

Bond Committee Meeting Notes April 19, 2017

| At 6:00 PM, meeting was opened by the Chair McCarthy.

Presentation of polling results by HighGround Consultant.

Presentation of proposed 2017 General Obligation Bond Election projects by city staff.

Questions from committee members:

- Are there other types of funding options? Tax for renters? Food tax?

City staff noted suggestions and advised that the food tax revenue would not be enough to support the significant funding required for Capital Improvement Projects.

- 16 acre land purchase, what is the breakdown for Police, Fire and the park?

City staff stated six acres for the park, with the remaining acreage used for the Fire Station and Police Substation.

- The park connected to the Fire Station/Police Substation land purchase, what will be included?

City staff stated the park portion of this project would resemble a neighborhood park with a playground and ramada.

- Police Training Facility, it is a new project, what is the increase of cost?

By constructing a new property evidence facility, city staff advised that the existing police property and evidence facility was proposed to be renovated into a police training facility at a cost of \$1.9 million. This new project provides a cost savings opportunity from having to construct a new facility.

- What is the national average for Fire Medical response times for cities our size?

City staff advised the National Fire Protection Association's standard (NFPA 1710) recommends the following:

| Emergency Medical Service (EMS) total response time of six (6) minutes.
Fire total response time of six (6) minutes, 20 seconds.

For the City of Surprise, the total average emergency response time for 2016 was six (6) minutes: 52 seconds.

- What are the individual costs for mitigation projects? Can we obtain statistics pertaining to these roads, including accidents, property damage, etc.? Can this information be equated to dollar value?

City staff advised \$22.9 million was the cost for the traffic congestion mitigation projects. City staff also noted they should be able to obtain the information pertaining to these roads and will try to equate them to dollar values for accidents, property damage, etc.

- Pavement Preservation, if this is funded, what happens after five years regarding resurfacing streets?

City staff advised on-going Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) of \$2 million were budgeted for resurfacing. And additional \$2.5 million comes from other sources, primarily the City's General fund for the Pavement Preservation Program.

- How will funds be used/spent for each project/package?

City staff advised that these funds could only be spent on the projects approved through this bond effort. City staff also added for some projects such as the road infrastructure could be subject to future development reimbursement revenues that would be used to pay back the bond debt.

Chair McCarthy asked for questions, comments, feedback.

None made, the committee by consensus moved forward with presenting proposed projects to City Council for formal action.

City staff provided timetable for next steps, Council Work Session May16 for further direction/input; depending on Council consensus a Call to Election agenda action item would occur on the first Council Meeting in June.

Committee member Norberg asked whether one question or three questions would be presented?

City staff advised that three separate questions would be proposed to City Council.

Committee member Norberg expressed concern that her belief was that this meeting was to be about a discussion and an opportunity to provide feedback on the individual projects presented.

Committee member Brown responded by stating that the Chair had asked for feedback and comments before the vote and that would have been the proper place for having a more extensive discussion on each individual project.

At 8:00 PM, the meeting was adjourned.