve the highest level of efficiency and effectiveness on behalf of the citizens and businesses within the city of Glendale. The GFD has been accredited through the Center for Public Safety Excellence (CPSE) since 2002. One strategic recommendation administered to the department during the 2012 CPSE accreditation review process was for the department to create a community driven strategic plan. The department completed a community based strategic planning process in April of 2014.

The use of response data and customer feedback will play an increasingly important role in decision making, and allow for a more targeted approach to resource deployment and public safety. This five year performance projection report will focus on service delivery for fire suppression, hazardous materials, technical rescue, and emergency medical services as prioritized in the customer based strategic planning process.

#### **Analysis**

An incident is defined as an individual emergency event. One incident may require multiple fire department unit responses (e.g., a standard house fire would require a minimum of three engines and one ladder company). The number of incidents has steadily increased over the last five years. The increase from 2010-2014 is 13.6% or approximately 2.72% per year.

An emergency response system must incorporate redundancy based upon adjacent station or unit reliability. The TriData Division of System Planning Corporation has performed more than 130 studies of local fire departments that include 35 large metropolitan fire departments (e.g., Chicago, Seattle, Houston, and Jacksonville). The following are guidelines published by TriData that outline redundancy levels required to meet response time goals in comparison to unit reliability:



Very Low (<500 responses/year)  
Low (500 - 999 responses/year)  
Moderate (1,000 - 1,999 responses/year)  
High (2,000 - 2,999 responses/year)  
Very High (3,000 - 3,999 responses/year)  
Extremely High (>4,000 responses/year)

In 2014, 83% of GFD emergency response units were in the High to Very High Range and 17% were in the Moderate Range.

**Previous Related Council Action**

On April 2, 2013, as a Council Items of Special Interest, the Police Department and Fire Department provided a Public Safety update on the department budgets and baseline service levels.