

MINUTES
REGULAR WORKSESSION
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YUMA, ARIZONA
YUMA CITY HALL
ONE CITY PLAZA, YUMA, ARIZONA
September 15, 2009
5:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Nelson called the City Council meeting to order.

Councilmembers Present: Shoop, Mendoza, Beeson, McClendon, Nicholls, Johnson and Mayor Nelson
Councilmembers Absent: none
Staffmembers Present: Deputy City Administrator, Bob Stull
City Attorney, Steve Moore
Director of Community Development, Laurie Lineberry
Director of Finance, Pat Wicks
Various department heads or their representatives
City Clerk, Brigitta Kuiper

I. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS - none

III. MARINE AVIATION WEAPONS AND TACTICS SQUADRON ONE (MAWTS-1) DESERT TALON TRAINING EXERCISE

Mayor Nelson moved the MAWTS-1 presentation, Agenda Item III, to this point in the meeting.

Marine Corps Air Station – Yuma (MCAS), Commanding Officer, Colonel Werth, introduced himself and fellow Commanding Officer, Colonel Thomas and Evolution Coordinator, Captain Trimble, noting that Captain Trimble is the Evolution Coordinator for Non-combatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) Training Assault Support Tactics III (AST 3) Course in Yuma and Brawley, California.

Trimble presented the following:

- Purpose: realistic training for real Marine Corps missions
- Weapons and Tactics Instruction (WTI) Training – upcoming event
 - Friday, October 23, 2009
 - 4:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. (arriving on site at 3 p.m.)
 - Air and ground equipment will be involved
 - Evacuation exercise will take place at Kiwanis Park
 - Three phase evacuation operation
 - Insert security forces
 - Evacuate noncombatant role players
 - Extract security forces
 - A simulated downed helicopter and quick reaction force response will occur at Trinity Christian Church.
 - Concurrent event with Brawley

- Aircraft will maintain 500 feet above ground, unless landing

Trimble outlined the sequence of events that will take place during the training and the routes that will be used by the helicopter, escort/support aircraft and ground vehicles.

- Security
 - Safety is a primary factor
 - Event will not conflict with air traffic control space
 - Event will comply with all Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.
 - The City Parks and Recreation Department, as well as Police and Fire, have been notified
 - No recreational or public events are scheduled during the training event.
 - Military Crash and Rescue personnel will be onsite.
 - Yuma Police and Military Police will be at both sites.
 - Site Commander will ensure the sites are clean prior to departure
 - No ordnance will be carried on any aircraft or by any personnel
 - Role players will be identified by reflective belts
- Community issues
 - Yuma Regional Medical Center has been notified.
 - Public notice will be printed in *The Yuma Sun*
 - Press Conference
 - Tuesday, October 20th at 9:00 a.m. at MCAS Command Center
 - MCAS Public Affairs Office available for contact
 - Noise complaints: Contact noise hotline, MAWTS-1 Supervisor of Flight or MCAS Officer of the Day; respective telephone numbers were displayed.

Trimble thanked the City of Yuma for their continued support to the military. **Mayor Nelson** thanked the military for its service.

II. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2009

Census 2010 Complete Count Committee

Shoop noted that one of the 12 members appointed at the September 9, 2009, Regular City Council Meeting, in accordance with Resolution R2009-63, would like to be removed. **Moore** confirmed that the resolution calls for a minimum of 14 members. **Johnson** opined that the resolution should be amended to require not less than 11 members. **Mayor Nelson**: The minimum should be no less than five.

Ordinance O2009-55: Zoning Code Text Amendment – Adding Definitions for Condominium, Planned Unit Development and Stock Cooperative

Nicholls asked how these definitions would apply to a property owned by a Limited Liability Corporation. Would that make the property a Stock Cooperative? **Lineberry**: Ordinance O2009-55 adds definitions that the Yuma City Code doesn't currently include. The definition language is taken directly from the Arizona Revised Statutes - none of the definitions are being changed.

SunGard Public Sector Beta Agreement/ Software Upgrade

Wicks presented the following information: key points regarding the 1996 enterprise system purchased from HTE.

HTE - History

- Current software – HTE (Harward Technical Enterprises, Inc.) purchased in 1996.
- Solid relationship with the company, but no substantive upgrades in technology have been available until now
- Excellent database engine
 - IBM iSeries (AS/400)
 - High speed
- Poor information system – “mining” the data requires special skills
- City’s network evolved into Windows environment; however, legacy HTE system remained the underlying program
 - City staff had to contend with two separate technologies.
- Staff wanted to move to completely Windows-based system for some time; however the cost was prohibitive – up to \$1 million.

SunGard

- One of world’s largest software and information technology services companies
 - \$5 billion in sales; 25,000 customers in 70 countries
- SunGard purchased three government software providers – HTE, Pentamation, and Bi-Tech – and, in 2006, created SunGard Public Sector.
- In 2009, announced creation of a new software product: OneSolution
- Product is ready for “Beta” testing by selected SunGard customers, one of which is the City of Yuma.
- “Beta” test: Final “real-world” testing by people outside the software company
 - Finance/Human Resources modules ready now
 - Future: Public Works/Utility management

SunGard Advantages

- SunGard knows current system and conversion of data is less of an issue
- SunGard will maintain portions of system not ready for Beta testing and create links necessary to integrate both systems
- SunGard will turn focus to new product and not provide any real updates to HTE version (although they will support it)
- City staff will have some influence on final product

New Capabilities

- Technology
 - Windows .Net-based application designed using service-oriented architecture (SOA)
 - New work process control
 - Easier to train users – only one layer of technology
 - Similar to productivity increase when City moved to Windows technology for word processing, calendaring, spreadsheets
- Expanded Web presence

- Employee Portal – Employee self service with pay and benefits data
- Applicant Portal – Replace current system that is not linked to HTE
- Bidding online – Purchasing module for vendors
 - Make the process “greener” with less paper
- Adaptability
 - Easier to tie in transactions in an ever-changing technical environment
 - Third-party vendor software (examples):
 - Safari (registration for events)
 - TicketSage (event tickets)
 - Fairways (golf course)
 - Concentrix (Civic Center)
 - Payment interchange systems
 - Internet/phone
 - Debit/credit transactions
 - Banking

Process

- SunGard will:
 - Install and prepare new system on City servers
 - Convert data in current system to new system
 - Train selected City staff
- City staff will operate both systems concurrently over a period of time
- System results will be reconciled

Modules to be tested – (*modules new to the City listed in italics*)

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| ▪ General ledger | ▪ Documents Online |
| ▪ Job/Project ledger | ▪ Easy Laser Forms |
| ▪ Budget item detail | ▪ <i>Contracts management</i> |
| ▪ Accounts payable w/ bank reconciliation | ▪ <i>PunchOut (Purchasing)</i> |
| ▪ Cash receipts | ▪ <i>Grants management</i> |
| ▪ Purchasing | ▪ <i>Employee online</i> |
| ▪ Stores inventory | ▪ <i>Applicant online</i> |
| ▪ Purchasing cards | ▪ <i>OneSolution Desktop</i> |
| ▪ Payroll | ▪ <i>Endowment management</i> |
| ▪ Position Budgeting | ▪ <i>Time card online</i> |
| ▪ Human Resources | ▪ <i>Bid online</i> |

Cost

- No direct cost or obligation for Beta test
 - Indirect cost of time and effort on managing test
- Upon successful completion and acceptance by City:
 - Pay discounted costs to procure general release version of software
 - Replacement modules: 100% discount on software price; 20% discount on all services costs
 - New modules: 70% discount on software price; same services discount
 - Pay only for modules accepted
 - Pay only for service time needed

- Maximum price: \$260,000, if the City chose to purchase all of the modules.
- Ongoing annual cost: \$71,600 (maintenance agreement)

Software Product		
	Software	Services
Modules in use		\$169,860
New modules	\$30,540	59,600
Total services		229,460
Total software	30,540	
Grand Total	\$260,000	
Maintenance Agreement		
	Old System	New System
Modules in use	\$54,043	\$51,240
New modules	-	20,360
Total	54,043	71,600
Increase	\$17,557	

Cost/benefit analysis

- Software cost amortized over 10 years: $\$260,000 / 10 = \$26,000/\text{year}$
- Additional maintenance agreement costs: \$17,557
- Targeted cost savings needed: \$43,557 annually

Wicks stated he is confident that more savings available would be possible during implementation. The above costs are the upfront direct costs. The new system will decrease the need for personnel; a full-time Senior Clerical staff member earns \$41,880 (mid-point of salary scale- including all benefits) annually. The software will save more than one position.

Targeted savings	\$43,557
Direct costs avoided:	
▫ Applicant tracking	(8,000)
▫ Direct deposit advices	(2,000)
▫ Printer/burster costs	(4,800)
Net targeted savings	28,757
Clerical salary/benefits (at midpoint)	\$41,880

Anticipated savings

- Electronic bidding/procurement
- Automated applicant process
- Improved process flow
- Better internal control
- User-friendly; higher productivity
- Lower training costs
- Broader utilization of system – more information rather than just data - transparency

Next steps

- Seek approval to enter Beta agreement at no initial cost
- Near end of testing –
 - Report status/success
 - Negotiate and prepare new long-term agreement reflecting new software
 - Seek approval from City Council for final accepted cost
- If City does not accept product – no payment

If the product isn't what the City wants...

- Staff will continue with our present system
- Staff will have gained some experience in new technology

Discussion

McClendon: How long is the test period? **Wicks:** 90 days, however, it can be extended. **McClendon:** Will staff be responsible for doing double the work in using both systems during this test period?

Wicks: Entry of data into the new system will have to be performed manually by keyboard as the information cannot be electronically imported. Beyond that, staff will have the added need of learning the new system and producing information from it, which will be ongoing even after the test period. During the test period, staff will have to confirm the integrity of the data and that the system is working as specified. New data entry will take place only until there is enough in place to thoroughly test the system. **McClendon:** Will this expenditure be paid for by bond money, like the software for Community Development? **Wicks:** Yes.

Nicholls: The City would save \$3,000 per month in software maintenance costs by only replacing the existing modules with the new replacement modules, correct? **Wicks:** Correct. **Nicholls:** Is the \$8,000 NeoGov applicant tracking paid monthly or annually? **Wicks:** It is paid annually; if it is not used, the City would be saving that amount. **Nicholls:** Will the interfacing between the modules be an issue, given that some modules will not be available during Beta testing? **Wicks:** The same vendor produces all the modules and they will link the new financial/general ledger modules into the information streaming in from subsystems, such as utility billing. When the SunGard utility billing module becomes available, the City will be requesting permission to become a Beta test site for it as well. **Nicholls:** Has staff discussed enhanced support, since the City will be acting as a test site? **Wicks:** Yes; SunGard has assigned a full-time project manager to the City, which will give the City direct access to that individual.

Beeson: Will the City's current staffing level be adequate? **Wicks:** Yes. The City will not be seeking additional help. It is his intent to centralize the input; Finance and Human Resources personnel will be thoroughly involved from the beginning.

Ordinance O2009-29: Zoning Code Text Amendment – 4-H and FFA Project Animals

Lineberry explained that this issue goes back 10 years, when it was identified as an area of concern by City staff. Over the last decade, dealing with growth and development pushed this issue aside. The existing code states that in order to raise a 4H or FFA project animal, the lot must be 40,000 square feet. Some complaints are received every year; they have not been staff's first priority because enforcement seemed to go against the agricultural nature of the community. Staff knew that the regulations needed to be changed and in May 2008, staff began the revision process by meeting with

representatives of the 4H and FFA. Their initial reaction was not positive because they did not feel that anything they were doing was a problem. Staff's focus was balancing the interests of 4H and FFA members with the right of their neighbors to enjoy their property – not all who live in an agricultural neighborhood actually have animals. The complexity of the issues became apparent as the discussions progressed. Project animals come in all sizes – birds, rabbits, sheep, goats, cows, et cetera. Tying the raising of an animal to a specific zoning district did not work because lot sizes vary within a given zoning district. Tying the activity to a specific lot size complicated the issue further and was also found to be unworkable. Thus, the criteria became performance based, as is reflected in the proposed ordinance.

During the discussions, the issue of food safety was brought up and the ordinance includes provisions related to this issue. At the time, 4H and FFA representatives felt that it was unfair to target just 4H and FFA animals in terms of food safety regulations, saying such regulations should apply to the entire community; however, separating this issue from the 4H and FFA provisions for future legislation proved unsuccessful. Therefore, the proposed ordinance includes provisions relating to food safety.

4H and FFA representatives expressed concern about the City enforcing the provisions without the involvement of 4H and FFA supervisors. They requested they be informed of problems and be the first to approach student participants. The ordinance calls for the City to contact 4H and FFA leaders first when problems arise. The City was concerned about neighbors being informed of the activity with the idea that when people personally approach others there is greater cooperation and fewer problems, so the ordinance requires neighbor notification. City staff was also concerned about how the animals would be housed out of concern for the health of the animal; the ordinance includes regulations dealing with this issue. Farmers were concerned with runoff with animal waste; the ordinance reflects their concerns. The ordinance also reflects the annual 4H and FFA animal raising season. The ordinance does not ignore existing prohibitions on pigs and roosters in the City limits. The requirement to pair goats/sheep was added at the suggestion of 4H and FFA representatives as a way to mitigate these animals' noise.

The 4H and FFA programs for this year have already begun. The organizations have completely revamped their curriculum to include new information about neighbor interaction, food safety and program expectations of participants.

Discussion

McClendon: What happens if a neighbor does not want a project animal next door? **Lineberry:** The ordinance requires only notification; although, a subdivision's Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&R's) could be a factor. **McClendon:** The requirement to pair goats/sheep will make it impossible for some students to participate because of cost and the maturity of the student. **Lineberry:** 4H and FFA leaders suggested this because they felt they would be able to pair students with one animal each. **McClendon** agreed strongly with the buffer zone requirement; however, she questioned to what extent 4H and FFA leaders would emphasize that students cannot walk their animals in fields and how closely they would watch to make sure students were complying.

Shoop: Can a youngster not involved in 4H or FFA raise an animal? **Lineberry:** The proposed ordinance is specific to the 4H and FFA programs because the existing Yuma City Code regulations

apply just to 4H and FFA activities. The current code does not apply to other groups; therefore, the proposed ordinance doesn't either.

Johnson responded to the concern voiced by some that the proposed ordinance singles out 4H and FFA. Rather than singling out for some kind of punishment, the ordinance is actually creating a special class of people for a special privilege. If a neighbor cannot veto an animal, how can their property rights be protected? **Lineberry**: Originally, a neighbor's approval was required; however, to facilitate consensus, it was changed to just notification. **Johnson**: Could a form be used to evidence a neighbor's approval? **Lineberry**: It could; however, 4H and FFA leaders at first did not want students to have to inform their neighbors. That was a change in their practice. Staff convinced them that students would be approaching neighbors, not strangers, and they did not have to go alone. Staff is relying on 4H and FFA leaders and parent support personnel to monitor notification compliance. **Johnson**: What happens if there's a noisy animal? **Lineberry**: The City will receive a complaint. Staff will contact 4H or FFA and relay the information. If 4H or FFA leaders and students are not able to resolve the issue, the City will step in and enforce the code.

Shoop stated that this ordinance will be before the City Council at tomorrow's meeting; public input will be taken. Any further discussion can take place at that time.

IV. GREATER YUMA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Julie Engle, President/CEO of the Greater Yuma Economic Development Corporation (Greater Yuma EDC), explained that the State-administered Enterprise Zone (EZ) program must be renewed every five years. The program offers incentives for certain businesses in areas recognized as depressed. All of Yuma County has been designated as an Enterprise Zone; therefore, she will be asking each of the entities involved – the City of Yuma (at the October 7, 2009 Regular City Council Meeting), Somerton, San Luis, Wellton and Yuma County – to approve the renewal Intergovernmental Agreement.

Yuma County Enterprise Zone

- 18 entities in Yuma County that take advantage of EZ income tax credits
 - For each employee hired over a 3-year period, the company receives a \$3,000 tax credit
- Only for base industries - manufacturing and some printing
 - Does not incentivize retail or hospitality activity
- Property tax component
 - No businesses in Yuma County take advantage of this benefit because the eligibility requirements are many and most do not qualify.
- New participating businesses in Yuma County in 2008-2009
 - These businesses cannot take advantage of the tax credits for a full year
 - General Motors: 90 new employees
 - Optic: 15 new employees
 - CFX Battery: 4 new employees
 - ACCT located in San Luis: 189 new employees
 - Allstate Claims Call Center: 21 new positions

