



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, May 19, 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

- [15-322](#) COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: UPDATE ON THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS RELATED TO A POSSIBLE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION ORDINANCE
Staff Contact: Jennifer Campbell, Assistant City Manager
Presenter: Karen Kurtz, Facilitator

Attachments: [2015 Tentative Public Participation Meeting Schedule](#)
- [15-313](#) FY 14-15 THIRD QUARTER FINANCIAL REPORT
Staff Contact: Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager
Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager
Staff Presenter: Vicki Rios, Interim Director, Finance and Technology

Attachments: [Third Quarter](#)
- [15-311](#) NORTHERN PARKWAY UPDATE
Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works
Staff Presenter: Debbie Albert, Interim Deputy Public Works Director
- [15-312](#) UPDATE ON LOOP 303 AND NORTHERN AVENUE ACCESS
Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works
Staff Presenter: Debbie Albert, Interim Deputy Public Works Director

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. LEGAL MATTERS - PROPERTY & CONTRACTS

A. Discussion and consultation with the City Attorney to receive an update, consider its position and provide instruction and direction to the City Attorney regarding Glendale's position in connection with agreements associated with the Arena and the Hockey Team. (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3)(4)(7))

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 #: 15-322, Version: 1

COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: UPDATE ON THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS RELATED TO A POSSIBLE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION ORDINANCE

Staff Contact: Jennifer Campbell, Assistant City Manager

Presenter: Karen Kurtz, Facilitator

Purpose and Policy Guidance

The purpose of this report is to update City Council on the public participation process related to a possible anti-discrimination ordinance presented by the facilitator Ms. Karen Kurtz. Staff is seeking guidance from the Council on this process.

Background

The topic of Anti-Discrimination was brought forward as a Council Item of Special Interest to the City Council Workshop on December 2, 2014. After discussion of the issue, Council provided direction to move forward with signing the UNITY Pledge from One Community, an interactive web and events community for LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning) and allied individuals and businesses. Council subsequently approved the UNITY Pledge at the December 18th, 2014 Council voting meeting.

The topic of Anti-Discrimination was brought forward as a Council Item of Special Interest to a the City Council Workshop on January 6, 2015 to seek guidance on options for enacting an inclusive non-discrimination Human Rights ordinance and whether there is a need for the City to establish a Human Relations Commission. After discussion on the topic, Council provided direction to administratively implement anti-discrimination language into the City's contract and purchasing process immediately. Council also provided direction to seek public input on this topic by having district meetings and to hire a professional facilitator to coordinate the public participation process and report on the findings.

Staff has updated its internal hiring and employment practices, as well as the City's contracting policies and practices, to ensure that the City and its contractors, vendors and suppliers do not discriminate against any employees or candidates for employment based on sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, genetic characteristics, familial status, U.S. military veteran status or any disability. The City Attorney's Office has assisted the Human Resources Department in amending HR Policies 201 and 513 to now include this equal employment and anti-discrimination language. The revised HR policies were reviewed by the Personnel Board and went into effect on February 1, 2015. The City Attorney's Office has also updated all City contract templates to require that vendors, suppliers and contractors providing goods and services to the City certify that they do not engage in discriminatory hiring and employment practices. The anti-discrimination contract provisions have been inserted in all City RFPs, contracts and contract amendments issued after February 15, 2015. The City Attorney's Office is unaware of any potential bidder or City contractor who was unwilling to agree to add or comply with the City's new non-discrimination language.

Analysis

The facilitator will present to City Council the process for gathering public input on the topic of anti-discrimination related to a possible city ordinance. Information on the process includes how many meetings are recommended to be held, locations and times of the meetings, format of the meetings, ground rules, questions asked and data to be gathered. A presentation to City Council on the findings will take place at the September 15, 2015 Workshop.

Previous Related Council Action

On January 6, 2015 City Council gave direction to administratively implement anti-discrimination language into the City's contract and purchasing process immediately. Council also provided direction to seek public input on this topic by holding district meetings and to hire a professional facilitator to coordinate the public participation process and report on the findings.

On December 18, 2014 City Council approved a resolution to sign the UNITY Pledge from ONE Community. The item was originally brought forth for discussion as a Council Item of Special Interest at the December 2, 2014 City Council Workshop.

Community Benefit and Public Involvement

Because any legislative action Council could take has the potential for City-wide cultural and economic impacts, it is anticipated that a series of public meetings would be held. These meetings would be designed to obtain citizen views on whether an anti-discrimination ordinance is necessary or should be adopted.

Budget and Financial Impacts

Any fiscal impact to the City will depend on the direction Council chooses to take after the facilitator presents the findings from the meetings. Drafting, implementing and enforcing a new City ordinance and Code provisions may cause an incremental increase in staff time and have resources implications. Drafting and preparing for a vote on a new City Charter provision is an option that is expected to have associated fiscal costs, mostly related to voter education activities and materials.

2015 TENTATIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETINGS SCHEDULE

All meetings are from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Meetings for the Public

Wednesday, June 3 – Renaissance Glendale Hotel & Spa – 9495 W. Coyotes Blvd. Glendale, AZ 85305

Thursday, June 4 - Foothills Branch Library – 19055 N. 57th Ave. Glendale, AZ 85308

Thursday, June 18 – Glendale Adult Center - 5970 W. Brown St. Glendale, AZ 85302

Meeting for Businesses

Wednesday, June 10 – Glendale Adult Center - 5970 W. Brown St. Glendale, AZ 85302



Legislation Description

File #: 15-313, **Version:** 1

FY 14-15 THIRD QUARTER FINANCIAL REPORT

Staff Contact: Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager

Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager

Staff Presenter: Vicki Rios, Interim Director, Finance and Technology

Purpose and Recommended Action

The purpose of this item is to provide Council with a FY14-15 Third Quarter Financial Report for the major operating funds which gives information regarding the actual results of the city's revenue collections and expenditures through March 31, 2015 including budget to actual comparisons and an assessment of any foreseeable financial issues.

Background

March 31, 2015 marks the end of the third quarter of the city's fiscal year. As part of the annual budget process and the preparation of the five-year forecasts, it is important to compare the actual financial results with the budgets and forecasts.

Best financial practice calls for periodic analysis of the variances between the budget or forecast and the actual financial results. This variance analysis identifies any significant factors that may influence revenue collections and expenditure levels. The analysis also serves to improve future forecasts and identify any foreseeable financial issues so they can be proactively addressed.

Analysis

The attached report contains detailed results and analysis of the major operating funds. Overall, the results of the analysis for the major funds show positive financial results for the fiscal year.

Staff continues to monitor the actual results and will prepare financial reports quarterly.

Previous Related Council Action

At the February 17, 2015 Council Workshop, the FY14-15 mid-year financial report was presented.

At the December 16, 2014 Council Workshop, the five-year financial forecast was provided presented which include revised FY14-15 revenue and expenditure estimates.

At the June 10, 2014 Council Voting Meeting, the FY14-15 budget was adopted.

Community Benefit/Public Involvement

The community benefit of a third quarter financial report is to provide solid financial analysis which compares actual results to the budget. This helps identify any significant factors that may influence revenue and expenditure levels, improves future forecasts and budgets, and identifies any foreseeable financial issues so they can be proactively addressed.



City of Glendale – Workshop Council Report May 19, 2015

Tom Duensing, Interim Assistant City Manager
Vicki Rios, Interim Director, Finance and Technology

FY 14-15 THIRD QUARTER FINANCIAL REPORT

The first section of this report covers the General Fund which includes all sources of revenue not designated for a special purpose and expenditures to support general City services such as police; fire; parks, recreation, and library; city court; general administrative services; and contractual obligations such as the Arena and Camelback Ranch. Unlike the five-year forecast which was presented on December 17, 2014, this report of the general fund does not include the general fund sub-funds. Staff is currently in the process of determining which sub-funds will be combined with the primary General Fund. The second section covers Special Revenue Funds which includes the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF), and the Transportation, Police, and Fire Special Revenue Funds. The third section covers Enterprise Funds which consists of the Water and Sewer; Sanitation; and Landfill Enterprise Funds.

For each of the major operating funds, the actual revenues and expenditures recorded in the City's financial system through March 31, 2015 are compared to the budget adopted by the Council on June 16, 2014. As a general guideline at the mid-year point, revenues and expenditures are considered to be on target if they are close to 75% of the budgeted amount. For simplicity and budgetary comparison purposes, revenues may include transfers in from other funds and expenditures may include transfers out to other funds. In some funds the transfers in and out are labeled and presented separately. In other funds, transfers in and out are presented as either a net transfer in or out. The actual revenues and expenditures are also compared to the actual revenues and expenditures from the same time last year. This analysis identifies upward or downward trends in revenue and expenditures compared to the previous year. At the request of the Council, year-to-date revenues and expenditures for the past two years are also presented to show a three-year comparison. Significant trends and variances are analyzed in more detail to determine what factors may be influencing the results.

General Fund

This General Fund analysis is for the primary General Fund and does not include the General Fund, Sub-Funds. The City's total general fund revenue/transfers-in is \$150.4 million which is slightly above target at 76% of the \$198.9 million budget. Revenues are \$26.1 million or 21% higher than revenues at the same time last year. Out of the \$26.1 million increase in revenues, \$18.3 million is due to a change in the accounting and budgeting method for Public Safety Sales Taxes which are now seen as a transfer into the General Fund for the amount equal to the calculated enhanced service level. The expenditures attributable to the enhanced service level are also now budgeted in the General Fund. The other two largest components of general fund revenues are City Sales Tax and State Shared Tax Revenues. Together these two revenue sources represent \$105.1 million or 70% of the general fund revenue at the end of the third quarter of the year. General Fund City Sales Tax collections are \$63 million which is an increase

of \$3.9 million or 6.6% over the same time last year. General Fund Sales Tax collections are on target at 75% of the budget for the year. These figures include sales taxes for the holiday season and the impact of major special events which occurred in late January and early February. State Shared Revenues are \$42.1 million which is an increase of \$2.6 million or 6.7% over last year and are on target at 75% of the annual budget. Other General Fund Revenues including Development Services Fees, Business License Fees, and Franchise Fees are \$1.2 million or 4.8% higher than they were at the same time last year and above target at \$27 million which is 79% of the annual budget.

General Fund expenditures are \$132.8 million which is below target at 66% of the budget. The actual expenditures increased by \$16.5 million over the same time last year. This increase is primarily attributable to the change in method of accounting and budgeting for enhanced public safety service levels which qualify to be paid by the public safety sales taxes and are now budgeted in the general fund. Transfers out are below budget at only 61%, primarily due to debt service transfers which occur at the end of the year. General fund operating expenses are running slightly below target at only 67%.

General Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
City Sales Tax	\$ 38,758,318	\$54,706,781	\$ 59,102,217	\$ 84,463,062	\$ 63,000,429	75%
State Shared Revenues	32,829,010	36,622,757	39,425,625	55,947,163	42,070,714	75%
Other Revenues	22,559,391	22,621,341	25,780,162	34,016,955	27,027,186	79%
Transfers In	-	113,000	-	24,442,419	18,331,814	75%
Total Revenues and Transfers In	94,146,719	114,063,879	124,308,003	198,869,599	150,430,143	76%
Expenditures	(94,769,845)	(89,781,817)	(90,974,557)	(162,618,585)	(109,252,845)	67%
Transfers Out	(10,322,314)	(9,715,985)	(25,381,531)	(38,367,189)	(23,556,568)	61%
Total Expenditures and Transfers Out	(105,092,159)	(99,497,802)	(116,356,088)	(200,985,774)	(132,809,413)	66%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$(10,945,440)	\$14,566,077	\$ 7,951,915	\$ (2,116,175)	\$ 17,620,730	

Special Revenue Funds

Special revenue funds presented below include the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF), Transportation Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund, Police Special Revenue Fund, and Fire Special Revenue Fund.

Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF)

Revenues in the Highway User Revenue Fund are \$10.1 million which is an increase of \$967,000 or 10.6% over the prior year. Highway User Revenues are also slightly above target at 78% of the annual budget.

Expenditures in the funds are significantly lower than the target at only 11% of the annual budget. The primary reason for this variance is a budgeted \$18.7 million which is planned to be used for capital improvements in the current fiscal year but has not yet been expended. These funds are typically carried over into the following year if the projects are not completed in the

current year. In addition, operating expenses in the fund were lower than anticipated at only 59% of the annual budget (after adjustment for a \$600,000 contingency appropriation).

Highway User Revenue Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Highway User Revenues	\$ 7,943,570	\$ 8,868,586	\$ 9,138,751	\$ 12,924,692	\$ 10,105,754	78%
Transfers In	-	-	-	1,000,000	-	0%
Total Revenues and Transfers In	7,943,570	8,868,586	9,138,751	13,924,692	10,105,754	
Expenditures	(6,127,650)	(5,146,395)	(5,912,896)	(29,704,957)	(5,249,743)	18%
Transfers Out	-	(94,060)	-	-	-	0%
Total Expenditures and Transfers Out	(6,127,650)	(5,240,455)	(5,912,896)	(29,704,957)	(5,249,743)	11%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 1,815,919	\$ 3,628,132	\$ 3,225,855	\$ (15,780,265)	\$ 4,856,011	

Transportation Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund

Revenues in the Transportation Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund are \$21.5 million and 49% of the budget. This shortfall is due primarily to a budgeted \$20 million in revenue for bond proceeds which are not anticipated to be issued this year. Excluding this potential source of funds, actual revenues are \$3.9 million or 22.6 % higher than the same time last year and above target at 88.6% of the annual budget. Expenditures in this fund are below target at only 24% of the budget due to anticipated capital project expenditures of \$38.3 million in this fund which typically are spent unevenly throughout the year.

Transportation Sales Tax Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Revenues	\$ 15,562,361	\$ 16,537,649	\$ 16,825,000	\$ 23,641,743	\$ 20,775,479	88%
Bond Proceeds				20,000,000	-	0%
Transfers In (Net)	675,000	703,024	675,000	566,707	675,000	119%
Total Revenues and Transfers In	16,237,361	17,240,673	17,500,000	44,208,450	21,450,479	49%
Expenditures	(10,446,171)	(14,966,250)	(13,779,835)	(60,934,114)	(14,529,176)	24%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 5,791,191	\$ 2,274,422	\$ 3,720,165	\$ (16,725,664)	\$ 6,921,303	

Police Special Revenue Fund

Revenues in the Police Special Revenue Fund are \$11.2 million which is \$1.2 million or 12% above the revenues at same time last year and above target at 77% of the annual budget. Transfers out in the Police Special Revenue Fund are \$12.4 million which is on target at 75% of the budget. Due to the change in the method of accounting and budgeting for enhanced police services, there are no budgeted expenditures in this fund and all uses are accounted for as transfers to the General Fund.

Police Special Revenue Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Total Revenues	\$ 9,228,273	\$ 9,843,903	\$ 10,035,649	\$ 14,565,300	\$ 11,208,496	77%
Total Transfers Out	(8,570,650)	(8,313,287)	(9,700,242)	(16,550,770)	(12,413,077)	75%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 657,623	\$ 1,530,616	\$ 335,407	\$ (1,985,470)	\$ (1,204,581)	

Fire Special Revenue Fund

Revenues in Fire Special Revenue Fund are \$5.6 million which is \$579,000 or 12% above the revenues at the same time last year and on target at 76% of the annual budget. Fire Special Revenue fund transfers out are \$5.9 million which is on target at 75% of the annual budget. Due to the change in the method of accounting and budgeting for enhanced fire services, there are no budgeted expenditures in this fund and all uses are accounted for as transfers to the General Fund.

Fire Special Revenue Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Total Revenues	\$ 4,617,120	\$ 4,921,313	\$ 5,028,303	\$ 7,334,300	\$ 5,607,727	76%
Total Transfers Out	\$ (5,209,356)	\$ (5,157,170)	\$ (5,138,846)	\$ (7,891,649)	\$ (5,918,737)	75%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ (592,236)	\$ (235,857)	\$ (110,543)	\$ (557,349)	\$ (311,010)	

Enterprise Funds

The funds presented below include the Water and Sewer, Sanitation, and Landfill Enterprise Funds.

Water and Sewer Enterprise Funds

Revenues in the Water and Sewer enterprise fund total \$59.7 million at the three quarter point of the year. The water revenue of \$34.2 million is \$1.7 million lower than last year which is a variance of 4.8% and revenues are below target at 69% of the annual budget. Water revenues were lower on a month-by-month basis over the first half of the year when compared to the same months last year. Staff will continue to monitor these revenues over the coming months to determine whether the forecast for the annual revenues needs to be adjusted. Sewer revenues are \$23.8 million which is substantially equal to the same time last year. Sewer revenues are also slightly below target at only 72% when compared to the budget.

Nevertheless, due to increases in other revenues, combined revenues in the fund are at 71% of the annual budget.

Expenditures in the water and sewer enterprise funds are approximately \$4.5 million lower than the previous year and below target at 40% of the annual budget. This variance is primarily due to \$35 million in budgeted capital projects in this fund year which typically are spent unevenly throughout the year.

Water and Sewer Enterprise Funds

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Water Revenues	\$ 37,020,715	\$ 36,238,437	\$ 35,949,877	\$ 49,684,102	\$ 34,222,420	69%
Sewer Revenues	23,539,488	24,596,434	24,081,162	33,176,526	23,775,603	72%
Other Revenues	2,594,467	2,240,673	1,821,420	1,295,203	1,749,166	135%
Total Revenues	63,154,671	63,075,543	61,852,458	84,155,831	59,747,188	71%
Total Expenditures and Transfers Out	(47,803,963)	(44,395,376)	(50,555,562)	(115,311,156)	(46,078,926)	40%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 15,350,708	\$ 18,680,167	\$ 11,296,896	\$ (31,155,325)	\$ 13,668,262	

Sanitation Enterprise Fund

Combined revenues in the Sanitation Enterprise Fund are \$11.2 million which is substantially equivalent to the prior fiscal year and on target at 75% of the annual budget. Expenditures are \$1.1 million lower than last year and below target at only 65% of the annual budget. This variance is primarily due to \$4.0 million in budgeted but unspent capital projects which will be spent unevenly throughout the year.

Sanitation Enterprise Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Commercial Sanitation Revenue	\$ 2,935,905	\$ 2,953,094	\$ 2,952,663	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 3,102,788	76%
Residential Sanitation Revenue	7,836,335	7,924,746	8,012,799	10,630,000	8,043,458	76%
Other Sanitation Revenue	203,925	184,773	123,244	264,588	96,527	30%
Total Revenues	10,976,164	11,062,613	11,088,706	14,994,588	11,242,772	75%
Total Expenditures and Transfers Out	(10,497,416)	(10,307,531)	(10,592,688)	(18,018,526)	(11,737,137)	65%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 478,748	\$ 755,082	\$ 496,018	\$ (3,023,938)	\$ (494,365)	

Landfill Enterprise Fund

Revenues in the Landfill Enterprise Fund are substantially the same as last year but below target at 66% of the annual budget. Anticipated revenues for tipping fees are lower than anticipated, however this is offset by an equivalent reduction in expenditures.

Expenditures in the fund are below target at only 27% of the annual amount. This variance is primarily due to \$12 million in budgeted but unspent capital project funds which will typically be spent unevenly throughout the year and also reflects the reduction in tipping costs mentioned above.

Landfill Enterprise Fund

Item Description	FY11-12 YTD	FY12-13 YTD	FY13-14 YTD	Budget FY14-15	Actual FY14-15	% of Budget
Total Revenues	\$ 5,737,736	\$ 6,331,089	\$ 6,820,693	\$ 11,014,643	\$ 7,323,248	66%
Total Expenditures	(5,188,135)	(5,411,676)	(4,972,808)	(21,617,810)	(5,762,336)	27%
Excess (Deficiency)	\$ 549,601	\$ 919,413	\$ 1,847,885	\$ (10,603,167)	\$ 1,560,912	

Summary

Overall, an analysis of revenues for the major operating funds shows consistent financial results when compared to the budget. Expenditures remained on track or were less than budgeted due primarily to unspent capital projects funding. Staff will continue to monitor the actual results and prepare a financial report for the year-end, mid-year, and third quarter of each year.



Legislation Description

File #: 15-311, Version: 1

NORTHERN PARKWAY UPDATE

Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Debbie Albert, Interim Deputy Public Works Director

Purpose and Policy Guidance

This report presents an update on the Northern Parkway project currently underway by the cities of Glendale, El Mirage, Peoria and the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). The purpose of this report is to provide City Council an update on project progress, including the completion of recent project milestones.

Background

Northern Parkway is a partial access-controlled roadway extending from Grand Avenue to Loop 303. The project will tie together the central and western portions of Glendale, providing for reduced congestion in central Glendale and facilitating traffic from new developments in the western area.

This project was first conceived by the Glendale Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation Issues (CACTI) in 2001, during the preparation of the Glendale Transportation Plan. Since then, it was included on ballot initiatives for funding and approved by: Glendale voters in 2001; countywide voters in 2004 (Proposition 400); and Peoria voters in 2005.

In partnership with the cities of El Mirage and Peoria, as well as MCDOT, Glendale took the lead in developing the project design concept report (DCR) and obtaining environmental clearance. Other partners include the Maricopa County Flood Control District, Luke Air Force Base, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the Federal Highway Administration and the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG).

The DCR identified what portions of the project would be included in the funded phase, along with the overall design for the entire project. In general, funded improvements consist of new roadway construction from Sarival Avenue to Dysart Road, and roadway widening/frontage roads from Dysart Road to 111th Avenue. Grade separations at major intersections and a bridge at the Agua Fria River are also included. East of 111th Avenue, funded improvements include additional roadway widening and interim intersection improvements.

In 2008, the city entered into an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with El Mirage, MCDOT and Peoria to identify funding, construction and maintenance of the Parkway project. The current level of funding from all sources is adequate to construct the Parkway from Loop 303 to Loop 101. Additional funding is needed to complete the Parkway to its ultimate configuration.

The first phase of Northern Parkway-between Sarival Avenue and Dysart Road-opened to traffic in December 2013. The improvements include two travel lanes in each direction, as well as drainage features and overpasses at Sarival Avenue and the BNSF Railroad. The intersections with Litchfield and Reems Roads remained at grade until January 2015, when the overpasses were completed. Landscaping for the entire stretch was completed in March 2015. Based on IGAs approved in 2008 and 2012, the city is currently in the process of taking over operations and maintenance responsibilities for this segment of the Parkway.

The next phase of the Parkway-from Dysart Road to 111th Avenue-is currently under design and scheduled to begin construction in fall 2015. In addition to providing input on the design elements for Phase Two, the city is coordinating with MCDOT on operations and maintenance responsibilities, which will be presented to City Council at an upcoming voting meeting.

Transportation staff nominated Phase One of Northern Parkway for a 2014 MAG Desert Peaks Award in the Public Partnership category, and on June 25, 2014, the project won; and on November 5, 2014, the Northern Parkway project also won WESTMARC's Best of West Economic Engine award.

Previous Related Council Action

On October 9, 2012, City Council approved an IGA with Maricopa County for inspection services for Phase 1 of Northern Parkway.

On April 26, 2011, City Council approved an IGA between Maricopa County and the City of Glendale for ownership, operation and maintenance of Northern Parkway, from Sarival Avenue to Dysart Road.

On September 23, 2008, City Council approved an IGA between Maricopa County and the cities of El Mirage, Peoria and Glendale for construction of Northern Parkway from Loop 303 to Grand Avenue. As provided in the 2008 IGA, Maricopa County is responsible for arranging and overseeing the construction of the Northern Parkway project, including field engineering and inspection work.

There were a total of eight property acquisitions for Northern Parkway that were approved by Council during Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007. The total amount paid for these eight properties was approximately \$6 million.

On December 12, 2006, Council approved a contract with Acquisition Sciences, Ltd. for right-of-way acquisition services for the Northern Parkway in the amount of \$789,000.

On April 16, 2003, Council approved an IGA with ADOT to modify the design and construction of the 67th Avenue Overpass over Grand Avenue to accommodate future construction of the Northern Parkway.

Community Benefit/Public Involvement

Northern Parkway will provide regional connectivity to the state highway system, enhance east/west mobility, serve expected population growth, improve safety of travel within Glendale, reduce travel time, improve access across the Agua Fria River and enhance flood protection.

The Parkway corridor is located within Glendale and the Glendale Planning Area and is adjacent to large, undeveloped parcels and farmland that are ready for conversion to urban uses. Construction of the Northern Parkway corridor will support the cities and county in planning urban development that is compatible with the Parkway and that would utilize the added capacity and mobility provided by the Parkway. The Parkway will attract quality development that will help support the local tax base.

Public meetings specifically addressing the Northern Parkway were held in February and July 2003, and in June and December of 2005. Seven meetings with individual neighborhoods were held in January through March 2006. MCDOT hosted public engagement meetings related to the segment between 111th and 103rd Avenues between September 2012 and April 2013. Additionally, a public meeting regarding Phase 2 was held on August 20, 2014.

Budget and Financial Impacts

The total estimated cost for the overall Northern Parkway project included in the 2010 design concept report is \$612.6 million in 2009 dollars. The funded portion of the Northern Parkway project is approximately \$340 million. Northern Parkway is included in the Regional Transportation Plan as an Arterial Life Cycle Program project, which includes approximately \$237 million in regional funds through 2025. The remaining balance of local funds is allocated as specified in the 2008 IGA with El Mirage, MCDOT and Peoria. Glendale's share is estimated at approximately \$40.6 million. To date, approximately \$31.8 million has been expended on the project. To complete the overall project, additional funding is required or the project would have to be completed after the current Regional Transportation Plan expires.

The Capital Improvement Plan includes \$7,662,470 in remaining funding for Northern Parkway through Fiscal Year 2025. Operating and Maintenance costs are budgeted in Fund 1660, the Transportation Sales Tax Fund. Operating costs for Fiscal Year 2015-16 are estimated at approximately \$1,000,000.



Legislation Description

File #: 15-312, Version: 1

UPDATE ON LOOP 303 AND NORTHERN AVENUE ACCESS

Staff Contact: Jack Friedline, Director, Public Works

Staff Presenter: Debbie Albert, Interim Deputy Public Works Director

Purpose and Policy Guidance

The purpose of this report is to provide Council an update on transportation access to Loop 303 at Northern Avenue, and for Council to provide staff direction regarding coordination with BNSF Railroad, the Arizona Corporation Commission and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) to further develop a potential solution.

Background

ADOT is nearing completion of improvements to Loop 303 in the West Valley to a limited-access, six-lane facility with grade separations at major intersections, including Northern and Olive Avenues. Traffic enhancements at these locations include a northbound off-ramp and a southbound on-ramp at Northern Avenue. Interim direct-access ramps allow traffic to seamlessly flow between two high-capacity transportation corridors-Loop 303 and the newly constructed Northern Parkway.

The ultimate system interchange and improvements to Loop 303 have been conceptually designed and include reconfigured ramp connections between Loop 303 and Northern Parkway, as well as northbound and southbound frontage roads between Northern and Peoria Avenues. Additional ramp connections are also included for northbound and southbound off-ramps and on-ramps, respectively, at Northern Avenue. Some of these improvements are included as part of the Regional Transportation Plan; however, the funding is not programmed within the current countywide half-cent sales tax plan.

Several property owners have contacted the city, as they are concerned about the diminished level of access provided at Loop 303 and Northern Avenue, particularly for traffic traveling to and from the north end of the interchange.

Analysis

Because the alignment of Northern Parkway falls halfway between Olive and Northern Avenues, and with the Railroad's location on the north side of Olive Avenue, there are limited opportunities for access from Loop 303 and these two arterial streets. The current Loop 303 and Northern Parkway configuration does not permit the frontage roads and access ramps to be constructed as shown on the ultimate improvement design concept. This requires vehicles travelling to areas in the vicinity of Loop 303 and Northern Avenue to take a circuitous route.

The city has worked with the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) and ADOT to develop a potential solution to address some of the issues identified by local property owners. This solution will require grade crossings of the BNSF Railroad on the north side of Olive Avenue for new entrance and exit ramps. ADOT has requested the city's assistance in establishing these crossings, as well as a commitment to remove the crossings if they become a safety issue in the future. Staff also continues to work with MAG to identify funding that may be used for the proposed improvements.

Previous Related Council Action

On June 17, 2014, staff presented an update on the Loop 303 access at Northern Avenue in response to a Council Item of Special Interest request by Mayor Weiers.

Community Benefit/Public Involvement

A robust and comprehensive transportation system is critical to the overall economic development and vitality of the city. Additional access from Loop 303 to Northern Avenue will increase transportation options and circulation in the area, stimulating interest in potential development.

Budget and Financial Impacts

The total estimated cost for the proposed access improvement is approximately \$15 million, and MAG is currently working to include the funding in the next update of the Transportation Improvement Program. No local funding would be required for the design or construction.

The estimate for future removal of the proposed railroad grade crossings is \$265,000. Funding would need to be identified to cover this cost should it be deemed necessary. Specifics for the funding would be included in a future intergovernmental agreement with ADOT that would be brought forward for Council consideration.