

# City of Glendale

*5850 West Glendale Avenue  
Glendale, AZ 85301*



## Meeting Minutes - Final

**Tuesday, March 7, 2017**

**1:30 PM**

**Workshop**

**Council Chambers**

## **City Council Workshop**

*Mayor Jerry Weiers*

*Vice Mayor Ian Hugh*

*Councilmember Jamie Aldama*

*Councilmember Joyce Clark*

*Councilmember Ray Malnar*

*Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff*

*Councilmember Bart Turner*

**CALL TO ORDER****ROLL CALL**

**Present** 7 - Mayor Jerry Weiers, Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Joyce Clark, Councilmember Ray Malnar, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner

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

**WORKSHOP SESSION**

1. [17-078](#) URBAN LAND INSTITUTE ARIZONA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PANEL REPORT - REVITALIZING GLENDALE'S MIDTOWN DISTRICT  
Staff Contact: Jean Moreno, Executive Officer Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects  
Guest Presenter: Amy Malloy, AzTAP Committee Vice-Chair, Evergreen Devco  
Guest Presenter: Tom Hester, Regional Placemaking Manager WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff  
Guest Presenter: Mark A. Davis, Davis Enterprises

Ms. Moreno said the overall goal of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel Report (AzTAP) regarding the Centerline area was to tap into industry experts and to understand market limitations and enablers. Goals also included examining holistic contextual factors such as placemaking, housing, education, transit, economic development, infrastructure and neighborhoods. The focus of the study was the downtown area. She said staff was seeking guidance on two issues: 1) Were there any recommended strategies that were off limits for continued study and implementation included in the report; and 2) Were there any specific strategies from the report that Council would like to see prioritized.

Ms. Malloy said a list of stakeholders was contacted to find out what their concerns were and the panel was brought to the area ahead of time and given a book of information from City staff that provided information about the issues the area faced, which included development constraints and housing. The panel toured the area so it had some context about the issues faced before panel discussions began.

Ms. Malloy said ingredients for a successful downtown area included a distinctive community brand that represented its unique heritage. A successful downtown was multifunctional, had a mix of uses, incorporated historic preservation and encouraged adaptive reuse. It had a pedestrian friendly design and active streets, with managed parking and accessible, connected multimodal transportation options. There was connected open space with coordinated public-private partnerships and a rich civic engagement.

Ms. Malloy said the panel discussed whether a downtown area could succeed with or without light rail. She said that light rail would provide a quick return on investment in a downtown area and said there were communities with and without light rail that had

successful downtown areas. The Centerline district had a good foundation to build on including historic assets, cultural authenticity, abundant land, parks, a walkable downtown, established neighborhoods and businesses, existing anchor institutions and nearby transportation infrastructure. Its proximity to Grand Canyon University provided many opportunities for the area. The downtown area had a unique character that was rare for this part of the valley.

Mr. Davis said the panel focused on six topic areas: land development; transit readiness and infrastructure improvement strategies; housing and education; placemaking and neighborhood preservation; employment and economic development; and financing and implementation strategies. He said policy, people and place were the strategies and actions up for consideration during the current process. The discussion centered around how to engage people and what policies were in place to encourage investment.

Mr. Davis said engaging the private sector to grow and invest in the community was very important. The goals and objectives reached during the process included: committing to a clear, long-term vision; promoting an authentic identity for the corridor; engaging the community; leveraging quick wins; and identifying a project.

Mr. Davis said land development and transit readiness would include a determination if the right policies were in place. The recommendation was to create a one-stop business advocacy liaison in City Hall and to inventory and promote sites for anchor development. He explained placemaking and neighborhood preservation included investing in downtown by activating underutilized properties, growing the creative economy and enhancing green space and social connections. He said the area was unique and growing an innovative economy was possible with minimal investment.

Mr. Hester said another recommendation was to focus on small, signature schools. He said a challenge was there were four different school districts in the midtown area. One of the suggestions was to have the City establish partnerships by getting the different districts to talk to each other and support each other. The City could encourage neighborhood-oriented schools and joint-use policies as well as finding creative locations for school projects. Mr. Hester said there was an opportunity to use a quality workforce and mixed income housing to leverage state and federal housing programs and partner with community development and anchor organizations. The tax credit housing would help stabilize the sub-market and it was an opportunity to use the tax credit housing to help get rid of blighted properties. Additionally, the tax credit housing could be placed on sites that were not contributing to the area.

Mr. Hester said there was a competitive advantage in the area being so close to Grand Canyon University for possible student housing. It would add to the return on investment. Economic development could stabilize underlying neighborhood conditions, support business incubators and co-working spaces, develop strong messaging, promotion and coordination as well as facilitate land assembly now. He said the rents in the market were very reasonable and that provided opportunities for start-up businesses.

Mr. Davis said financial investment tools came from multilayer approaches. He said the panel found that the housing participants were interested in developing in the area now. Committing to a few market opportunities would attract private sector investment. He suggested creating a CDC or CDFI focused on Centerline and reevaluating ideas for City-owned parcels. Some of the funding from light rail or transit-oriented development could help fill in the gaps for essential services. He said a consistent vision and consistent action would provide development predictability and would unlock value for the area.

Councilmember Clark asked what was the one action or strategy to start with.

Mr. Hester said a retail property investor he spoke with wanted the City to create a long-term vision and wanted to know if light rail was coming or not, as it would affect the business decisions he made about his property. Mr. Hester said Council needed to understand the critical transportation issues before moving forward. The community would benefit greatly from light rail.

Councilmember Clark said light rail was a mass people mover. She asked what was Glendale's destination that would make light rail successful in the area.

Mr. Hester said it was a competitive advantage to be the only community in the west valley with light rail. Light rail was an alternative mode of travel and it functioned well with bicycles and buses.

Mr. Davis said it was important to engage the community in a way that would get a plan that the community and policymakers could believe in and move forward. The downtown area could be a great place to grow more employment and was logical to bring light rail to the area. He said there would be much more housing and jobs and that would complement the entertainment venues already located in the City.

Councilmember Clark said there was already low- to moderate-income housing in the area. She asked if it would be better to obtain more moderate-income housing or concentrate on rehabbing the blighted properties.

Mr. Hester said all the above and having a diverse rent environment was good for the area. There was an income gap in the area and it might be a good idea to establish low income housing tax credit projects. It would prime the area for more moderate housing to come in right after it. He said those projects needed to be near mass transit.

Councilmember Clark wanted answers that focused on having light rail and not having light rail.

Mr. Hester said the panel didn't believe light rail was necessary for the transformation of the area. It would be based on scale and timing and what the stakeholders needed. It would be necessary to find innovative ways to meet those needs and solve the problems.

Councilmember Turner asked if Ms. Malloy had anything to say.

Ms. Malloy said the panel did look at redeveloping the downtown area, with or without light rail. The panel felt it was critical to the balance and longevity of the City to have a strong downtown. She said opportunities would come after light rail if Glendale moved in that direction, but it was difficult to retrofit the community after light rail. She said the Council should create a vision and a plan and be stalwart in the execution of that plan.

Councilmember Turner appreciated the efforts of the team in conducting the study. He said the Council needed to be proactive, in order to begin changing the area. If Council established a vision, it could begin to protect the historic downtown and create a new Centerline. The blight would continue to creep up if nothing was done. Councilmember Turner said light rail might be the key to starting change.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the lack of a decision about light rail was holding back development in the Centerline area.

Mr. Davis said the short answer was yes because developers loved predictability. Uncertainty about the light rail was causing a problem.

Mayor Weiers said whether light rail happened or not, developers just needed to know what was going to happen.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the report was talking about housing density in the downtown area.

Mr. Davis said denser housing areas would pay off on the return on investment along the light rail corridor.

Mr. Hester said developers had many options for development in high density areas. The City had to remember to create open space and to connect that to the higher density areas. Those actions would help expand the overall diversity of the economy.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the Centerline area was too big of an area and should it be broken down into smaller areas for development.

Mr. Hester said once the areas that were in line with community needs were determined, those areas could be focused on for development.

Councilmember Malnar agreed with the idea of a catalyst and the need to create a long-term strategy. He asked if anything other than light rail was presented as a catalyst when speaking with the stakeholders.

Ms. Malloy said education was a major economic development engine and the idea of signature schools made sense for the area. She said a strong signature school program in the downtown area would be a benefit to downtown.

Mr. Davis spoke about the downtown revitalization in Phoenix and said it was a collective community placemaking. He said they asked broad questions of the stakeholders regarding their thoughts about housing and schools in the area.

Councilmember Malnar said the area needed some sort of transportation infrastructure and asked if the panel looked at other methods of transportation.

Mr. Hester said there were many layers to the development and transportation would also be a layered approach. He said the Centerline's infrastructure was classic and it already had a multimodal system of transportation. The public would use what it felt was safe. People would be moving differently in the next five to ten years, which enabled a broader diversity of people to move around.

Councilmember Malnar said light rail shouldn't be left out of the long-term planning, but it was not absolutely necessary for the Centerline planning over the next five to ten years.

Mr. Hester said the success of the Centerline project was not dependent on light rail.

Councilmember Aldama asked how much time the panel spent in the residential communities in the downtown, Catlin Court, and the weed and seed area at 67th Avenue and Glendale. He said many of those areas zoned commercial were encroaching on the nearby residential areas. He was concerned about getting buy-in from the residents if nearby areas kept commercializing and not investing in neighborhoods.

Ms. Malloy said the panel review was over a two-day period, but panelists did not get out and talk with residents. She said they did speak with multifamily units in the midtown area. The housing questions were critical and being responsive to the residents in the area was critical as was the need to balance the groups already in the neighborhood with development. She said community input was the foundation for building a vision.

Councilmember Aldama wanted to see community reinvestment in existing neighborhoods and was concerned about the encroachment of the entertainment district. He didn't want the panel to forget about the communities on both sides of Glendale Avenue.

Vice Mayor Hugh said there had been many transformations of downtown Glendale. Downtown Glendale was beautiful and that was something to build on. There were good high schools near downtown and educational programs should be emphasized. He said downtown Glendale would continue to be a special place.

Councilmember Clark asked what the speakers envisioned as the downtown anchor for Glendale.

Ms. Malloy said the central park was the best feature. She said Glendale's events could be more carefully woven into an implementation strategy that was part of a sustainable downtown.

Mr. Hester said downtown was a destination and the City needed to look at a multi-block area and work with business owners and investors. The City needed to begin forming partnerships and having dialogues with residents and business owners to determine what they wanted and how to maintain Glendale as a destination.

Mr. Davis said restaurants and retail spaces were critical. Rent was low and there was a great variety of restaurants. Restaurant sales were more robust and sustainable than antique stores and would bring more people to the area. He said the City needed to find where the obstacles were to developers and work to overcome them.

Councilmember Clark said the City did not have the support of the entire community and asked how to solve the problem of downtown community engagement.

Mr. Hester said there was no simple fix and the City would need a downtown manager to help solve the problem. The community needed to know how investment would help them. He said the City had access to many resources through ULI to come up with a robust engagement process.

Councilmember Clark asked what was the first quick fix for the downtown area.

Ms. Malloy said the first quick fix would be establishing pride of place and over-invest in code enforcement and beautification of the area to show that the City cared about the area.

Mr. Hester said maintaining City-owned properties and reaching out to large landowners and stakeholders to find out what their issues were and finding out how to make the private sector thrive.

Mr. Davis said a short-term quick fix was getting clear direction on the future for landowners in terms of light rail.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said City Hall was the biggest stakeholder in downtown Glendale. She asked how much it would help if the city buildings and land were spruced up, painted and cleaned up.

Ms. Malloy said all the speakers would agree that beautification of the buildings would be very helpful. There were wonderful older buildings and historic homes that were a draw to visitors. She agreed that the City Hall building was a bit of a contrast to the rest of the older, historic area.

Ms. Moreno asked if there were any recommendations from the report that Council did not want to implement or any it wanted to make a high priority.

Councilmember Clark didn't want to remove anything from the table, but would like to see downtown beautification as a priority. She would also like to reengage with the downtown community.

Councilmember Malnar would like to see a clear vision established.

Councilmember Tolmachoff liked the idea of using the City buildings as a starting point to engage the community. She also spoke of rebranding Glendale.

Councilmember Aldama said the City buildings and public places should amplify aesthetics and should look pleasing. He was also in favor of placemaking as long as it included reinvestment.

Councilmember Turner said code enforcement needed to do a better job in the downtown area and keep the historic area looking clean. He said the focus should be on bringing people into downtown on a regular basis, not just during the large festivals.

Vice Mayor Hugh agreed with Councilmember Turner and believed something should be happening in downtown every weekend.

Mayor Weiers would like to have the Jazz Festival return to Glendale as soon as possible.

## 2. [17-084](#)

### COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: EMAIL RETENTION

Staff Contact and Presenter: Julie K. Bower, City Clerk

Ms. Bower said the item was a follow-up to a Council item of special interest by Councilmember Turner and Vice Mayor Hugh. She explained that phase 1 of the project included collecting, reviewing and analyzing state and national data regarding email retention. Staff investigated and determined if there were agencies that provided standards/recognition for organizational transparency and analyzed electronic document management systems (EDMS) and the cost of implementation. During this phase, the cost of storage if the length of retention was increased was also analyzed.

Ms. Bower explained that public records were governed by statute and all records were property of the state. The state library director had the authority to establish retention schedules. Per state retention schedules, retention for electronic communications records depended upon the content of the communication.

Ms. Bower said the state retention schedule required a two-year retention if the email was constituent correspondence. The retention for general correspondence, per state

retention schedule, was after the administrative value had been served. The majority of email was considered general correspondence. This meant that once the email was read, it could be deleted.

Ms. Bower explained that for some email, the retention could be longer than two years. For example, election emails concerning political committees, the retention was 3 years after termination of the committee and for emails concerning zoning case files the retention was twenty years.

Mr. Bailey said there were legal liabilities regarding retaining records past their retention dates. He spoke about the liability with various litigation the City might face. Another challenge was knowing whether a document existed. Personal emails were not public records. He said another problem was the ability to find the documents in the case of litigation. The City had a duty to promptly respond and furnish public records. The larger the repository of documents, the harder it was to furnish a prompt response to a request for public records. Mr. Bailey said the more emails the City kept, the harder it was to know what those documents were and to find the specific documents it was looking for and respond in a timely manner.

Ms. Bower said 15 states and 17 cities and towns were surveyed and in all states surveyed, email records were not treated differently than any other records and just like in Arizona, retention was based on the content of the email. Retention on the email systems varied from as little as 30 days to as long as 3 years. The average retention length was 325 days. Staff was unable to identify any agencies that provided standards or recognition for organizational transparency.

Ms. Bower said the email system was a communication tool and not a document management tool and averaged over 1 million emails sent and received per month. When public records requests were received, the IT Department might have to search the entire repository. Because it wasn't a document management system, it was unable to search 365 days' worth of email at once so IT had to break the search up into smaller pieces. Once the searches were complete, the documents found were forwarded to the Clerk's Office and Clerk staff reviewed each email, removing any that were not pertinent to the request.

Ms. Bower said the current policy stated it was the responsibility of the employee to actively manage email based on content. Each department had a designated records control officer who was responsible for maintaining records in accordance with retention schedules.

Ms. Bower said the City could increase the retention of email on the server. The retention had been temporarily increased from 1 year to 2 years to allow time to study the issue. That increase could be made permanent. There would be no increased cost for storage for the 2-year retention. However, a longer retention would exacerbate the problems encountered when conducting searches for public record requests and would increase the time staff spent reviewing records. It also didn't relieve the user from the responsibility of determining the appropriate retention of each email record, especially if that retention was longer than 2 years.

Ms. Bower said any solution should include updating the email policy and developing ongoing training for employees that addressed how to manage email and apply the appropriate retention schedule. The City could also invest in a document management system. It would allow the user to import emails into the system with one click and build in retention based on record type. Regardless of the email situation, there was a need for



an organization-wide document management system. In addition to connecting document imaging with document management, it would provide greater transparency to the public. Records such as contracts, minutes, ordinance, etc., would be consolidated in one place on the City's website and search capabilities would be greatly improved.

Ms. Bower said the Clerk's Office would be including a request for funding for the document management system in the FY17-18 budget in the amount of \$380,000. This included one-time costs of \$313,000 for software, professional services, conversion of 3.5 million records and annual costs of \$67,000 for maintenance, hosting and cloud storage.

Councilmember Turner said progress had been made by allowing emails to be saved for two years instead of one year. He said a policy should be established to manage electronic documents. He understood the difficulty it caused to search the increased number of records and suggested breaking the emails down into one year folders so they could be accessed easily if a public records request was made. He understood the liability issue, but said it had been his experience that saving emails for a longer period of time was better. He asked Mr. Phelps for his thoughts on the email retention issue.

Mr. Phelps said the City Clerk had identified some concerns. His prior organization did have software to assist with retention and redaction of documents. The City did not have the technology to manage documents as effectively as it could and that technology did come at a cost. He suggested starting work on better education and training for employees.

Councilmember Turner said the City should continue training staff on what needed to be saved and increasing the length of time for saving the document. It was interesting that other cities didn't hold emails as long, but that didn't mean those cities were doing it the right way. He wanted to save what needed to be saved and save it for a longer period of time.

Councilmember Clark said the item sounded like a solution in search of a problem. She said people were inundated with information and emails. She said one million emails per month equaled over 12 million emails a year. It would be difficult to maintain that amount of data and a 1-year retention seemed much more manageable. Many of the emails were irrelevant and that was where the training should be and the solution was to develop a better training program.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the proposed EDMS would allow Council to save emails that would not be deleted. He asked if the current system could save emails until he decided to delete it without saving it to his hard drive.

Ms. Bower said currently the email would be retained for 2 years and to retain it longer Councilmember Malnar would have to save the email outside of the email system.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the EDMS system would be able to do that.

Ms. Bower said yes, Councilmember Malnar could send the email to the document management system.

Councilmember Malnar asked if all the emails would be sent to the EDMS system for retention.

Ms. Bower said the EDMS system would only save the email that the Councilmember wanted to save, it would not save all the emails.

Councilmember Malnar asked about the advantages of the EDMS system if the Councilmembers could save emails just by sending them to their hard drives. He said he was looking at the \$380,000 cost.

Mr. Bailey said the system was a one click system, so there was the convenience of that function. He said the documents would also be in a format that was better organized and searchable.

Councilmember Malnar said he was trying to figure out if the EDMS system was necessary.

Mr. Bailey said the policy would include a training element.

Councilmember Malnar said they would be required to move all the emails into EDMS if they move forward with this process.

Ms. Bower said the EDMS system would manage City documents, not just email. She said the system would provide a public portal on the City's website for better access to City documents by the public.

Councilmember Tolmachoff provided an example of searching the email server and the document management system and said if both areas had to be searched, it would defeat the purpose of the EDMS system.

Mr. Bailey said staff searched everything and said the new technology would allow staff to find the needle in the haystack, rather than expending the time and effort spent now to find things. He said there was an educational component for staff.

Councilmember Tolmachoff did not understand the benefit of an EDMS system if it was not going to eliminate the necessity to search everywhere. She said she understood the rest of the records retention issue.

Ms. Bower said with the EDMS system, there was no need for a 7-year retention of email. The important emails, that needed to be kept for more than the 1-year retention would be placed in the EDMS system. She said that would make it much easier if the 1 year of email in the email system needed to be searched. That way, staff was not searching over 50 million or more emails.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked how the existing emails would get into the EDMS system.

Ms. Bower said, once the new system was installed, there was a tab that Councilmembers could use to send their emails to the document management system.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked about the emails she already had, not new emails. She had a lot of emails that were supposed to be put in folders to save and some had been deleted and others were still in the system.

Mr. Murphy said there were import processes that could be used to get those emails into the new system. Staff would also work with the vendor to move the existing documents into the new system and that was part of the plan.

Vice Mayor Hugh wanted the business emails of the Council saved for a longer period

and would be in favor of the best system to save the important emails that needed to be saved.

Councilmember Turner was not advocating saving 12 million emails a year. Staff needed to be properly trained on what had to be kept and how long it needed to be kept. Emails probably hadn't been properly retained and the problem seemed to have been going on for a long time. He said the Laserfiche program had the capability to search through the entire document just like Outlook did. Even with Laserfiche, employees still needed to manage the documents.

Mr. Phelps said it was an important topic and recommended continuing it for further discussion. He said there was a need to get more information and bring it back for a future workshop.

Councilmember Clark asked if the document management system was primarily an archival system and if it would be easier to search.

Ms. Bower said it would definitely be easier to search for records with the document management system and it had value as an archival system although it was much more than just an archival system.

Mayor Weiers said the item would come back at a later date for further discussion.

3. [17-068](#)

**COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: COLUMBUS DAY AS A CITY HOLIDAY**

**Staff Contact: Jim Brown, Director, Human Resources and Risk Management**

Mr. Brown said the Council item of special interest was from Mayor Weiers. He said the scope of the request included reviewing whether City offices would remain open on Columbus Day and if the City would provide a floating holiday for employees in lieu of Columbus Day, and what that impact would be to the City.

Mr. Brown said a survey was conducted of department heads and there would be little or no financial impact by keeping offices open on Columbus Day or providing a floating holiday. He provided a list of benchmark cities and said none of the cities were currently closed on Columbus Day. He said several of the benchmark cities recognized another holiday instead of Columbus Day, provided a floating holiday in lieu of Columbus Day or both.

Mr. Brown said if the Council desired to remove Columbus Day as a City holiday, leave City offices open that day, and provide employees a floating holiday, Human Resources would work to revise HR Policy 401 and would bring the policy changes to the Personnel Board for review and recommendations. Human Resources would then bring Policy 401 with recommended changes to a voting session. Any approved policy changes would go into effect with the new fiscal year on July 1, 2017.

Councilmember Aldama suggested considering a civil rights holiday in lieu of Columbus Day.

Mr. Brown said staff kept the presentation to the scope of the request. He said some of the benchmark cities were closed for Cesar Chavez Day in lieu of Columbus Day. He said none of the cities had a civil rights day.

Councilmember Aldama suggested using a civil rights day to celebrate diversity.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the number of paid holidays was the same in all the benchmark cities.

Mr. Brown said Glendale currently had 11.5 paid holidays. The other benchmark cities were very similar with 10 to 12 paid holidays.

Councilmember Malnar asked if employees could take a floating holiday on any day.

Mr. Brown said that was correct.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the state and county had paid time off on Columbus Day.

Mr. Brown said state and federal offices were closed on Columbus Day. He said he would check to see if the county was closed.

Mayor Weiers said Council had worked very hard to make City pay competitive. He agreed employees should have the right to celebrate the holidays that were special to them, but keep the doors open and provide service to the citizens.

Councilmember Turner thought it was a good idea when it was brought up. He said Council might want to consider whether the holiday could be combined with some three-day weekends.

Councilmember Malnar asked if the holiday would be a use it or lose it holiday.

Mr. Brown said employees would have to use the floating holiday or lose it by the end of the year.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus to move forward with it. He asked if Mr. Brown had everything he needed.

Mr. Brown said his understanding was to bring forward the 8 hours of floating holiday to a voting meeting.

Mayor Weiers said that was correct.

**4. [17-069](#)**

THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: DIVERSITY COMMISSION  
ORDINANCE

Staff Contact: Jim Brown, Director, Human Resources and Risk  
Management

This item was removed from the agenda prior to the meeting and not presented.

**CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

Mr. Phelps has no items to report.

**CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

Mr. Bailey has no items to report.

**COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

Councilmember Aldama asked for staff to bring back the Jazz Festival item.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The City Council adjourned at 4:13 p.m.